



Sheringham Shoal and Dudgeon Offshore Wind Farm Extension Projects

The Applicant's Response to Natural England's Risk and Issues Log

Revision A

Deadline 8

July 2023

Document Reference: 22.10

Title:	
Sheringham Shoal and Dudgeon Offshore Wind Farm Extension Projects The Applicant's Response to Natural England's Risk and Issues Log	
PINS Document no.: 22.10	
Document no.: C282-RH-Z-GA-00322	
Date:	Classification
July 2023	Final
Prepared by:	
Royal HaskoningDHV	
Approved by:	Date:
Tom Morris / Sheery Atkins, Equinor	July 2023

1 Applicant's Comments on Natural England's Deadline 5 Appendix K3 Risk and Issues Log [REP5-093]

1.1 Applicant's comments on Tab A Development Consent Order (DCO) /Deemed Marine Licence (DML) of Natural England's Deadline 5 Risk and Issues Log

Point	Point Number(s) from Appendix A [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP and DEP Appendix A - Development Consent Order, Deemed Marine Licences and related certified documentation [RR-063]	RAG Status Rel and WR Rep D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D7	Applicant's comment on D7
Document Used : [APP-024] 3.1 Development Consent Order												
A1	1	The interpretations have included a definition of the habitats regulations derogation provision of evidence, Annex 2A which outlines sandwich tern compensation implementation and monitoring plan. There is no issue on the face of this interpretation, however, the Applicant refers to a plan that may change during the examination process as discussions regarding the compensation are ongoing. Therefore, there may be a need to update this definition later. This comment applies to the interpretation related to Annex 3A as well. We advise there is no action needed now, but once derogations issues have reached their conclusion, this interpretation should be reviewed to ensure it remains appropriate.		No change at deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3		No change at Deadline 5		Given the late stage of the examination we consider that this definition remains appropriate and is unlikely to change before the close of examination. Therefore we consider this issue resolved.		
A2	2, 3, 11	The following Requirements and conditions do not include a maximum number of turbines per development. Natural England recommends adding additional text to make the limitation on the maximum number of turbines clear. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schedule 2, Part 1, Requirement 2 • Schedule 10, Part 2, Condition 1 Comments raised on schedule 10 also apply to Schedules 11, 12 and 13 where similar conditions exist.		Natural England notes the proposed changes which address this issue.								

Point	Point Number(s) from Appendix A [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP and DEP Appendix A - Development Consent Order, Deemed Marine Licences and related certified documentation [RR-063]	RAG Status Rel and WR Rep D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D7	Applicant's comment on D7
A3	4, 5, 11	<p>Natural England advises the text should be amended to include consultation of the relevant SNCB in each of these conditions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schedule 10 Part 2 Condition 4: Due to the importance of in-combination and cumulative impacts of the development. • Schedule 10 Part 2 Condition 13 (1): This condition should also include the need to consult the relevant SNCB as appropriate. <p>Comments raised on schedule 10 also apply to Schedules 11, 12 and 13 where similar conditions exist.</p>		No change at deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3		No Change at Deadline 5 and unlikely to change during examination.		No change at deadline 7		The Applicant's position remains as set out in IDs 5 and 6 of Table 14.8.1 in The Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations - Part 1 [REP1-033] that it is not necessary or appropriate to include consultation of the relevant SNCB in either of these conditions. Natural England will be duly consulted in the usual way by the MMO on relevant plans and, as such, are named consultees (as the relevant SNCB) within each DML in respect of the Site Integrity Plan, pre- and post-construction monitoring and surveys and construction monitoring surveys.
A4	6, 11	<p>There is no mention within Schedule 10 Part 2 Condition 13 of a requirement to microsite cables around identified features of conservation importance. This is a standard mitigation measure and is normally secured within the requirements at Condition 13 (1) (a).</p> <p>Comments raised on schedule 10 also apply to Schedules 11,12 and 13 where similar conditions exist.</p>		Natural England notes and accepts the updated drafting of DCO revision C.								
A5	7, 11	<p>Schedule 10 Part 2 Condition 13 (c) (ii) allows for the scour and cable protection plan to be amended after installation. However, Natural England has concerns about the deployment of scour and cable protection across the entire lifetime of the project. We advise the Applicant amends the condition to make it clear the plan may only be amended and resubmitted to a maximum period of ten years after commencement of operation.</p> <p>Comments raised on schedule 10 also apply to Schedules 11, 12 and 13</p>		No change at deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3		No change at Deadline 5		No change at deadline 7		The Applicant's Position remains as set out in ID 8 of Table 14.8.1 in The Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations - Part 1 [REP1-033] that the amendments are not necessary or appropriate because the relevant controls for scour protection are secured through the approval and implementation of the Offshore Operations and Maintenance Plan under conditions 13(1) and 15(3) of Schedules 10 and 11 and conditions 12(1)(g) and 14(3) of Schedules 12 and 13. In addition, the Applicant has further updated the Outline Offshore Operations and Maintenance Plan (Revision C) [REP3-058] to directly address concerns raised by Natural England around deployment of scour protection across the entire lifetime of the project and makes clear that an additional marine licence would be required to install further scour protection outside of the CSCB MCZ during the operational phase where the scour protection would either exceed that assessed in the

Point	Point Number(s) from Appendix A [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP and DEP Appendix A - Development Consent Order, Deemed Marine Licences and related certified documentation [RR-063]	RAG Status Rel and WR Rep D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D7	Applicant's comment on D7
		where similar conditions exist.										ES or is to be installed after a period of five years from completion of construction.
A6	8, 11	<p>Natural England does not agree with the requirement for this plan to be submitted 4 months prior to construction. Natural England recommends that the timing is amended to require the Site Implementation Plan (SIP) to be submitted no earlier than 9 months and no later than 6 months prior to commencement.</p> <p>Comments raised on schedule 10 also apply to Schedules 11, 12 and 13 where similar conditions exist.</p>		Natural England notes the change to six months prior to construction which partially addresses our concern. However, our request for no submission prior to 9 months before start of construction stands.		No change at Deadline 3		No change at Deadline 5		No change at deadline 7		The Applicant notes as per its response at ID9 of Table 14.8.1 in The Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations - Part 1 [REP1-033] that it has amended the SIP condition following agreement and discussions with the MMO. The MMO as the relevant discharging authority does not require this condition to be further amended to provide that the SIP should be submitted no earlier than 9 months prior to commencement, such an amendment is not considered necessary or helpful.
A7	9, 11	<p>Natural England does not consider 4 months an appropriate timeframe to approve all plans and documentation. Natural England recommends amending the time period to 6 months or adopt a more document specific timing requirement. We are willing to discuss with the Applicant and the MMO a more document specific timing requirement.</p> <p>Comments raised on schedule 10 also apply to Schedules 11, 12 and 13 where similar conditions exist.</p>		No change at deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3		Natural England notes some conditions now allow for 6 months of consultation, partially addressing our concerns.		No change at deadline 7		The Applicant notes that following discussion and agreement with the MMO as the relevant discharging authority it has amended the timings for submission of various plans as set out as set out in ID2 of Table 4 in the Final Statement of Common Ground with Marine Management Organisation (Revision D) [document reference 12.11] and in response to second written question 2.11.6.1 in The Applicant's Responses to the Examining Authority's Second Written Questions [REP3-101]. This agreed document specific approach is considered to be proportionate and reasonable and no further amendments will be made to the timings for submission of plans pursuant to the DMLs.
A8	10, 11	<p>Natural England notes that Schedule 10 Part 2 condition 20 specifies the requirement of monitoring only. This monitoring is required due to uncertainties within the assessment. However, there is no requirement within the condition for the applicant, or regulatory authority, to take action should the monitoring highlight that the impact is significantly in excess of the impact assessed. Consideration should be given to amending the monitoring requirements to make it clear that, if identified impacts are in excess of</p>		No change at deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3		No change at Deadline 5		No change at deadline 7		<p>The Applicant refers to its response to Q4.11.8.2 in The Applicant's Response to the ExA's Fourth Written Questions [document reference 21.5].</p> <p>The Applicant has updated Condition 20 of Schedules 10 and 11 and Condition 19 of Schedules 12 and 13 of the draft DCO (Revision K) [document reference 3.1] to include an additional sub-paragraph (6) as follows:</p> <p><i>(6) In the event that the reports provided to the MMO under sub-paragraph (4) identify a need for additional monitoring, the requirement for any additional monitoring will be agreed with the MMO in writing and implemented as agreed.</i></p> <p>The Applicant does not consider that any further amendments or drafting edits are necessary or appropriate. This is further explained within ID 4 of Table 2 of the Offshore In Principle Monitoring</p>

Point	Point Number(s) from Appendix A [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP and DEP Appendix A - Development Consent Order, Deemed Marine Licences and related certified documentation [RR-063]	RAG Status Rel and WR Rep D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D7	Applicant's comment on D7
		<p>those assessed, there is a need to provide a consideration of appropriate action that could be taken.</p> <p>Comments raised on schedule 10 also apply to Schedules 11, 12 and 13 where similar conditions exist.</p>										<p>Plan (Revision C) [document reference 9.5] which states:</p> <p><i>"If monitoring work identified a potential need for adaptive management or remedial measures, then the Applicant would discuss with the relevant parties (i.e. Natural England and the MMO) at the relevant time what an appropriate course of action would be. Such measures may themselves require a separate consent or agreement before they could be implemented (e.g. a marine licence for works to the seabed). It will therefore not necessarily be within the Applicant's power to immediately undertake such works and therefore it is not appropriate to seek to impose such a requirement through the DML."</i></p> <p>As outlined in the response to Q4.11.8.2, the Applicant considers that any condition that sought to impose additional requirements (i.e. a need to undertake remediation or further mitigation) would not meet the necessary policy tests.</p>
A9	12, 13	<p>Natural England notes that Schedule 12 Part 2 Condition 19 does not contain a requirement for post construction monitoring of the Cromer Shoals Chalk Bed (CSCB) MCZ. Natural England advises that text should be added to this condition to make it clear the need to monitor the works within the MCZ are secured. The monitoring condition should also secure the requirement to take appropriate restoration measures or mitigations should the monitoring highlight an impact of concern beyond that predicted in the ES.</p> <p>Comments raised on Schedule 12 also apply to schedule 13 where similar conditions exist.</p>		No change at deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3		No change at Deadline 5				<p>The Applicant notes that it has amended Condition 19 of Schedules 12 and 13 in response to DC1.8.1.1 in The Applicant's Response to the ExA's commentary on or proposed schedule of changes to the draft Development Consent Order [REP5-051] to specifically refer to undertaking monitoring within the Cromer Shoals Chalk Bed MCZ.</p>
A10	14, 20	<p>Natural England welcomes the requirements of Schedule 17 Part 1 and 2, conditions 2 and 11 to submit the plan of works to the Sandwich Tern Compensation Steering Group and the Kittiwake Compensation Steering Group. We are however concerned that there is no requirement for consultation with the proposed members of the group prior to submission. The plan of works should only be agreed</p>		No change at deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3		No change at Deadline 5		No change at deadline 7		<p>The Applicant's position remains as set out in ID 15 of Table 14.8.1 in The Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations - Part 1 [REP1-033] that it is not necessary or appropriate to include additional consultation requirements that are secured by condition.</p>

Point	Point Number(s) from Appendix A [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP and DEP Appendix A - Development Consent Order, Deemed Marine Licences and related certified documentation [RR-063]	RAG Status Rel and WR Rep D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D7	Applicant's comment on D7
		once the proposed members have been able to voice concerns, as has been the case with other OWF steering groups. Natural England advises these conditions are amended to include a requirement to consult the membership of the steering groups prior to approval of the plans.										
A11	15, 21	Natural England advises that the Applicant considers amending the wording of Schedule 17 Part 1 and 2 Conditions 3 and 12 to ensure that the submission of the monitoring plan is in accordance with the timetable and process approved under the plan of works. We recommend amending the wording to make it clear the implementation and monitoring plans will be submitted at the appropriate juncture.		No change at deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3		No change at Deadline 5		No change at deadline 7		<p>The Applicant's position remains as set out in ID 16 of Table 14.8.1 in The Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations - Part 1 [REP1-033] that it is not necessary or appropriate to include a condition to this effect.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Applicant considers that the key controls that secure the timing of implementation of the compensation measures are the conditions that restrict the operation of any turbine forming part of the development until a certain period after the CIMPs have been implemented (conditions 6 and 16 in Schedule 17 of the draft DCO (Revision K) [document reference 3.1]). These ensure that the compensation will be in place for an appropriate period prior to operation of the developments.</p> <p>Q2.14.1.5 in The Applicant's response to the Examining Authority's Second Written Questions [REP3-101] signposts the various documents that detail the justification for the timescales selected within the DCO drafting.</p> <p>The Applicant would also refer to its response to Q3.14.1.14 within The Applicant's response to the Examining Authority's Third Written Questions [REP5-049] and its response to Q3.14.1.14 within Table 10 of The Applicant's Comments on Responses to the Examining Authority's Third Written Questions [REP6-013].</p>
A12	16	When choosing a suitable compensation site to deliver compensation, consideration is needed on the potential for changes to environmental conditions at the location. These should include the potential for nearby developments that might reduce the effectiveness of the compensation delivered as part of this development.		No change at deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3		No change at Deadline 5		No change at deadline 7		<p>The Applicant's position remains as set out in ID 17 of Table 14.8.1 in The Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations - Part 1 [REP1-033].</p> <p>The Applicant notes that the outline CIMPs already include a section relating to location of the compensation measures (see for example section 2.1 of [APP-073]).</p> <p>Furthermore, the draft DCO (Revision K) [document reference 3.1] (conditions 8 and 18 of Schedule 17) requires the Applicant to submit results from the monitoring scheme for the compensation measures at least annually to the Secretary of State and the relevant statutory nature conservation body. If there is any finding that the measures have been ineffective, then the relevant undertaker must propose adaptive management measures to address this. Any approved measures must be implemented. This would address</p>

Point	Point Number(s) from Appendix A [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP and DEP Appendix A - Development Consent Order, Deemed Marine Licences and related certified documentation [RR-063]	RAG Status Rel and WR Rep D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D7	Applicant's comment on D7
												any reduction in efficacy during the operational period of the developments.
A13	17, 24	Natural England appreciates that monitoring is secured within conditions Schedule 17 Part 1 and 2 Conditions 4 (1) (f) and (2) (f) and 13 (f). This includes a requirement to implement adaptive management, or alternative compensation where monitoring reveals that impacts have reached certain thresholds. However, nowhere within the schedule is it secured that adaptive management measures, or alternative compensation measures must be implemented as approved. Natural England advises that the wording is amended to reflect this requirement.		No change at deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3		No change at Deadline 5		No change at deadline 7		At Deadline 6, The Applicant amended the drafting within Schedule 17 of the draft DCO (Revision H) [REP5-005] for Sandwich tern and kittiwake and in the Without Prejudice DCO Drafting (Revision D) [document reference 3.1.3] for guillemot and native oyster restoration to make more explicit what its obligations will be in relation to monitoring, reporting and adaptive management. The following condition has been added to each Part of the schedule relating to the various compensation measures proposed: "Results from the monitoring scheme must be submitted at least annually to the Secretary of State and the relevant statutory nature conservation body. This must include details of any finding that the measures have been ineffective and, in such case, proposals to address this. Any proposals to address effectiveness must thereafter be implemented by the undertaker as approved in writing by the Secretary of State in consultation with the relevant statutory nature conservation body." The Applicant considers that this addresses the point raised by Natural England. The Applicant also refers to its response to Q3.12.1.3 of The Applicant's response to the Examining Authority's Third Written Questions [REP5-049]
A14	18	The conditions set out in Schedule 17 Part 1 and 2 Conditions 5 and 14 disapply conditions 6,7 and 8 as well as 15, 16 and 17 of the same schedule respectively. These provisions depend, at least partially, on a third party delivering the compensation. As this third party would be outside of the DCO, Natural England queries what would happen should the third party fail to deliver compensation?		Changes to the conditions have been proposed. These changes partially address the concerns but concerns remain regarding the delivery of compensation by third parties as per our comments in our Deadline 2 covering letter.		No change at Deadline 3		No change at Deadline 5		No change at deadline 7		The Applicant's position remains as set out in ID 19 of Table 14.8.1 in The Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations - Part 1 [REP1-033]. The Applicant also refers to the first response in table 1 of The Applicant's comments on Natural England's Deadline 2 Submissions [REP3-107] and to its response to Q3.14.1.16 of The Applicant's response to the Examining Authority's Third Written Questions [REP5-049]. The Applicant maintains that the requirement to obtain Secretary of State consent provides a sufficient mechanism to ensure that any compensation that would be delivered by a third party would be deliverable within the timescales for SEP and DEP. Otherwise, the Secretary of State would not agree to it.
A15	19	Condition 6 does not secure a time requirement for the delivery of the compensation. Natural England advises that timing requirement should be included for both proposals.		No change at deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3		No change at Deadline 5		No change at deadline 7		The Applicant acknowledges that there is a difference of opinion with Natural England on the number of breeding seasons that compensation measures for Sandwich tern and kittiwake should be in operation prior to commencement of operation of the development. The Applicant's position is set out within: - ID 20 of Table 14.8.1 in The Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations - Part 1 [REP1-033]. - Q2.14.1.5 in The Applicant's response to the Examining Authority's Second Written Questions [REP3-101], which signposts the

Point	Point Number(s) from Appendix A [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP and DEP Appendix A - Development Consent Order, Deemed Marine Licences and related certified documentation [RR-063]	RAG Status Rel and WR Rep D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D7	Applicant's comment on D7
												<p>various documents that detail the justification for the timescales selected within the DCO drafting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Applicant's response to Natural England within Q2.14.1.5 of The Applicant's Comments on Responses to the ExA's 2WQ [REP4-028] - Q3.14.1.14 c) within Table 10 of The Applicant's Comments on Responses to the Examining Authority's Third Written Questions [REP6-013].
<p>Document Used: [APP-083] 5.7.1 In-Principle Cromer Shoal Chalk Bed Marine Conservation Zone Measures of Equivalent Environmental Benefit Plan</p>												
A16	22	See comment on DCO Schedule 17 Part 1 and 2 condition 3 (a) and 12 (a) (Point A11)		Updated wording to be submitted by the applicant at Deadline 2 NE to review and comment by deadline 3		Natural England notes the wording has been resubmitted within the Proposed Without Prejudice DCO Drafting Revision B but no change has been made to the wording. Therefore, no change to our position at Deadline 3.		No change at Deadline 5		No change at deadline 7		The Applicant refers to the response at point A11 above.
A17	23	Natural England advises that the requirement for a marine licence should also include the timetables for expected issue of a marine licence and a demonstration that licence can be obtained within the timescales of the plan.		Updated wording to be submitted by the applicant at Deadline 2 NE to review and comment by deadline 3		Natural England notes the wording has been resubmitted within the Proposed Without Prejudice DCO Drafting Revision B but no change has been made to the wording. Therefore, no change to our position at Deadline 3.		No change at Deadline 5		No change at deadline 7		The Applicant's position remains as set out in ID 24 of Table 14.8.1 in The Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations - Part 1 [REP1-033]. The Applicant does not consider any amendment is required to the wording of the DCO.
A18	25	Annex D condition 22 secures that no works may commence until the plan is approved. However, it does not secure the measures of benefit being undertaken prior to works. We consider that it is important the plan secures that compensation measures will be in place and functioning prior to the impact occurring.		Updated wording to be submitted by the applicant at Deadline 2 NE to review and comment by deadline 3		Natural England notes the wording has been resubmitted within the Proposed Without Prejudice DCO Drafting Revision B but no change has been made to the wording. Therefore, no change to our position at Deadline 3.		No change at Deadline 5		No change at deadline 7		<p>The Applicant notes that its position in relation to the need for MEEB has been submitted on a 'without prejudice' basis and the Applicant's position is that, in the event that the Secretary of State concludes that the Applicant is required to undertake MEEB, this would only be where external cable protection was required to be installed in the MCZ.</p> <p>As set out in the Applicant's response to Q3.3.4.1 of The Applicant's response to the Examining Authority's Third Written Questions [REP5-049], if during the pre-construction phase it was determined that no external cable protection for SEP and DEP was required to be installed within the MCZ, then the requirement to deliver MEEB would fall away. The drafting that would secure the MEEB within the Without Prejudice DCO Drafting (Revision D) [document reference 3.1.3] sets out in conditions 35 and 36 of the relevant Part of the Schedule that the MEEB would not require to be undertaken if no external cable protection works were required within the MCZ.</p> <p>Furthermore, if the Secretary of State concluded that MEEB was required, the Applicant assumes that this would be on the basis of the potential <u>cumulative long term</u> habitat loss impacts from the installation of external cable protection within the MCZ. As set out in the In-Principle CSCB MCZ MEEB Plan (Revision C) [REP2-020], the MEEB would provide long-term habitat enhancement.</p> <p>The timetable for implementation of the MEEB would be included within the MEEB Implementation and</p>

Point	Point Number(s) from Appendix A [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP and DEP Appendix A - Development Consent Order, Deemed Marine Licences and related certified documentation [RR-063]	RAG Status Rel and WR Rep D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D7	Applicant's comment on D7
												Monitoring Plan, as secured within paragraph 32(d) of Schedule 17 within the Without Prejudice DCO Drafting (Revision D) [document reference 3.1.3]. On the basis of the above, the Applicant considers that the timing controls within the Without Prejudice DCO Drafting (Revision D) [document reference 3.1.3] are appropriate.
Document Used: 9.5 SEP and DEP Offshore In-Principle Monitoring Plan [APP-289]												
A19	N/A	Additional comment. Natural England advises of the importance of securing a mechanism for adaptive management within the DCO. We advise the bulleted list in Para. 20 of the Offshore IPMP [App-289] omits this key consideration, and that the potential for certain monitoring to trigger the development of countermeasures (with associated monitoring of those measures) should be clearly stated in relevant tables of the IPMP, and incorporated into the DCO conditions where relevant.		No change at deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3		The applicant has updated the IPMP to note potential for Adaptive management. Natural England considers this insufficient to secure that such adaptive management could be enforced and request changes to the IPMP and the DCO. Deadline 5 Appendix A2		No change at deadline 7		The Applicant refers to its response at ID A8 above.
A20	N/A	Additional Comment. As the projects have included a requirement for cable protection within the CSCB MCZ, Natural England advises that a monitoring plan for any cable protection within the MCZ is included with the IPMP and secured within the DCO.		No change at deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3		The Applicant has included proposed monitoring. However, Natural England has requested further detail before we can agree.		No change at deadline 7		As described in the Offshore In-Principle Monitoring Plan (Revision C) document reference 9.5], it is proposed that as the tasks outlined in Table 4 of that document (with respect to monitoring of export cables in the MCZ) are progressed, the specific details and requirements for monitoring are discussed and agreed with Natural England and the MMO, once the detailed design, installation techniques and programme for SEP and DEP are confirmed. Consideration will be given to how monitoring within the MCZ can complement that undertaken for SOW and DOW rather than repeating what was undertaken for those projects. This approach would also apply to any related benthic ecology monitoring.
A21	N/A	Additional Comment: In light of potential sediment disposal across the construction area including within the CSCB MCZ, Natural England advises that pre-construction sediment contaminant monitoring will be required for the purposes of suitability for sediment disposal. We advise this must be agreed with the MMO/CEFAS and secured within the DCO/DML.		No change at deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3		As above, proposals have been updated but further detail is needed.		No change at deadline 7		The Applicant has committed to undertake additional contaminants surveys post-consent and has agreed this with the MMO. As noted in the Final SoCG with the MMO (Revision D) [document reference 12.11]: <i>The MMO welcomes the Applicant's commitment to additional sampling post consent and has provided suggested wording in our Deadline 3 response which the Applicant has included in the Draft DCO (Revision F) [document reference 3.1] at Deadline 3. Therefore this matter is agreed.</i>

Point	Point Number(s) from Appendix A [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP and DEP Appendix A - Development Consent Order, Deemed Marine Licences and related certified documentation [RR-063]	RAG Status Rel and WR Rep D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D7	Applicant's comment on D7
A22	N/A	Additional Comment: Natural England is concerned that no monitoring has been outlined which would provide evidence of the impacts of underwater noise to marine mammals. Please note that if the mitigation measures outlined in the MMMP are found to be insufficient then the DCO or another named plan must secure the action to be taken to address the identified issues and further monitored.		No change at deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3		The Applicant has provided further information, however, Natural England considers that further detail is needed before our concerns can be removed.		No change at deadline 7		The Offshore In-Principle Monitoring Plan (Revision C) [document reference 9.5] was further updated at Deadline 7 to include additional text relating to the hypotheses that the marine mammals monitoring is seeking to address, as requested by Natural England.
A23	N/A	Additional Comment: Subject to Natural England's final position: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ornithological monitoring of species/impacts subject to compensation (kittiwake, Sandwich tern and potentially guillemots, razorbills and red-throated diver) should be conducted at the windfarm site as well as at the compensation sites. Other species that are close to adverse effect (under HRA) or moderate adverse (under EIA) to be included as targets for monitoring. Any other key areas of uncertainty that feed into the impact assessment should be included, for example sandwich tern flight speed/flight height, survival rates etc. 		No change at deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3		Updated species list has been accepted, however, further information is still required on ornithological monitoring, see Deadline 5 Appendix A2 table 2.		No change at deadline 7		The Offshore In-Principle Monitoring Plan (Revision C) [document reference 9.5] was updated at Deadline 7. Table 2 of that document provides responses to Natural England's points around monitoring in relation to offshore ornithology.
Additional Comments Since Relevant Representation												
A24	N/A	Additional comment: Natural England advises that the Landscape management plan and the Ecological management plan required in Schedule 2 part 1 requirements 12 and 14 should be amalgamated into an outline landscape environmental management strategy (OLEMS). This was identified within App. I of Natural England's Relevant Representation [RR-063] and should have been included in Annex A [RR-063] as well for clarity. See Onshore Ecology Tab I, Point I13.		No change at deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3		No change at Deadline 5		No change at deadline 7		The application and DCO has been structured on the basis of separate landscape and ecological management plans which are secured through Requirements 11, 12 and 13 of the draft DCO (Revision K) [document 3.1]. It is not necessary to amalgamate the two documents into one OLEMS in order to deliver the required mitigation. Moreover, the local authorities who are responsible for discharging the relevant requirements are satisfied with the Applicant's approach which is well precedented in recent DCOs including The Hornsea Three Offshore Wind Farm Order 2020, The Norfolk Boreas Offshore Wind Farm Order 2021, The Norfolk Vanguard Offshore Wind Farm Order 2022, The East Anglia One North Offshore Wind Farm Order 2022, The East Anglia Two Offshore Wind Farm Order 2022 and the final draft Hornsea Four Offshore Wind Farm Order 202X .

Point	Point Number(s) from Appendix A [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP and DEP Appendix A - Development Consent Order, Deemed Marine Licences and related certified documentation [RR-063]	RAG Status Rel and WR Rep D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D7	Applicant's comment on D7
A25	N/A	Additional Comment: Natural England wishes to work with the Applicant to secure a condition for strategic pink footed geese mitigation. See tab I - Terrestrial Ecology Point I10.		No change at deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3		No change at Deadline 5		Please see our advice to the ExAWQ4 in appendix L4 and response to the RIES in Appendix L5. Natural England advises that a condition is added to the DCO that ensures that until the PFG mitigation measures are agreed no works can commence.		<p>The Applicant has made a commitment to provide a Pink Footed Goose Management Plan within the Outline Ecological Management Plan (Revision E) [document reference 9.19], which is secured by Requirement 13 of the draft DCO (Revision K) [document reference 3.1]. The Outline Ecological Management Plan includes an example as to what the mitigation could include i.e. a Watching Brief, demonstrating that mitigation options are readily available, with final details to be provided within the final management plan.</p> <p>The is of the view that the mitigation options provided within the Best Practice Advice on North Norfolk Coast SPA Pink Footed Geese – February 2023 [REP1-137] are not the only mitigation options that exist. It is also evident that one of the two mitigation options presented within the Best Practice Guidance will not be sufficiently developed by the close of the Examination for the Applicant to include it in its dDCO and as a result the Applicant has concluded this is not the route to secure pink-footed goose mitigation measures. Finally, the evidence base underpinning the guidance is also unclear.</p> <p>The Applicant therefore considers it more appropriate to develop a bespoke management plan based on site-specific evidence and updated surveys and in discussion with Natural England. Those discussions are ongoing and will continue following the Examination and grant of consent, in the event that the DCO is made.</p> <p>The Applicant also refers to its response within The Applicant's Response to the Examining Authority's Rule 17 Letter dated 12 July 2023 [document reference 22.2].</p>
A25	N/A	Additional Comment: Noting the addition of a definition of Natural England and changes to some requirements to reference Natural England and not the Relevant Statutory Nature Conservation Body. Natural England does not agree with this change due to the lack of consistency and the increased potential for error created by its inclusion.						Raised at Deadline 5 due to changes at Deadline 4.		No change at deadline 7		<p>The Applicant has included reference to Natural England within the requirements at the request of the local authorities. Based on recent experience discharging similar requirements, the local authorities consider that it is clearer and more certain to include reference to the specific bodies it must consult by naming them. The Applicant also notes that the definition of Natural England includes 'any successor in name or function'. With regards to precedent, the Applicant notes that there are examples of DCOs where the consultees are specifically named and also where the term relevant SNCB is used and as such, either approach should be considered acceptable. For example, the A428 Black Cat to Caxton Gibbet Development Consent Order 2022 included reference to Natural England in Requirements 3, 6 and 24 (Part 1 of Schedule 2) and the term SNCB is not used. The same approach has also been used in the A47 Wansford to Sutton Development Consent Order 2023, A417 Missing Link Development Consent Order 2022, A57 Link Roads Development Consent Order 2022 and A47/A11 Thickthorn Junction Development Consent Order 2022.</p>

1.2 Applicant's comments on Tab B Offshore Ornithology of Natural England's Deadline 5 Risk and Issues Log

Point	Point Number(s) from Appendix B [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP AND DEP Appendix B - Offshore Ornithology [RR-063]	RAG Status Rel and WR Rep D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D7	Applicant's comment on D7
Document Used: [APP-097] Chapter 11 Offshore Ornithology. PINS Doc Number 6.1.11. Doc RefC282-RH-Z-GA-00031												
B1	Summary Section 2 and point 7	Collision Risk Management (CRM) Parameters: We would advise that, as a minimum, revised figures based on a subset of variables (i.e. using mean density data and CRM parameters (central value only) from the Natural England's interim guidance note) are presented for Sandwich tern, gannet, kittiwake, great black backed gull, lesser black backed gull (LBBG) and little gull. See Section 2 and Appendix B1 of [RR-063] Relevant Representation of Natural England.		No change at deadline 2.		Natural England welcome the inclusion of other OWF data and the correction of CRM data, however we still require further explanation of methods before we can place confidence in these values. Therefore, the status remains unchanged. Please see comment 4, comment 5 and comment 11, Appendix C2 of our Deadline 3 response.		NE acknowledge that the Applicant has provided updated collision estimates in the CRM update note: revised collision risk totals for SEP, DEP and previous projects and in-combination assessment. We agree with the values presented by the Applicant in the latest CRM update. The HRA update has yet to be revised to reflect the slight changes made to the cumulative collision risk figures presented in CRM (NE do not consider these discrepancies will materially affect the conclusion).		The applicant is advised to update the HRA note before close of examination.		The Applicant has updated the collision risk estimates in the Apportioning and Habitats Regulations Assessment Note (Revision E) [document reference 13.3] for gannet and kittiwake at Deadline 7, in accordance with NE's request. It is noted that these changes do not affect the conclusions of the assessment.
B2	Summary Section 3	<p>Natural England's Position: Natural England has identified significant adverse impacts at the EIA scale to gannet, kittiwake, great black-backed gull, guillemot, razorbill and red-throated diver (RTD) irrespective of whether SEP and DEP are included in the cumulative totals. SEP and DEP will be making an additional contribution to those totals.</p> <p>At the end of the Hornsea Project Four (HP4) Examination, Natural England could not rule out adverse effects on the integrity of the kittiwake, guillemot, razorbill and seabird features of the Flamborough Filey Coast (FFC) SPA, irrespective of whether SEP and DEP were included in the in-combination totals. We have also previously advised in combination adverse effects cannot be ruled out for sandwich tern at the North Norfolk Coast SPA. Again, SEP and DEP will make contributions to the in-combination impacts.</p> <p>In the case of HRA, where SEP and DEP make an additional contribution to the in-combination impact, then a derogation case will be required, unless the impact can be substantially mitigated. Where impacts have been deemed to be significant at the EIA scale, the Applicant should demonstrate that its contribution to those impacts has been duly reduced through mitigation.</p> <p>Providing there are no further significant changes to the collision and displacement figures provided for SEP and DEP, Natural England is likely to reach a conclusion of no Adverse Effect on Integrity (AEOI) for FFC SPA gannet feature when considering the in-combination impact including SEP and DEP.</p>		No change at deadline 2.		<p>"Alde-Ore Estuary SPA Lesser black back gull - Natural England agrees with the conclusion of no AEOI LBBG at Alde Ore SPA alone and no measurable contribution to in-combination. Natural England agree that the apportioning approach is likely to lead to overestimation of apportioning for projects at the further reaches of a species foraging range.</p> <p>Red Throated Diver in the Greater Wash SPA - Whilst SEP and DEP's contribution to displacement within the GW SPA is minimal, SEP's contribution in combination with existing OWFs mean that adverse effects on site integrity cannot be ruled out. Please see Appendix C2 of our Deadline 3 response.</p> <p>Guillemot within the Flamborough and Filey Coast SAC - Natural England has concerns with the method adopted to calculate impact assessment. We recommend that the Applicant adopts the approach taken by the Hornsea Four project. Please see comment 6, comment 7 and comment 8, Appendix C2 of our Deadline 3 response.</p> <p>We will update our position by Deadline 5 at the latest."</p>		Greater Wash SPA RTD feature - NE will advise further by Deadline 7 at the latest. Natural England can advise that there is no adverse effect on integrity (AEol) of the gannet feature of the FFC SPA for SEP, DEP and SEP&DEP in-combination with currently consented projects. It is not possible to rule out AEol of the kittiwake feature of the FFC SPA or the Sandwich Tern feature of the North Norfolk Coast SPA for collision impacts from in-combination with other plans and projects. Guillemot and Razorbill - FFC SA - the impact estimates for Hornsea 4 need to be updated for guillemot and razorbill to reflect NE's approach to calculation of impact.		Please refer to Natural England's Deadline 7 submission: Appendix B2 - Natural England's Offshore Ornithology Position		<p>Red-throated diver (GW SPA)</p> <p>Please refer to Points B8 and B14-B18 for the Applicant's position in relation to red-throated diver.</p> <p>Gannet (FFC SPA)</p> <p>The Applicant welcomes NE's confirmation that it is agreed that there would be no AEol in respect of this feature.</p> <p>Kittiwake (FFC SPA) and Sandwich tern (NNC SPA)</p> <p>It is noted that the conclusion of AEol is agreed between the Applicant and NE, and that compensation measures are proposed accordingly, as set out in relevant documents submitted to the Examination.</p> <p>Guillemot and razorbill (FFC SPA)</p> <p>The Applicant provided updated in-combination estimates for these species in the Apportioning and Habitats Regulations Assessment Note (Revision D) [REP5-043] submitted at Deadline 5. These include the most recent estimates for HP4, as requested by NE. The Applicant's position in respect of these species is unchanged, i.e. that no AEol for the guillemot and razorbill feature of FFC SPA can be concluded.</p>

Point	Point Number(s) from Appendix B [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP AND DEP Appendix B - Offshore Ornithology [RR-063]	RAG Status Rel and WR Rep D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D7	Applicant's comment on D7
		We have also previously advised that we cannot rule out AEOI in combination for the LBBG feature at Alde-Ore Estuary SPA and RTD feature at the Outer Thames Estuary SPA. We also have concerns about adverse effects on the Greater Wash SPA RTD feature.										
B3	Summary Section 4	Biologically Defined Minimum Population Size (BDMPS) Apportioning in the Breeding Season: Natural England recommends that some level of apportioning is presented for qualifying features within mean max and mean max plus one standard deviation (SD).		No change at deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3		Resolved.				
B4	Summary Section 5	BDMPS Apportioning for Kittiwake and Gannet in the Non-breeding Season: Natural England advises that it is not appropriate to correct the BDMPS apportioning in the non-breeding season for the proportion of adults (or adult types in the case of kittiwakes) observed in the at sea survey data. The proportion of adults is already corrected for with the BDMPS figures, and applying this correction 'double corrects', reducing the level of impact apportioned (albeit to a relatively small extent).		No change at deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3		Resolved.				
B5	Summary Section 6	Flamborough and Filey Coast SPA: Natural England advises that puffin, as a component species of the FFC SPA seabird assemblage, will need to be considered as part of the assessment of impacts on the seabird assemblage in the HRA.		No change at deadline 2.		Natural England welcome the acknowledgement of potential connectivity between breeding puffin at FFC SPA and the project as noted within our RR-063. Whilst we don't agree with the method of calculation, we are in agreement that there would be no measurable contribution to in-combination puffin mortality from SEP and DEP (please see comment 15, Appendix C2 of Deadline 3 response).						
B6	Summary Section 10	Mitigation Hierarchy: The assessment has presented scenarios for DEP that involve placing all turbines in DEP N (as opposed to turbines in both DEP N and DEP S), this scenario is somewhat at odds with the mitigation hierarchy, as it increases the impact to key species which are sensitive to collision. Natural England recommends this scenario is not progressed into any DCO that might be granted, as it departs from the mitigation hierarchy, would increase the project's impacts on key SPA features of concern and raise the demands on the proposed compensatory measures, the performance of which is inevitably uncertain.		No change at deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3		Please refer to Natural England's comments at Deadline 4 [REP4-049].		No change at deadline 7.		The Applicant has presented its position on this matter in its written representations (e.g. Q2.5.1.4 of [REP5-056]). It is maintained that it is not appropriate to restrict the placement of turbines within the DEP array areas, and also maintains that the approach to the assessment meets mitigation hierarchy requirements.

Point	Point Number(s) from Appendix B [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP AND DEP Appendix B - Offshore Ornithology [RR-063]	RAG Status Rel and WR Rep D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D7	Applicant's comment on D7
B7	Summary Section 11	Updating Cumulative and In Combination Totals: As the Applicant notes, the cumulative and in-combination assessments presented in the submission will need to be updated to reflect recently submitted/examined projects, particularly as the recent Hornsea Project Four examination has resulted in Natural England advising AEoI on a number of qualifying features at FFC SPA. Natural England will need to receive up-to-date cumulative and in-combination assessments for review before we can provide our final advice.		No change at deadline 2.		In-combination totals have been updated for Kittiwake and Razorbill at FFC SPA, however no explanation has been provided for the change. Therefore no change at Deadline 3 (please see comments 13 and 14, Appendix C2 of Deadline 3 response).		Kittiwake FFC SPA - NE have re-calculated in-combination impacts to include these projects, alongside totals where zeroes are used. Razorbill + Guillemot FFC SPA: The impact estimates for Hornsea 4 need to be updated. The applicant has indicated that this update will be expected at Deadline 5.		Guillemot and Razorbill, FFC SPA in-combination assessment, Position provided. This addresses our comment, no further action required.		Updates have been provided in the Apportioning and Habitats Regulations Assessment Note (Revision E) [document reference 13.3]. No further updates are proposed by the Applicant; it is noted that NE has acknowledged that it has sufficient information to provide its final position in respect of these features.
Document Used: [APP-097] Chapter 11 Offshore Ornithology. PINS Doc Number 6.1.11. Doc RefC282-RH-Z-GA-00031												
B8	1 (and Summary Section 9)	The Applicant should consider if the different winter season length for RTD as presented by the Applicant would impact the assessment outcome, and consider seasonal restrictions to vessel movements in the SPA between 1st November and 31st March. Further investigation of all potential vessel movements within the Greater Wash SPA (and Outer Thames Estuary SPA) is needed, and the mitigation hierarchy applied to minimise the potential for SEP and DEP to contribute to these effects. Residual effects should be considered in tandem with permanent displacement effects arising from the presence of the SEP array.		No change at deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3		No change at Deadline 5. The applicant has indicated that this update will be expected at Deadline 5.		Natural England await Deadline 7 update and will provide a final position at Deadline 8.		<p>The Applicant maintains that, based on its assessments within the Apportioning and Habitats Regulations Assessment Updates Technical Note (Revision E) [document reference 13.3], an AEoI on the red-throated diver feature can be ruled out. Nevertheless, in order to reach an agreed position with Natural England, the Applicant has committed to the following mitigation measures.</p> <p>The Applicant has committed to a seasonal restriction on export cable laying activity within the SPA as secured by Condition 24 of Schedules 12 and 13 of the draft DCO (Revision K) [document reference 3.1] and therefore potential impacts on RTD from export cable installation would be avoided.</p> <p>In addition, the Applicant updated the best practice protocol for minimising disturbance to red-throated divers within the Outline PEMP (Revision D) [document reference 9.10] to include further mitigation commitments regarding construction and O&M vessel movements (see B14 below for details).</p> <p>Finally, as noted within the Apportioning and Habitats Regulations Assessment Updates Technical Note (Revision E) [document reference 13.3], the Applicant put forward proposals at Deadline 7 for a turbine restriction zone at the south eastern corner of SEP to mitigate array-related displacement effects on the Greater Wash SPA. This resulted in an approximate 4.5% reduction in buildable area of SEP and would remove turbines from the only part of SEP that is located within 10km of GW SPA, where the SPA is not currently located within 10km of the existing Sheringham Shoal and Race Bank OWFs and/or outside of the red-throated diver 'maximum curvature</p>

Point	Point Number(s) from Appendix B [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP AND DEP Appendix B - Offshore Ornithology [RR-063]	RAG Status Rel and WR Rep D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D7	Applicant's comment on D7
												<p>analysis' (MCA) area within the SPA. Accordingly, it is the Applicant's position that this would effectively reduce the net displacement effect from SEP to zero, and would further support the Applicant's position that there would be no AEol in respect of this feature.</p> <p>However, following further consideration and discussions with Natural England on 14 July 2023, the Applicant has subsequently committed to an additional turbine restriction zone in the southwest corner of SEP at Deadline 8. This is documented in the Apportioning and Habitats Regulations Assessment Updates Technical Note (Revision E) [document reference 13.3] and the Works Plans (Offshore) (Revision D) [document reference 2.7], to be submitted at Deadline 8. The south-western and south-eastern exclusion areas together would reduce the buildable area within SEP by approximately 7.8%. Together with the above commitments, this has allowed Natural England to rule out AEol on the RTD feature of the Greater Wash and Outer Thames Estuary SPAs (see the Final Statement of Common Ground with Natural England (Offshore Ornithology) (Revision B) [document reference 14.8]). This commitment is secured through the Works Plans (Offshore) (Revision D) [document reference 2.7].</p>
B9	2	Natural England recommends the Applicant reviews our guidance (see [RR-063] Appendix B2) on existing pressures in the wider environment, and potentially compile available information on current understanding of impacts of Highly Pathogenic Avian Influenza (HPAI) to key species/colonies of relevance to the SEP and DEP application (Species: Sandwich tern, kittiwake, guillemot, razorbill, little gull, RTD, gannet, LBBG), puffin, colonies: Flamborough & Filey Coast SPA, North Norfolk Coast SPA, Alde-Ore Estuary SPA, Greater Wash SPA). We advise the Applicant considers potential implications of HPAI for the impact assessments and submits an update into the Examination.		No change at deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3. We have advised the Applicant to provide us with the relevant information and submit into examination.		NE acknowledge the HPAI report. NE highlight long-term impacts of the ongoing avian influenza epidemic on the seabird SPA populations are presently unknown. This means there is considerable uncertainty regarding the likely population sizes and growth rates in the future.				

Point	Point Number(s) from Appendix B [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP AND DEP Appendix B - Offshore Ornithology [RR-063]	RAG Status Rel and WR Rep D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D7	Applicant's comment on D7
B10	4	The current approach to assessing displacement during construction uses data from Fleissbech et al (2019). However, Natural England advises it may make more sense to just extend the predicted operational impact by 1-2 years rather than going through the process of calculating a different approach. Acknowledging that, as the construction develops, there are more and more turbines present in the array site which may (whether operational or not) cause displacement. This is only relevant if there is a need for population modelling (i.e. the period of impact is 42 years rather than 40 years).		No change at deadline 2.								
B11	5	Natural England recommends the assessment of an annual impact at the largest BDMPS recommended for EIA, and notes that for some species the appropriate population scale is the breeding season population – please see our outline of this issue in point 4 (B3) above.		No change at deadline 2.								
B12	6	Regarding the assessment of impacts on RTD: please note the latest Statutory Nature Conservation Body (SNCB) advice. https://hub.jncc.gov.uk/assets/9aecb87c-80c5-4cfb-9102-39f0228dcc9a										
B13	8	Natural England advises that Rampion 2 PEIR was published in Aug 2021 (https://rampion2.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/07/Rampion-2-PEIR-Volume-2-Chapter-12-Offshore-ornithology.pdf). This should be included in totals where appropriate. We acknowledge that the Applicant plans to update the assessment with up-to-date Hornsea Project 4 totals. We highlight that a number of OWF PEIRs are anticipated in early 2023, and we advise data from relevant projects should be used to update cumulative/in-combination assessments as required.		No change at deadline 2.		"Natural England welcomes the inclusion of Rampion 2 data. With regard the updating of Hornsea Project FOUR (HP4) data for the in combination displacement assessment and the in combination collision risk assessment. Hornsea Project FOUR have amended their data since our advice. They have used three different approaches ("Natural England's Standard", "Natural England's Bespoke" and the "Applicant's Approach"). For FFC SPA, we request the Applicant presents both the Natural England Standard and Bespoke approaches rather than the Applicant's Approach. EIA totals haven't been updated since the Hornsea Project FOUR data have been released. We have signposted to the most recent data. We will base our decisions on Natural England approaches only. Please see point 4 of our Appendix C2 of Deadline 3 response. "		Natural England notes that a number of North Sea OWF projects have submitted EIA scoping reports to PINS; Rampion 2, Five Estuaries, North Falls, Outer Dowsing, Dogger Bank South (2 projects) and Dogger Bank D. The Rampion 2 PEIR was consulted on in 2022. The Five Estuaries and North Falls PEIRs have been consulted on recently, with Outer Dowsing and Dogger Bank South PEIRs due to be consulted on shortly. As Tier 4-5 projects, these projects should be considered as part of in-combination assessments where this would be meaningful. Please also note that Berwick Bank OWF. The section 36 submission for Berwick Bank, while later than the SEP and DEP DCO submission, is now available however Natural England consider that based on recent submissions from Hornsea Project 4, (which now include Berwick Bank) this additional data from Berwick Bank will not affect the integrity judgments we have provided.		Please refer to Natural England's comments at Deadline 5, Appendix B1 [REP5-091].		The Applicant has provided updates to the in-combination values for HP4 (using the 'Applicant's approach', 'NE standard approach' and 'NE bespoke approach') in the Apportioning and Habitats Regulations Assessment Updates Technical Note (Revision C) [REP5-043] submitted at Deadline 5. Values from Five Estuaries and North Falls PEIRs have not been included in the values presented in the HRA Note; however, their inclusion would make no measurable difference to the presented PVA outputs or the assessment conclusions.

Document Used: [APP059] 5.4 Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment – Offshore Ornithology Sections

Point	Point Number(s) from Appendix B [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP AND DEP Appendix B - Offshore Ornithology [RR-063]	RAG Status Rel and WR Rep D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D7	Applicant's comment on D7
B14	9	<p>It is unclear why Dudgeon Extension Project (DEP) is not being considered for operational phase effects, given that O&M vessels may transit through the Greater Wash SPA on route to the array.</p> <p>Natural England advises the Applicant considers impacts on O&M vessels from DEP as well as Sheringham Extension Project (SEP), or clarify that O&M vessels from Great Yarmouth will not enter the SPA.</p>		No change at deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3. See Summary of advice on red throated diver, Appendix C2, of our Deadline 3 submission.		No change. Natural England is expecting further information at deadline 5.		Natural England await Deadline 7 update and will provide a final position at Deadline 8.		<p>The Applicant has provided an update on these matters in the Apportioning and Habitats Regulations Assessment Note (Revision E) [document reference 13.3]. The Applicant has agreed that there will be a seasonal restriction on export cable laying activity within the SPA, as secured by Condition 24 of Schedules 12 and 13 of the draft DCO (Revision K) [document reference 3.1]; and also that the best practice protocol for minimising disturbance to red-throated diver has been updated with a firm commitment to utilise existing vessel transit routes, and an additional commitment regarding considering the potential for crew transfer vessels to transit to the wind farm sites in convoy, where practicable. This is secured within the Outline Project Environmental Management Plan (PEMP) (Revision D) [document reference 9.10]. As above (B8), Natural England have agreed that AEol can be ruled out.</p>
B15	10, 12	<p>As a minimum, the best practice protocol for all vessel movements through the SPA should be adhered to (see EA1N/EA2 pre-determination submissions regarding the details of the protocol). However, at this stage we are uncertain that this will be sufficient to avoid the project from contributing to potential adverse effects on the Greater Wash SPA.</p> <p>Natural England recommends that the implications of cable installation on extent of available habitat in the SPA are assessed. Please consider the need for a seasonal restriction to cable installation works between 1st November to 31st March inclusive or other mitigation measures.</p>		No change at deadline 2.		Natural England welcomes the consideration for the reduction in available habitat presented by the Applicant in REP2-036. We request that further justification is supplied for why the concurrent construction would represent the WCS for RTD displacement. Please see Point 21 within Appendix C2 of our Deadline 3 response.		No change. Natural England is expecting further information at deadline 5.		Natural England await Deadline 7 update and will provide a final position at Deadline 8.		<p>The Applicant clarified in the Apportioning and Habitats Regulations Assessment Updates Technical Note (Revision C) [REP5-043] submitted at Deadline 5 that the sequential (and not concurrent) cable laying approach is considered to be the WCS.</p> <p>Refer to Point B14 above for the Applicant's response to other matters.</p>
B16	11	<p>We note that the gradient approach to RTD displacement, as used in EA1N and EA2 has been presented within the RIAA. This accords with advice given in the ETG, but please note Natural England has recently provided updated advice on appropriate gradients, please see advice in Appendix B Table 3 of [RR-063] Relevant Representation of Natural England. Natural England advises the Applicant amends the tables/results accordingly.</p>		No change at deadline 2.		Applicant has adopted advised appropriate RTD displacement gradients [REP2-036].		No change. Natural England is expecting further information at deadline 5.		Natural England await Deadline 7 update and will provide a final position at Deadline 8.		See response at B8 above.

Point	Point Number(s) from Appendix B [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP AND DEP Appendix B - Offshore Ornithology [RR-063]	RAG Status Rel and WR Rep D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D7	Applicant's comment on D7
B17	13	<p>The assessment usefully reveals that that 22.81% of the Greater Wash SPA already falls within 12km of an OWF. This inevitably raises the concern that there are existing adverse effects from the existing OWF to which SEP could add further operational displacement i.e. an in-combination adverse effect. This matter will need further discussion during the Examination. We note in Para. 1079 that part of the area impacted by operational displacement was classified for species other than RTD. Natural England advises this should be quantified and explored in more detail.</p> <p>Natural England advises further investigation of the significance of the impacted area to RTD is needed to help better understand the likely contribution of SEP to in-combination displacement to RTD. If an in-combination adverse effect cannot be excluded, impact avoidance/reduction e.g. array design should be considered.</p>		No change at deadline 2.		Clarity of method provided by the Applicant [REP2-036] has suggested their estimates of displacement of SEP alone is likely an underestimate. Please see Point 22 within Appendix C2 of our Deadline 3 response.		Natural England will provide further detailed information by Deadline 7.		Natural England await Deadline 7 update and will provide a final position at Deadline 8.		<p>The Applicant has provided an update on this matter in the Apportioning and Habitats Regulations Assessment Updates Technical Note (Revision E) [Document reference 13.3] to be submitted at Deadline 8.</p> <p>See B8 regarding RTD mitigation commitments. Natural England confirmed in its meeting with the Applicant on 14 July 2023, that through the Applicant's additional commitments (as set out at B8) no AEol can be concluded in respect of GW SPA red-throated diver.</p>
B18	14	<p>Data Natural England holds from the NNR manager for the colonies in question present some discrepancies, mainly minor. Please see Table B5 of Appendix B [RR-063] Relevant Representation of Natural England, highlighted cells indicate discrepancies. We have already provided the data to the Applicant. The key discrepancy is that there is productivity data for Scolt Head in the Seabird Monitoring Programme in 2019 (where the Table reads no data). Natural England advises the Applicant to update the figures - and explore whether the changes warrant an updated PVA.</p>		No change at deadline 2.		No Change at Deadline 3. Please clarify that these data have been incorporated into calculation.		No change at Deadline 5.		No change at Deadline 7.		<p>As set out in the Applicant's comments on Relevant Representations at Deadline 1 [REP1-033] (ID 33 Table 4.18.2), it is confirmed that the Applicant has reviewed these data and that the small discrepancies will make no appreciable effect on the PVA outputs. Accordingly, no updates the PVA outputs have been undertaken or are warranted.</p>
B19	15	<p>Natural England accepts there is potential for sandwich tern to be displaced, and while we welcome the review of possible evidence and the inclusion of this in the impact assessment, we do not consider the evidence base is sufficiently robust at this stage to incorporate Macro Avoidance into the collision risk assessment.</p> <p>Natural England will base our conclusions on collision alone and displacement and collision together (but not with the inclusion of macro avoidance in the collision assessment). However, we note that the advised change to the avoidance rate for sandwich terns from 98% to 99% is the equivalent of the presented 98% figures with a 50% Macro Avoidance.</p>		No change at deadline 2.		Applicant has conducted the CRM omitting macro-avoidance values within REP2-036.						

Point	Point Number(s) from Appendix B [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP AND DEP Appendix B - Offshore Ornithology [RR-063]	RAG Status Rel and WR Rep D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D7	Applicant's comment on D7
B20	16	<p>Please note Natural England recommends the use of the published flight speed (Fijn and Gyimesi (2018)) of 10.3 m/s, as opposed to the selected flight speed of Fijn and Collier (2020) at 8.3 m/s, however we recognise the value in colony specific evidence and will take note of both outputs when forming our advice. Note also the advised changed AR of 99% - the use of a 50% MA and 98% AR is the equivalent of 0% MA and 99% AR.</p> <p>We advise that the Applicant should refer to the new CRM parameter guidance (see Appendix B1 of [RR-063] Relevant Representation of Natural England) and present the CRM outputs using the parameters set out in the new guidance (incl flight speed, but limited to a subset of mean values only (i.e. excluding models of outputs using the 95% CI/SDs of key parameters).</p>		No change at deadline 2.		Applicant has now provided both sets of flight speed data within REP2-036.						
B21	18	<p>We note a number of scenarios have been presented representing the range of possible legal and practical built turbine parameters. Natural England requires that an 'as-built' scenario is 'legally secure' and as such the starting point for assessment will be Scenario A. However, we will also take note of Scenario C (which is as built, but with excess capacity modelled as consented). We also observe there is a scenario not presented, which is all legally secured parameters (for this it would presumably be scenario A but with Dudgeon reflecting the as-built?).</p>		No change at deadline 2.		We acknowledge that a new scenario (Scenario F) included within REP2-036 we will provide further update at Deadline 4.		In terms of in-combination impact, the applicant has presented six scenarios. In the case of Dudgeon, Equinor have legally secured the as-built turbine parameters. This means NE can also refer to scenario F which is as per Scenario A apart from the collision estimates for Dudgeon, which are calculated using 'as built' turbine parameters. Please refer to Natural England's comments at Deadline 4 [REP4-049].				
B22	19	<p>SEP and DEP are both within mean max foraging range for Lesser Black Backed Gull (LBBG), yet the apportioning rate in the breeding season is 0% - this is not reasonable, despite presence of other nearer colonies, some of which are much smaller than Alde-Ore Estuary SPA. Natural England advises it would be worth reviewing the submissions made in the Norfolk Boreas/Vanguard and EA1N/EA2 projects to see what data was marshalled regarding non-SPA colonies in Suffolk (e.g. Lowestoft), as some of those may fall within the foraging range. Natural England recommends developing an evidence-based approach to apportioning LBBG mortality to Alde-Ore SPA in the breeding season, considering all colonies within the mean max foraging range.</p>		No change at deadline 2.		Natural England agrees with the Applicant's rationale as set out within REP2-036. Please see Point 1 and Point 2, Appendix C2, of our Deadline 3 response.						

Point	Point Number(s) from Appendix B [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP AND DEP Appendix B - Offshore Ornithology [RR-063]	RAG Status Rel and WR Rep D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D7	Applicant's comment on D7
B23	20	Kittiwake and Gannet apportioning has not been calculated correctly in the non-breeding season. The BDMPS proportions already take account of the number of adults likely to be present in the BDMPS, so it is not appropriate to correct (a second time) for the proportions of adults (or adult type in the case of kittiwake) in the BDMPS. For example, for gannet in the post breeding/autumn migration season the apportioning should be 4.8%, not 4.8%*93.4%. Please provide corrected figures.		No change at deadline 2.		Corrected in REP2-036.						
B24	21	HPAI appears to have spread rapidly within parts of the gannetry at FFC SPA in the 2022 breeding season. The consequences of this for the gannet population and its future growth rate are not known, but may have implications for the impact assessment (and indeed for other affected seabird species). Natural England will endeavour to keep the project updated during the Examination. We advise the impact assessment may need to be updated in the light of HPAI impacts, though this cannot be confirmed at this stage (a point also relevant to other seabirds affected by HPAI).		No change at deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3. We have advised the Applicant to provide us with the relevant information and submit into examination.		Numbers of dead gannet in the HPAI report is likely to be an underestimate. Gannet productivity at sample plots at FFC was recued significantly in 2022, indicating colony might be increasingly sensitive to other impacts. Although NE note the reduction in the wider gannet population would be expected to result in a proportionate reduction in any collision/displacement effects at SEP and DEP. No further information is required.				
B25	22	In the case of guillemot and razorbill, we welcome the presentation of a range of displacement rates (30-70%) and mortality (1-10%) and will rely on a range-based approach to form our position as it acknowledges the uncertainties within the evidence base on this impact. However, we do not consider it appropriate (or suitably evidence based) to rely on one combination of displacement and mortality (50% and 1%) for the impact assessment.		No change at deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3. Please see Point 10, Appendix C2 of our Deadline 3 response.		No change at Deadline 5.		Please refer to Natural England's comments at Deadline 5, Appendix B1 [REP5-091]. Now resolved.		
B26	N/A	Added at Deadline 3 - We note that common scoter is a qualifying feature at Greater Wash SPA but has not been included in the RIAA for Greater Wash SPA. We request that a likely significant effects assessment for common scoter at the Greater Wash SPA is submitted into examination				Identified at Deadline 3. Please see Point 25, Appendix C2 of our Deadline 3 response.		Natural England welcomes the inclusion of the Greater Wash Special Protection Area (SPA) Common Scoter screening assessment at Deadline 4 [REP4-010]. We agree with the Applicant's conclusion of no potential for likely significant effect (LSE) for this feature, alone or in-combination and therefore it is screened out.				

1.3 Applicant's comments on Tab C Offshore Ornithology Compensation of Natural England's Deadline 5 Risk and Issues Log

Point	Point Number(s) from Appendix C [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP AND DEP Appendix C - Offshore Ornithology Compensation [RR-063]	RAG Status Rel and WR Rep D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D7	Applicant's comment D7
Document used: [APP-069] 5.5.2 Appendix 2 - Sandwich Tern Compensation Document												
C1	7, 11, 19	<p>Natural England reiterate that we consider it very unlikely that sandwich terns would colonise a pontoon structure of a similar design to that frequently deployed for common tern. Natural England are of the opinion that the provision of a pontoon for breeding Sandwich tern is a high-risk option due to a lack of any species-specific evidence to suggest that colonisation is likely.</p> <p>To have any confidence in the suitability of a pontoon for breeding sandwich tern, Natural England will need to review detailed designs, which should be informed by species-specific preferences regarding breeding site characteristics. Preferably, these designs would be tested at a location where sandwich terns currently breed at sub-optimal locations (e.g., due to disturbance or predation pressures) or are habitat limited.</p> <p>On the evidence and information presented, Natural England advise that the Applicant commit to the preferred option of habitat creation by provision of a lagoon with nesting islands. Contingency should be provided through alternative locations rather than potentially suboptimal alternatives with high levels of uncertainty regarding colonisation potential. If a pontoon option is to be progressed, it is suggested that significant development of the design should be considered to increase the chance of colonisation by Sandwich tern. For example, creating a more diverse habitat by grading the surface, increasing the height above the water level, or planting vegetation might all be beneficial. Nevertheless we consider that the risk of non-colonisation would remain considerable.</p>		No change at Deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3		Natural England re-affirms its position that the proposed measures at Farne Islands SPA will not provide meaningful compensatory benefits, even as a supporting or secondary measure.		It is Natural England's understanding that the Applicant is not progressing the pontoon further. Natural England will provide a final update at deadline 8. Please also refer to Natural England's response to Exa fourth questions (Appendix L4).		As noted in the Final SoCG with Natural England (HRA Derogation) [document reference 12.15], the Applicant and Natural England agreed not to pursue discussions during Examination regarding the installation of a pontoon at Loch Ryan, but rather focus efforts on the inland pool option, which has good stakeholder support, strong ecological merit and a high chance of successfully delivering the required level of compensation.
C2	8	<p>The proposed scale of compensation is to compensate the annual upper 95% CI of adult mortality. According to the Applicants estimates this will require the equivalent of 28 adult Sandwich terns to be delivered into the population annually for the lifetime of the project. It is suggested that "120-150 pairs be likely to produce about 100 chicks per year (equivalent to about 38 adults)".</p> <p>To provide the requisite confidence in the number of recruits that would be produced, the methodology for calculation of a reasonable target population for the compensatory measure should be fully detailed.</p> <p>It would be useful to stress test the proposed colony size in terms of its ability to deliver the</p>		Please Refer to Natural England's response Appendix C1 at Deadline 2. The issue remains and we have further queries.		No change at Deadline 3		The applicant has addressed the calculation of scale of compensation but not fully addressed our queries regarding stress testing and assessment of a mortality debt. However commitments have been made by the applicant to ensure the CIMP is adequately detailed to ensure the compensation requirements are met via rigorous monitoring and an agreement the management measure will remain in place beyond the operational lifetime of the project if needs be to account for any 'mortality debt' accrued .		Letters of support from the council and Landowner have been submitted at Deadline 6. Outside of examination, Natural England have had a brief meeting with an update with the Applicant. Please also refer to Natural England's response to Exa fourth questions (Appendix L4).		<p>The Applicant updated Appendix 2 – Sandwich Tern Compensation Document (Revision B) [document reference 5.5.2] at Deadline 7 to include provision for extending the duration of active management at Loch Ryan, if required, to account for any mortality debt that could accrue whilst the measure was being developed and colonised.</p> <p>In addition, the Applicant has updated the Sandwich Tern – Quantification of Productivity Benefits Technical Note (Revision C) [document reference 13.4] at Deadline 7 to address the Natural England comments around the requirement for further stress testing and to include consideration of the Cemlyn lagoon colony productivity.</p>

Point	Point Number(s) from Appendix C [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP AND DEP Appendix C - Offshore Ornithology Compensation [RR-063]	RAG Status Rel and WR Rep D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D7	Applicant's comment D7
		required compensation under a worst-case productivity scenario.										
C3	9	The land to the southwest of Scar Point would appear to offer opportunities for habitat creation. Natural England requests clarification regarding the extent of the area of search, and exclusion of the apparently suitable adjacent area to the south and west		No change at Deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3		Please refer to out cover letter - EN010109 13015 436963 SEP DEP Natural England (NE) Cover Letter Deadline 5.		Letters of support from the council and Landowner have been submitted at Deadline 6. Outside of examination, Natural England have had a brief meeting with an update with the Applicant. Please also refer to Natural England's response to Exa fourth questions (Appendix L4).		The Applicant updated Appendix 2 – Sandwich Tern Compensation Document (Revision B) [document reference 5.5.2] at Deadline 7 to include indicative locations for the siting of an inland pool within the Applicant's preferred area of search. The Applicant has responded to Appendix L4 in The Applicant's Comments on Natural England Deadline 7 Submissions [document reference 22.16].
C4	10	<p>Natural England agree that increasing the size of islands within the pool is not likely to impact colonisation potential. However, the proposed lagoon/pool and islands therein are of relatively limited size. We consider that provision of a greater number of islands within a larger lagoon could increase the likelihood of colonisation, given the limited understanding of what drives sandwich tern nest selection. There would be increased certainty in the measure being able to accommodate the population required if more space was available as the potential for habitat heterogeneity would be increased. The works would also then deliver greater ancillary benefits, e.g., to shorebirds in winter.</p> <p>Consideration of increasing the scale of habitat provision should also account for the fact that other species are likely to colonise. This may be of overall benefit, e.g., in the case of black-headed gull. However, it should be considered that there will be increased competition for nest site space. Further, a very spatially compact colony of sandwich terns might be more vulnerable to kleptoparasitism (by black-headed gull) or avian predators that directly predate eggs and chicks, such as grey heron.</p> <p>Aspects of the design such as electric fencing should follow best practice guidance, e.g., Babcock and Booth (2020) Anti-predator Fencing. Tern Conservation Best Practice.</p> <p>Overall, Natural England would strongly encourage the Applicant to be more ambitious regarding the scale of habitat provision, and to present detailed proposals for the habitat creation during the Examination.</p>		Please Refer to Natural England's response Appendix C1. The issue remains and we have further queries.		No change at Deadline 3		Natural England is concerned by the level of progress made regarding key issues at this stage in the Examination, in particular the lack of a confirmed location and any landowner agreement. We recommend the Applicant bring forward further detail as a matter of urgency.		Letters of support from the council and Landowner have been submitted at Deadline 6. Outside of examination, Natural England have had a brief meeting with an update with the Applicant. Please also refer to Natural England's response to Exa fourth questions (Appendix L4).		Also see The Applicant's Closing Statement [document reference 22.11] regarding its closing position on compensation.

Point	Point Number(s) from Appendix C [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP AND DEP Appendix C - Offshore Ornithology Compensation [RR-063]	RAG Status Rel and WR Rep D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D7	Applicant's comment D7
C5	12	<p>We note that "Discussions with relevant landowners are underway to secure land or rights to deliver nesting habitat improvement measures at Loch Ryan, Scotland. The Applicant will provide PINS with a further update on the progress of these discussions following DCO application submission."</p> <p>Natural England welcome this and highlight the importance of progressing efforts to secure land or rights to deliver nesting habitat. The measure cannot be considered secured until the completion of this process.</p> <p>We anticipate updates throughout the Examination and will advise as appropriate.</p>		No change at Deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3		Natural England is concerned by the level of progress made regarding key issues at this stage in the Examination, in particular the lack of a confirmed location and any landowner agreement. We recommend the Applicant bring forward further detail as a matter of urgency.		No change at Deadline 7.		
C6	13	<p>We note that the outline roadmap for the implementation of the habitat provision compensation measure aims to allow 2 full breeding seasons of operation prior to first power at SEP and DEP.</p> <p>Sandwich tern recruit into the breeding population in their third year, and therefore the measure could in theory be delivering adults into the wider breeding population at the point of impact. However, colonisation of habitat is highly uncertain in terms of time taken, and uptake/growth. With a 2-year lead in it is highly likely that the measure will accrue a mortality debt in the formative years. Calculations relating to the scale of the measure required to compensate a specified impact should be stress tested against mortality debt scenarios, especially when further adaptive management options are limited.</p>		No change at Deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3		Please refer to: EN010109 436963 SEP DEP Appendix C3 - Natural England's Further Response to Offshore Ornithology Compensation [REP3-022] [REP3-023] [REP3-088] [REP3-092] [REP3-096] Deadline 5.		No change at Deadline 7.		The Applicant updated the Sandwich Tern – Quantification of Productivity Benefits Technical Note (Revision C) [document reference 13.4] at Deadline 7 to address the Natural England comments in Appendix C3.
C7	14	<p>It is important to note that Sandwich tern on the Isle of May do not nest in boxes, but in the open on the terraces.</p> <p>While Natural England are supportive of efforts to restore the Sandwich tern population on the Farne Islands, we highlight that the principal issues identified as affecting the colony relate to vegetation management (resulting in limitations to nesting space) and predation from large gulls. It is anticipated that the forthcoming National Nature Reserve (NNR) plan will include sufficient measures to address these. Should that plan then be implemented, it is difficult to support the delivery of compensation through measures that are not thought of sufficient importance to be delivered by the site management plan.</p> <p>While the provision of cameras to further understand predation would undoubtedly provide useful scientific data, and possibly inform further management, this should not be considered as a measure that could directly provide compensation.</p>		No change at Deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3		Please refer to : EN010109 436963 SEP DEP Appendix L3 – Natural England's Response to ExA Third Written Questions Deadline 5.		Please refer to NE's response to ExA fourth questions (Appendix L4).		<p>Regarding the Farnes, the Applicant maintains that in light of possible upcoming changes to policy and best practice guidance with respect to additionality and the severity of the situation at the Farne Islands SPA, it is considered important that this measure remains within the Applicant's proposed package of compensatory measures for Sandwich tern.</p> <p>Regarding the credibility of the measures, the Applicant maintains its position that the measures proposed would make a meaningful difference to the Sandwich tern population on the Farne Islands for the reasons described in Section 4.2.1 of the HRA Derogation and Compensatory Measures Update Note (Revision C) [document reference 3.1] and that the measures would be additional to those proposed in the NNR management plan.</p> <p>The Applicant has responded to Appendix L4 in The Applicant's Comments on Natural England</p>

Point	Point Number(s) from Appendix C [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP AND DEP Appendix C - Offshore Ornithology Compensation [RR-063]	RAG Status Rel and WR Rep D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D7	Applicant's comment D7
												<p>Deadline 7 Submissions [document reference 22.16].</p> <p>Also see the Applicant's response to REP5-094 (NE's Appendix L3) in The Applicant's Comments on Responses to the Examining Authority's Third Written Questions [REP6-013].</p>
C8	15	<p>Provision of nest boxes, monitoring by camera, and potential installation of bamboo canes to deter gull predation is proposed at the Farne Islands to improve breeding success of Sandwich terns.</p> <p>It should be noted that both nest boxes/shelters and bamboo canes have previously been used on the Farne Islands for the benefit of breeding terns, and boxes/shelters are likely to be deployed in the future. It is also unclear whether the provision of 400 nest boxes and 400 shelters in areas which could support sandwich tern is feasible, and whether this is proposed for areas already occupied by sandwich terns or where it is hoped they could return.</p> <p>Natural England remain concerned that the measures proposed are not truly additional, and in any event are likely to provide only minor benefits compared to an ongoing programme of vegetation and large gull management.</p>		No change at Deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3		Please refer to : EN010109 436963 SEP DEP Appendix L3 – Natural England's Response to ExA Third Written Questions Deadline 5.		Please refer to NE's response to ExA fourth questions (Appendix L4).		See response at C8 above.
C9	16	<p>We consider that the evidence supplied regarding expected reductions to nest and chick predation is not specific to Sandwich tern. It is not expected that Sandwich terns will nest inside boxes, so nest predation is unlikely to be significantly reduced.</p> <p>If reducing predation of chicks is proposed as a compensatory measure, then a full understanding of existing levels and impacts of that predation will be required in order to design solutions and quantify any benefits.</p> <p>The current estimates of potential gains from these measures appear highly speculative.</p>		Please Refer to Natural England's response Appendix C1. At Deadline 2 Natural England has raised further queries regarding the use of the productivity figure of 0.8 for colonies not subject to mammalian predation or human disturbance.		No change at Deadline 3		Natural England thanks the applicant for providing more detail in regards to the productivity figure. Incorporate justification for the productivity figure into the main report. Submit Short 2020 into the Examination.		This issue refers to the Farnes: please refer to Appendix L3 [REP5-094]		<p>See response at C8 above.</p> <p>Also, see the Applicant's response to REP5-094 The Applicant's Comments on Responses to the Examining Authority's Third Written Questions [REP6-013] and the Applicant's response to REP5-094 The Applicant's Comments on Responses to the Examining Authority's Third Written Questions [REP6-013].</p> <p>Regarding, Short (2020), the Applicant notes that this is an unpublished report that was provided to the Applicant's HRA compensation advisor upon request; however, it was not agreed that this could be published. Therefore, it is suggested that Natural England request this from NatureScot</p>

Point	Point Number(s) from Appendix C [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP AND DEP Appendix C - Offshore Ornithology Compensation [RR-063]	RAG Status Rel and WR Rep D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D7	Applicant's comment D7
C10	17	<p>Natural England do not consider that the cited evidence is sufficient to suggest high uptake of nest boxes by Sandwich tern. Sandwich tern do not nest within the boxes at the Isle of May (or elsewhere). Productivity benefits have not been quantified.</p> <p>Again, it is very difficult to support the implementation of bamboo canes as compensation due to issues of additionality and the danger of simply repurposing as compensation low-cost interventions that, if effective, should be incorporated into routine site management.</p>		No change at Deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3		No change at Deadline 5.		No change at Deadline 7		See response at C8 above.
Document used: [APP-070 and APP-071] 5.5.2.1 and 5.5.2.2 Annex 2A - Annex 2B - Sandwich Tern Nesting Habitat Improvements Site Selection												
C11	18	<p>General comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Natural England agrees with the suitability of the area and identified preferred site within it. The species conservation benefit of increasing resilience by range restoration and population dispersal is particularly highlighted by the recent HPAI outbreak. It would be useful to clearly identify and prioritise locations other than Loch Ryan in case of insurmountable issues with acquiring or developing a site there, or for potential adaptive management options if required. The RSPB proposal to install a common tern raft in very close proximity to the identified site raises some concerns, but also possibilities. For example, if the pontoon was to be designed with Sandwich tern in mind it would still be reasonable to assume common tern could colonise it. A pontoon and lagoon could then conceivably be implemented alongside one another. 		No change at Deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3		Natural England are awaiting further information.		Please refer to Natural England's response to Exa fourth questions (Appendix L4).		<p>Exploration of alternative sites was undertaken during the pre-application phase as part of a robust and iterative site selection process informed by an extensive programme of consultation with the HRA Offshore Ornithology Compensation ETG (see Annex 2B – Sandwich Tern Nesting Habitat Improvements Site Selection [APP-071] and Annex 1D - Record of HRA Derogation Consultation [APP-68]). This process failed to identify any other suitable sites that had good stakeholder support, strong ecological merit and as high a likelihood of successfully delivering the required level of compensation as Loch Ryan. In light of the positive progress that is being made with respect to securing land at Loch Ryan, the Applicant does not consider there to be a need at this stage to explore other sites.</p> <p>The Applicant has responded to Appendix L4 in The Applicant's Comments on Natural England Deadline 7 Submissions [document reference 22.16].</p>
C12	20, 21	<p>We note that the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB) have received funding to install a common tern pontoon just offshore of Wig Sands, immediately to the west of Scar Point in Loch Ryan. To help understand the spatial implications better, we request that the Applicant define the potential area for common tern pontoon installation on Figure 5.</p> <p>Additionally, five potential sites suitable for developing breeding habitat for sandwich tern have been identified around Loch Ryan, two of which are in the preferred area of search. We request that the Applicant mark all of the potential sites on Figure 5 and/or 6.</p>		No change at Deadline 2.								
Document used: [APP-072] 5.5.3 Appendix 3 - Kittiwake Compensation Document												

Point	Point Number(s) from Appendix C [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP AND DEP Appendix C - Offshore Ornithology Compensation [RR-063]	RAG Status Rel and WR Rep D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D7	Applicant's comment D7
C13	22	Natural England agrees with the statement that a lack of knowledge regarding likely recruits to new nest sites, and the difficulty in securing locations to deploy ANS, will be significant problems.		No change at Deadline 2.								
C14	23	Natural England does not believe that adaptations to an existing structure are inherently more likely to deliver productivity gains than provision of new structures. In fact, if well located and designed bespoke structures could well be more effective.		Please refer to Natural England's response Appendix C1 at Deadline 2. Natural England does believe there may be potential to provide appropriate compensation through the Gateshead Modification tower. However this is subject to the Applicant providing further requested information.		No change at Deadline 3		No change at Deadline 5.		No change at Deadline 7.		See the HRA Derogation and Compensatory Measures Update (Revision D) [document reference 13.7] for an update on progress regarding modification of the Gateshead kittiwake tower.
C15	25	Regarding scale of the measure, a method to quantify benefit has not been fully detailed. This should be submitted into the Examination. We also observe that the Applicant equates birds lost from Flamborough and Filey Coast Special Protection Area (FFC SPA) with birds entering the biogeographic population from which FFC SPA draws its recruits. Given all the other colonies that kittiwake produced by the ANS could colonise, Natural England does not consider this equivalence is likely to maintain the coherence of the national site network. The measure is described as an intervention to an identified issue, but it envisaged that once ledges have been provided to compensate for losses from a known displacement then they will continue to function. I.e., it is the intention that in following years the productivity of those ledges will constitute the measure of success. It remains unclear how this measure is fundamentally different to the provision of an artificial nesting structure (ANS), and ultimately, if it is appropriate to continue facilitating or encouraging opportunistic nesting kittiwakes on buildings in urban environments given the future provision of purpose-built ANS.		No change at Deadline 2. As per our Appendix C1 advice at Deadline 2 further information is needed.		No change at Deadline 3		Natural England has no further comment at this stage.		Natural England has no further comment at this stage.		The Applicant notes that Natural England have stated in REP5-092 that the updates to the Gateshead Kittiwake Tower Modification – Quantification of Productivity Benefits Technical Note (Revision B) [REP3-088] have largely satisfied Natural England's requests for additional information on kittiwake breeding performance on the Tyne and its implications for the proposed compensation, and therefore this matter is considered to be resolved.
C16	26	The measure is scheduled to be implemented 4 (worst case 3) years before the SEP and DEP turbines are operational. Due to the proposed timing and definition of success, there are high levels of uncertainty that suitable locations identified (or otherwise) will be available for the required scale of intervention over the lifetime of the project. It is plausible that prior to implementation, improvements and proliferation of deterrent measures and the new provision of bespoke ANS installed nearby may already be excluding birds from nuisance sites while providing high quality alternative sites. I.e., birds that would have been targeted by the measure may have		No change at Deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3		Natural England has no further comment at this stage.		Natural England has no further comment at this stage.		The Applicant considers the reason for this remaining a 'red' status is in relation to the commitment to implement the measures 3 breeding seasons prior to the operation of the first turbine upon which the Applicant maintains its position that the Schedule 17 draft DCO (Revision K) [document reference 3.1], is appropriate. The Applicant's position is set out within: - ID 20 of Table 14.8.1 in The Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations - Part 1 [REP1-033]. - Q2.14.1.5 in The Applicant's response to the Examining

Point	Point Number(s) from Appendix C [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP AND DEP Appendix C - Offshore Ornithology Compensation [RR-063]	RAG Status Rel and WR Rep D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D7	Applicant's comment D7
		relocated, and the potential for colonisation of inappropriate urban locations, some of which are clearly sub-optimal, may be reduced.										<p>Authority's Second Written Questions [REP3-101], which signposts the various documents that detail the justification for the timescales selected within the DCO drafting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Applicant's response to Natural England within Q2.14.1.5 of The Applicant's Comments on Responses to the ExA's 2WQ [REP4-028] - Q3.14.1.14 c) within Table 10 of The Applicant's Comments on Responses to the Examining Authority's Third Written Questions [REP6-013]. <p>The second paragraph relates to the Applicant's proposals at Lowestoft which the Applicant has agreed with Natural England not to actively progress during the Examination (Final SOCG with Natural England (HRA Derogation)) [document reference 12.15]).</p>
C17	27	<p>Natural England confirm that we are not supportive of the further provision of onshore ANS, especially in the Lowestoft area, until the results of the currently planned provision start to emerge. In the light of the recent planning application for an additional ANS next to the existing one at Gateshead Salt meadows, further provision on the Tyne seems also of questionable benefit.</p> <p>It is not clear that the measures proposed here offer any real-world additional benefits distinct from the provision of new ANS.</p>		Please refer to Natural England's response Appendix C1 at Deadline 2. Due to the size of the impact at SEP and DEP, Natural England considers there may be potential for onshore ANS at the Gateshead Saltmeadows. However as per our advice, further information is required.		No change at Deadline 3		Natural England are awaiting concept designs for the proposed augmentation for the kittiwake towers.		Natural England are still awaiting detailed designs for the proposed augmentation for the kittiwake towers, however brief outline plans have been submitted at D6 (derogation and compensation update), and Natural England have provided comment in ExA Qs (Appendix L4).		<p>The Applicant has responded to Appendix L4 in The Applicant's Comments on Natural England Deadline 7 Submissions [document reference 22.16].</p> <p>Also see the HRA Derogation and Compensatory Measures Update (Revision D) [document reference 13.7] for an update on progress regarding modification of the Gateshead kittiwake tower.</p>
<p>Document used: [APP-074] 5.5.4 - Appendix 4 - Gannet, Guillemot and Razorbill Compensation Document</p>												
C18	28, 29	<p>We note that 50% displacement and 1% mortality rates have been used to estimate mortality of 6 guillemot and 0.5 razorbill a year to be compensated.</p> <p>Natural England does not support the use of a single rate for the purposes of impact assessment, advising that a range-based approach is taken instead. Please see our offshore ornithology comments. We also do not support the use of this specific rate for scaling compensation.</p>		No change at Deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3		Establish compensatory requirements that reflect the 95% CI for 70% displacement and 2% mortality. Please see EN010109 436963 SEP DEP Appendix C3 - Natural England's Further Response to Offshore Ornithology Compensation [REP3-022] [REP3-023] [REP3-088] [REP3-092] [REP3-096] Deadline 5		No change at Deadline 7.		<p>Appendix 4 Guillemot and Razorbill Compensation Document (Revision D) [document reference 5.5.4] was updated at Deadline 7 to address comments from Natural England in its Appendix C3.</p> <p>Also, see the Applicant's response to Appendix C3 in The Applicant's comments on Natural England's Deadline 5 Submission [REP6-015].</p>
C19	30	<p>Natural England do not consider that the provision of a pontoon will deliver any meaningful secondary benefits for non-target species.</p> <p>If provision of an inland pool is also intended to provide non-like-for-like compensation for project impacts other than Sandwich tern the design must balance the varied habitat requirements appropriately and the habitat</p>		No change at Deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3		No change at Deadline 5.		Please see comment for C1 at deadline 7		See response at C1.

Point	Point Number(s) from Appendix C [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP AND DEP Appendix C - Offshore Ornithology Compensation [RR-063]	RAG Status Rel and WR Rep D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D7	Applicant's comment D7
		provided be of a scale and nature that would result in meaningful levels of benefit.										
C20	31	Natural England agree that the creation of a protected inland pool with islands at Loch Ryan would be utilised by waterfowl and shorebirds immediately. However, we highlight that if a pontoon was to be installed instead there would be few, if any, substantial benefits to these species.		No change at Deadline 2.								
C21	32	<p>The nature and scale of set net use in Northeast England is not clear from the text, or information supplied by the Applicant in Annex 1D Record of HRA Derogation Consultation (document reference 5.5.1.4).</p> <p>Natural England request clarity on the exact nature of set netting activity identified, to understand the potential for bycatch reduction to provide compensation opportunities. Are nets for trout set from beaches and are they attended by fishers? Although it is stated that some fishers operate year-round, it is likely that this activity is predominantly seasonal, to what extent? How widespread is this activity? Has any attempt been made to quantify levels of auk bycatch? Has it been ascertained from fishers or NEIFCA if any best practice measures as adopted in the Filey Bay fishery are being followed voluntarily?</p>		No change at Deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3		The Applicant do not provide opportunity for compensation and are now focussing on SW England, that does not address NE's fundamental concerns for the proposed measures. No change at Deadline 5. The Applicant has clarified that bycatch levels in the North east do not provide any opportunity for compensation therefore are now focussing on Southwest England. This however does not address Natural England's fundamental concerns regarding the proposed measures.		No change at Deadline 7		The Applicant maintains that bycatch reduction through implementation of LEB's/AWDs is the most appropriate option for offshore wind farm developers with low levels of guillemot mortality to provide project-led compensation. The Applicant notes that the SoS has accepted this compensation measure on Hornsea Project Four.
C22	33	<p>Regarding the success of measures implemented at Filey Bay to reduce auk bycatch the Applicant states, "the reduced bycatch achieved there may relate to the use of high visibility corline and the attendance of fishers at nets with the aim of releasing any birds that become entangled."</p> <p>It is Natural England's understanding that the Filey Bay Net Limitation Order (NLO) bylaws stipulated that a record was kept of birds removed and number released alive. Has this data been obtained to evidence the efficacy of releasing entangled birds?</p>		No change at Deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3		The Applicant do not provide opportunity for compensation and are now focussing on SW England, that does not address NE's fundamental concerns for the proposed measures. No change at Deadline 5. The Applicant has clarified that bycatch levels in the North east do not provide any opportunity for compensation therefore are now focussing on Southwest England. This however does not address Natural England's fundamental concerns regarding the proposed measures.		Please disregard the previous comment and refer to Natural England's comments at Deadline 5, Appendix C3 [REP5-092].		See the Applicant's response to Appendix C3 in The Applicant's comments on Natural England's Deadline 5 Submission [REP6-015] .

Point	Point Number(s) from Appendix C [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP AND DEP Appendix C - Offshore Ornithology Compensation [RR-063]	RAG Status Rel and WR Rep D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D7	Applicant's comment D7
C23	34	<p>Natural England currently consider the Looming Eye Buoys (LEB) to remain an unproven technology with respect to reducing bycatch of auks, and has significant reservations regarding the conclusions drawn on the trial carried out by Hornsea 4 OWF.</p> <p>Please see Natural England's advice during the Hornsea Project Four Examination available at: EN010098-001970-Natural England - Comments on any submissions received at Deadline 6 1.pdf (planninginspectorate.gov.uk).</p>		No change at Deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3		Natural England considers that the justification provided does not address our concerns regarding the effectiveness of LEB, however we welcome the proposed collection of data regarding the effectiveness of LEB and the level of bycatch on an ongoing basis		No change at Deadline 7		See response at C21 above.
C24	35, 37	<p>The Applicant states, "The most effective measure implemented at Filey Bay is anticipated to be the training of fishers to safely remove and release birds that become tangled in nets so that the birds survive rather than die".</p> <p>Is there any evidence from any set net fisheries that training fishers to remove and release birds has been successful in reducing bycatch mortality? It is likely that fishers must attend nets very closely with short soak times for birds not to drown prior to retrieval. In this case it may be that bycatch is reducing simply by a disturbance effect reducing bird density in the vicinity of nets.</p> <p>It is not clear that the process of removing auks from nets and releasing them is in of itself a problematic process for fishers. Have fishers identified a need for this training?</p> <p>Before training of fishers to effectively release birds entangled in nets can be considered as a viable compensatory measure, the current level of bycatch mortality that could be prevented by more effective disentanglement and release needs to be quantified. At present it is not clear that live birds are being bycaught and not surviving the removal and release process.</p>		No change at Deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3		Natural England broadly supports the inclusion of these measures (AWD and to train fishers) in the compensation proposals. These do not overcome the uncertainty regarding the effectiveness of LEB, which is currently the primary compensation mechanism.		No change at Deadline 7		See response at C21 above.
C25	38	<p>The Applicant has identified sites for delivery of bycatch reduction using the analysis presented by Cleasby et al (2022) to identify 'hotspots' of breeding birds from FFC SPA and gillnet fisheries.</p> <p>Natural England highlight that Cleasby et al (2022) state, "Fishing effort data presented here did not include an estimate of bycatch rate. As such, the maps highlight areas of potential rather than actual risk." Accordingly, Natural England do not accept that these locations are necessarily suitable and consider that evidence is required to support the selection of these sites for bycatch reduction measures.</p> <p>Has there been any attempt to ascertain if</p>		No change at Deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3		Natural England note that bycatch reduction is now being focused on the SW England.		No change at Deadline 7		No further comments.

Point	Point Number(s) from Appendix C [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP AND DEP Appendix C - Offshore Ornithology Compensation [RR-063]	RAG Status Rel and WR Rep D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D7	Applicant's comment D7
		bycatch is occurring, and if so, to quantify rates at the proposed fisheries?										
C26	39	<p>The Applicant states, "Because measures will reduce bycatch of adult guillemots and razorbills (as well as other age classes that are present) the compensation will account one to one for losses to OWF impacts, with no delay."</p> <p>Natural England agree that as bycatch reduction should reduce direct mortality it can deliver compensation instantly upon implementation. However, we consider that the age structure of the population must be accounted for in quantifying the benefit. Only the proportion of adult birds saved from bycatch mortality can be considered as direct compensation for impacts on birds apportioned to the breeding population at FFC SPA.</p>		No change at Deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3		No change at Deadline 5.		Please refer to Natural England's comments at Deadline 5, Appendix C3 [REP5-092].		See the Applicant's response to Appendix C3 in The Applicant's comments on Natural England's Deadline 5 Submission [REP6-015] .
C27	40	<p>The Applicant states, "It would be necessary to monitor bycatch of guillemots and razorbills in the gillnet fishery being subject to bycatch reduction measures, preferably including monitoring of bycatch numbers before bycatch reduction measures are implemented in order to be able to quantify the gain being made."</p> <p>Natural England consider it essential that empirical data is gathered to evidence the levels and nature of pre-existing bycatch in the target fisheries. Without this data the benefits of implementing the compensatory measure cannot be proven, and following implementation, quantified.</p>		No change at Deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3		Natural England note the commitment to implement baseline monitoring of bycatch of guillemot and razorbill in the relevant gill net fishery and note the suggestion to collaborate and/or align with existing trials underway for Hornsea P4. Both are appropriate but do not really address Natural England's concerns regarding the likely effectiveness of the measure.		No change at Deadline 7.		See response at C21 above.
C28	41	<p>The Applicant states, "It would also be desirable to monitor change in guillemot breeding numbers at FFC SPA (corrected for any influence of change in sandeel stock biomass and impacts of climate change) to assess the extent to which the population trajectory at FFC SPA was influenced by reduction in bycatch."</p> <p>Whilst we welcome the proposed monitoring of guillemot trends at FFC SPA, we consider this is best done collaboratively by industry, as a number of developments will be impacting the SPA (and some will be required to provide compensation). It would not be possible to discern the impacts of a given project and/or its compensation, but such monitoring would help provide some comfort that the population trajectory is not adversely affected. We recommend the Applicant work with other developers to deliver strategic monitoring of the FFC SPA colony.</p>		No change at Deadline 2.								

Point	Point Number(s) from Appendix C [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP AND DEP Appendix C - Offshore Ornithology Compensation [RR-063]	RAG Status Rel and WR Rep D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D7	Applicant's comment D7
C29	42	<p>Only one year of baseline monitoring of bycatch is proposed, and this monitoring is not implemented until the completion of the development of compensation proposals and site selection. Natural England highlight the necessity of identifying and quantifying bycatch as part of the measure development and site selection process. It is currently uncertain that there is bycatch of the target species that can be reduced. Further, the nature of this bycatch is not understood, so any measure to address it is purely speculative.</p> <p>Natural England advise that at least two years of baseline data should be gathered to account for inter-annual variation.</p>		No change at Deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3		No change at Deadline 5.		No change at Deadline 7.		<p>At point C27 above: "Natural England note the commitment to implement baseline monitoring of bycatch of guillemot and razorbill in the relevant gill net fishery and note the suggestion to collaborate and/or align with existing trials underway for Hornsea P4. Both are appropriate..."</p> <p>Appendix 4 Guillemot and Razorbill Compensation Document (Revision D) [document reference 5.5.4] was updated at Deadline 7 to confirm that baseline monitoring would be undertaken following approval of the Guillemot and Razorbill CIMP.</p>
C30	43	<p>The potential for compensation through eradicating rats in the Channel Islands is identified.</p> <p>Natural England recommend that the Applicant review our advice relating to the Hornsea 4 compensatory measure proposal, in which we highlight that, "it is not clear that the sites shortlisted will offer sufficient opportunity to deliver meaningful benefits to auks or the level of compensation that Natural England consider necessary". This being the case, it is hard to see how predator management in the Channel Islands could offer compensation opportunities to SEP and DEP given the likely requirements of Hornsea 4.</p>		No change at Deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3		No change at Deadline 5.		No change at Deadline 7.		<p>As noted in Appendix 4 Guillemot and Razorbill Compensation Document (Revision D) [document reference 5.5.4], predator eradication is only being considered as part of a collaborative delivery model which, if required, would be further developed in the post-consent period.</p>
C31	44	<p>The Applicant proposes a collaboration with other developers to deliver a predator reduction measure.</p> <p>As previously stated, Natural England are supportive of potential collaborations to facilitate the delivery of compensatory measures. However, for measures to be delivered by these collaborations to be considered secured the agreements must be fully detailed, and a mechanism for quantifying and portioning the benefits to the projects involved should be set out.</p>		No change at Deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3		No change at Deadline 5.		No change at Deadline 7.		

1.4 Applicant's comments on Tab D Marine Mammals of Natural England's Deadline 5 Risk and Issues Log

Point	Point Number (s) from Appendix D [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP AND DEP Appendix D - Marine Mammals [RR-063]	RAG Status Rel and WR Rep D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D7	Applicant's comment D7
Document Used: [APP-191] 6.3.10.1 Marine Mammal Consultation Responses, Information and Survey Data.pdf												
D1	3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 66 (RIAA)	Natural England queries the methods used to determine seal abundance, both the reference population and abundance from the aerial surveys. Consequently, we are concerned that the number of harbour seals impacted has been underestimated, and so the impact on the Wash and North Norfolk Coast SAC.		No change at deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3		"The Applicant has updated parts of the assessment as requested (removal of the Wadden Sea from the reference population; updated at-sea seal density estimates; updated haul-out count for the Wash and North Norfolk Coast SAC; application of correction factors). The Applicant has assessed the impact to the Wash and North Norfolk Coast SAC population of harbour seals through population modelling. As stated in response to Point D9, we will provide a fuller response to the population modelling at Deadline 6"		Awaiting final clarification on the population modelling. Position to be provided at Deadline 8, following review of material to be submitted at Deadline 7.		The Applicant has provided additional information on the population modelling at Deadline 7 (within the updated Marine Mammals Technical Note and Addendum (Revision B) [document reference 16.14]. The Applicant considers this is sufficient to resolve Natural England's concerns, as confirmed by Natural England's response to WQ 4.12.2.1 [REP7-112].
Document used: [APP-192] 6.3.10.2 Underwater Noise Modelling Report												
D2	10	The Applicant should clarify how they will determine ADD duration/deployment for simultaneous piling and ensure the draft MMMP includes this measure. Should this increase the overall area over which ADD disturbance will occur, then this should be featured in the revised ADD assessment (see point D5).		No change at deadline 2.		As stated in point 35 of The Applicant's Responses on Relevant Representations Natural England Marine Mammals (Appendix D)[REP2-051], we accept the Applicant's position to address this post consent in the finalised Marine Mammal Management Plan (MMMP) and Site Integrity Plan (SIP). On the proviso that further assessment is conducted based upon the foundation type and installation method confirmed. We request that this is secured as a consent condition for the production on of a final MMMP within the DCO or/and detailed within the relevant outline plans and documentations.		No change at Deadline 5		No change at Deadline 7.		The final MMMP will include clear information on the determination of appropriate ADD activation periods, depending on the final pile design and installation scenarios. The Final MMMP will be developed in consultation with Natural England and the MMO, and therefore the Applicant does not consider a specific condition for ADD activation periods is required.
Document used: [APP-096] 6.1.10 Chapter 10 Marine Mammal Ecology												
D3	18, 75 (RIAA)	It is not clear whether simultaneous piling at one site is an option. If it is, the impacts of this scenario should be assessed as it may be the worst case scenario for some impact pathways. For example, it should be assessed whether it would lead to greater overlap with the SNS SAC.		No change at deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3		The Applicant has clarified that simultaneous piling at one site is an option and have assessed this worst-case scenario of overlap with the SNS SAC. This point has been sufficiently addressed.				
D4	19	The number of animals impacted after mitigation has been applied should be assessed.		No change at deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3		The Applicant has stated that these will be provided within the EPS Licence Application post-consent. Therefore no change at Deadline 5.		No change at Deadline 7.		As the Applicant has stated previously, this detail will be provided as part of the EPS Licence process post-consent, and no further information is required at this stage.

D5	21	An updated assessment of ADD disturbance, based on likely ADD duration, should be presented.		No change at deadline 2.		As per point D2, ADD duration will be confirmed post consent within the MMMP and SIP before construction begins. This commitment must be secured within the DCO or outline documents.		"The Applicant has provided an assessment of likely ADD duration and disturbance for single and sequential piling. However, the likely ADD duration for simultaneous piling is unknown, therefore this has not been assessed. Our comment is therefore partially addressed. Should the ADD duration increase due to simultaneous piling or further discussion with SNCB on appropriate durations, further assessment may be required post-consent."		No change at Deadline 7.		The final ADD activation requirements will be confirmed post-consent once the final pile design, and installation scenario, is known. An updated assessment of the potential for disturbance from the ADD would be provided within the EPS Licence Application process. Natural England confirmed in their response to WQ 4.12.2.1 [REP7-112] that this matter has been sufficiently addressed to not be a material concern. The Applicant therefore considers that no further information is required at this stage.
D6	24	The approach taken may underestimate the seal usage of, and transit through, the site. More information on the movements of seals in the site and surrounding area, based on telemetry data, should be presented.		No change at deadline 2.		As per point 49 of REP2-051, We are content that the medium sensitivity of the barrier effect would result in a low magnitude of effect and therefore would not affect the conclusion of minor adverse significance.		The Applicant has presented a more detailed assessment of barrier effects, including information on movements relative to SEP and DEP, which satisfies our comment.				
D7	24, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 42 (CIA Screening) , 79, 80, 81 (RIAA)	The assessment of indirect impact to seals due to changes in prey should be revised following our comments on: seal usage of the site, sensitivity of seals, likely responses of key prey, competition, recovery. Should the impact be determined as significant as a result, further mitigation should be considered. Post-consent monitoring could also be considered to validate the assessment. Following this, the impact pathway may also need further assessment in the CIA.		No change at deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3		No change at Deadline 5.		No change at Deadline 7.		The Applicant has provided full responses to all referred to points raised by Natural England within the Applicant's responses to Natural England's Relevant Representations (REP2-051; ID 49, 51 – 57, 70 & 100 - 102). To summarise, the additional information provided within each response concluded that no further assessment was required, and that there is no potential for significant effect due to changes in prey. Additional assessments were included within the Marine Mammals Technical Note and Addendum (Revision B) [document reference 16.14] relating to the presence and usage of seals within the Projects' sites, again concluding that there is no potential for significant effect. In addition, all assessments on prey species, as presented in ES Chapter 9 Fish and Shellfish Ecology [APP-095] concluded no significant effect. Therefore, the Applicant considers there is no potential for significant prey impacts to seal species, and that no further information or assessment is required.
D8	33, 34	The values used in the cumulative impact assessment should be reviewed and revised where needed: - number of vessels during construction - application of impact areas from SEP and DEP as 'standard' for offshore wind farms		No change at deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3		The Applicant has updated their cumulative assessment as requested, using the correct number of vessels during construction, and a "generalised" approach, using project-specific density estimates and impact numbers where available. This has addressed our point.				

D9	22, 35, 37	The assessment concludes significant impacts from disturbance for grey seal and harbour porpoise in EIA terms. We do not agree that the mitigation proposed will reduce the impact, therefore the residual impact is still significant. Further mitigation is needed to avoid a significant disturbance impact. For harbour porpoise, further tools (e.g. DEPONS or iPCOD) could be used to investigate whether the disturbance impact may be significant.		No change at deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3		"The Applicant has undertaken population modelling of harbour porpoise, grey seal and harbour seal reference populations (in EIA terms). IPCoD has been used to estimate the population impacts to these species from project-alone and cumulative offshore wind farm projects. Following the population modelling, the Applicant considers that no additional mitigation for disturbance is required. Natural England defers responding on this issue to Deadline 6 pending further consideration."		Awaiting final clarification on the population modelling. Position to be provided at Deadline 8, following review of material to be submitted at Deadline 7.		The Applicant has provided additional information on the population modelling at Deadline 7 (within the updated Marine Mammals Technical Note and Addendum (Revision B) [document reference 16.14]. The Applicant considers this is sufficient to resolve Natural England's concerns, as confirmed by Natural England's response to WQ 4.12.2.1 [REP7-112].
Document used: [APP-193] 6.3.10.3 Marine Mammals Cumulative Impact Assessment (CIA) Screening												
D10	40	The Applicant should provide further rationale as to why certain impacts have been screened out of the CIA.		No change at deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3		"The Applicant has provided further information on screening out disturbance to seal haul-out sites from vessel disturbance, and has assessed barrier effects in the CIA. The Applicant has presented additional approaches to estimating disturbance to seals, specifically using a 25km distance, and also using the dose-response curves (which are illustrated in Annex 3, Figure 5.3 for example). Based on these two approaches, there appears to be potential for direct disturbance to the Wash and North Norfolk Coast SAC, specifically the haul-out site at Blakeney Point, as a result of construction activities. We therefore request further assessment of this potential direct disturbance of a haul-out and breeding site."		No change at Deadline 7.		The Applicant has provided an additional assessment of the potential for disturbance to seals at the Blakeney Point haul-out site with the Marine Mammals Technical Note and Addendum (Revision B) [document reference 16.14] submitted at Deadline 7. The Applicant considers this assessment to be sufficient to resolve Natural England's concerns.
D11	43, 85 (RIAA)	Mobile sources (geophysical, seismic surveys) should be assessed as mobile rather than point sources in the CIA.		No change at deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3		The Applicant has provided an illustrative assessment of geophysical and seismic surveys as a mobile source, which addresses our comment.				
Document used: [APP-288] 9.4 Draft Marine Mammal Mitigation Protocol												
D12	57,58	Natural England advises the Applicant provides information in the draft Marine Mammal Mitigation Protocol (MMMP) on the principles that will guide the acoustic deterrent devices (ADD) duration for unexploded ordnance (UXO) clearance and piling.		No change at deadline 2.		As per point 74, of REP2-051, the Applicant has stated that this information will be included in the finalised MMMP. We request that the Draft MMMP become a certified document of the DCO and that it be updated to secure the commitment to assessment and consideration of appropriate ADD.		No change at Deadline 5		No change at Deadline 7.		The Applicant notes that the Draft MMMP (Revision B) [REP1-013] is a certified document – see Schedule 18 of the draft DCO (Revision K) [document reference 3.1]. Therefore, this matter is resolved.

D13	58	Clarify whether variation in strike rate will be included as a mitigation measures. Ensure this is reflected in the draft MMMP and the assessment.		No change at deadline 2.		As per point 76, the Applicant has stated that this information will be included in the finalised MMMP. We request that the Draft MMMP become a certified document of the DCO and that it be updated to secure the commitment here.		No change at Deadline 5		No change at Deadline 7.		The Applicant notes that the Draft MMMP (Revision B) [REP1-013] is a certified document – see Schedule 18 of the draft DCO (Revision K) [document reference 3.1]. Therefore, this matter is resolved.
Document used: [APP-059] 5.4 Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment												
D14	65, 70	The pathway of physical and permanent auditory injury should be taken through to Stage 2 of the HRA, so that mitigation is taken into account at the appropriate stage.		No change at deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3		Natural England accepts this concern has been addressed.				
D15	67	The Applicant must undertake an in-combination assessment of impacts to the Wash and North Norfolk Coast SAC population specifically.		No change at deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3		"The Applicant has undertaken an in-combination assessment against the Wash and North Norfolk Coast SAC population as requested. The results are significant in the Applicant's terms, therefore they have undertaken population modelling, also against the SAC population. As stated in response to Point D9, we will provide a fuller response to the population modelling at Deadline 6."		Awaiting final clarification on the population modelling. Position to be provided at Deadline 8, following review of material to be submitted at Deadline 7.		The Applicant has provided additional information on the population modelling at Deadline 7 (within the updated Marine Mammals Technical Note and Addendum (Revision B) [document reference 16.14]. The Applicant considers this is sufficient to resolve Natural England's concerns, as confirmed by Natural England's response to WQ 4.12.2.1 [REP7-112].
D16	68	The assessment of impacts to seal SACs should include impacts to functionally connected habitat in the wider environment that is used by the seal features. Taking this into account, LSE may not be able to be excluded for this pathway.		No change at deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3		The Applicant has provided an updated assessment of barrier effects to seals which in part addresses our concern.		No change at Deadline 7.		Within their response to REIS Q10a, Natural England have confirmed that while they consider effects to functionally linked habitats should have been screened in for LSE, there is no potential for AEoI on seal SACs, and therefore Natural England are in agreement that this matter has been resolved [REP7-111].
D17	75	The Applicant should consider committing to a maximum separation distance between piling that occurs on the same day.		No change at deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3		The updated project-alone assessment indicates that the project alone would not exceed the underwater noise daily disturbance threshold of the SNS SAC. This demonstrates that mitigation such as a maximum separation distance is not required at this stage. This option should be included in the next iteration of the SIP however.		No change at Deadline 7.		During the post-consent phase, the Applicant will update and finalise the SIP based on the final pile design and installation method, as well as the finalised piling programme. A pile separation limit will be considered as an option if there is determined to be the potential to exceed the Southern North Sea SAC disturbance thresholds. The final SIP will be developed and finalised in consultation with the MMO and Natural England, and therefore the Applicant considers no further information or commitment is required at this stage.
D18	83, 84, 86	The Applicant has identified the risk of a significant impact on harbour porpoise, in both EIA and HRA terms. The Applicant should update their assessment of in-combination seasonal disturbance to the Southern North Sea SAC to reflect all noisy activity that could occur through the season. Following this the area disturbed over a season may increase further. The Applicant should consider committing to additional mitigation at this stage to minimise the risk of AEoI on the SNS SAC from noise disturbance. Natural England has significant concerns over the effectiveness of multiple SIPs to reduce the risk. In particular the SIP has limited measures to mitigate exceedance of the seasonal threshold. Further mitigation should also be considered		No change at deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3		The Applicant has updated their assessment of in-combination seasonal disturbance to the Southern North Sea SAC. The updated assessment shows an increase in the maximum and average in-combination overlap with the summer and winter area, with all scenarios exceeding the threshold. Natural England maintains its previous concerns around the SIP process and considers that the Applicant should		No change at Deadline 7.		As the Applicant has responded previously (in response to WQ 3.12.2.4 [REP5-049]), it does not consider it to be appropriate to determine which of the potential mitigation and management measures would be required to reduce and potential for significant effect on the Southern North Sea SAC. This is due to the final pile design and programme not being known at this stage. Finalising the mitigation and management measures post-consent also allows for the best information to be

		to reduce the risk of a significant effect on the harbour porpoise North Sea management unit population.					commit to mitigation now in principle. This is particularly important for the seasonal threshold which cannot be mitigated through timing co-ordinations. Natural England considers it likely that measures will need to be implemented to reduce individual projects' noise. Committing to a mitigation measure such as a seasonal restriction is strongly advised and would reduce the risk to the project.			incorporated in relation to other projects that may be undertaking noisy activities in the same relevant season as the Projects. The potentially required mitigation and management options will be considered at an early enough point in the overall programme to allow for all mitigation and management options to be available to the Projects.
D19	90, 93	The Applicant has identified the risk of a significant impact on the grey seal feature of the Humber Estuary SAC. They have stated that it is not significant for several reasons that Natural England does not agree with. Further information is needed to demonstrate that an AEoI will not occur. And/or, the Applicant should commit to further mitigation to reduce the risk of significant disturbance.		No change at deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3	"The Applicant has undertaken population modelling (iPCoD) of the grey seal feature of the Humber Estuary SAC, from project-alone and cumulative offshore wind farm projects. Following the population modelling, the Applicant considers that no additional mitigation for disturbance is required. Natural England defers responding on this issue to Deadline 6 pending further consideration."		Awaiting final clarification on the population modelling. Position to be provided at Deadline 8, following review of material to be submitted at Deadline 7.	The Applicant has provided additional information on the population modelling at Deadline 7 (within the updated Marine Mammals Technical Note and Addendum (Revision B) [document reference 16.14]. The Applicant considers this is sufficient to resolve Natural England's concerns, as confirmed by Natural England's response to WQ 4.12.2.1 [REP7-112].
D20	91	The Applicant should update their assessment of barrier effects with information on movements (from telemetry data) and area lost due to the effects.		No change at deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3	The Applicant has provided an updated assessment of barrier effects to seals which partially addresses our concerns.		No change at Deadline 7.	As noted by Natural England in Appendix L5 Natural England's Response to the RIES [REP7-111] <i>"The Applicant has provided an updated assessment of barrier effects that provides part of the requested information. We are content that there would be no AEoI from this pathway."</i> Therefore this matter is considered to be resolved.
D21	94, 95	The Applicant should present an assessment of disturbance to harbour seals from The Wash and North Norfolk Coast (WNNC) SAC during piling based on the 25km disturbance range from Russell <i>et al.</i> (2016).		No change at deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3	The Applicant has presented an (illustrative) assessment of disturbance to seals at-sea using a 25km disturbance distance, which partially addresses our comment. Please see response to Point D10.		No change at Deadline 7.	The Applicant has provided additional information on the population modelling at Deadline 7 (within the updated Marine Mammals Technical Note and Addendum (Revision B) [document reference 16.14]. The Applicant considers this is sufficient to resolve Natural England's concerns.
Document used: [APP-289] 9.5 Offshore In Principle Monitoring Plan										
D22	N/A	New issue raised at deadline 1, see issues A21-A23 on the DCO/DML tab		No change at deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3	The Applicant has provided further information in the IPMP [REP4-015] that was specifically requested in relation to marine mammals (presenting updated conclusions from the RIAA and ES; assumptions and knowledge gaps). They have also presented options that would evidence the impacts to marine mammals, and also demonstrate the effectiveness of mitigation. Nevertheless, as outlined in our response to the Offshore IPMP at Deadline 1		No change at Deadline 7.	The Applicant submitted a further update to the Offshore IPMP (Revision C) [document reference 9.5] at Deadline 7 to seek to address Natural England's comments. The Applicant considers that the information provided within the Offshore IPMP for marine mammals is sufficient at this stage of the Projects. The Offshore IPMP provides information on the aims of the monitoring proposals, and the key knowledge gaps the monitoring will aim to achieve, including, where relevant, investigating the effectiveness of mitigation. The

							(see Paragraph 4), we consider that further detail is still required.				Applicant considers that flexibility in the final monitoring design and timeframes is appropriate to ensure the final project design and programme can be properly considered, and to ensure that other monitoring plans and future research is taken into account.
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--	--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

1.5 Applicant's comments on Tab E Marine & Coastal Processes of Natural England's Deadline 5 Risk and Issues Log

Point	Point Number(s) from Appendix E [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP AND DEP Appendix E - Marine Processes [RR-063]	RAG Status Rel and WR Rep	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Applicant's Comment D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D7	Applicant's Comment on D7
Document Used: [APP-090] 6.1.4 Chapter 4 Project Description													
E1	1	Natural England advises that the maximum trench width needs to be clarified in an updated document. Trench sizes quoted use a burial depth of 1.5m and a trench width of 5.2m (assuming a 30-degree trench side slope). However, in 6.1.6 [APP-092] Marine Geology, Oceanography and Physical Processes, it is stated that infield and interlink cables would be buried up to 1.5m below the seabed, with an indicative sediment displacement width of 1m for jetting. Similarly, it is stated that offshore export cables would be buried up to 1m below the seabed, with an indicative sediment displacement width of 1m. This is also contradictory to 5.1.2 [APP-182] relating to sediment process in the MCZ. Until this is clarified, we are unable to confirm that the Worst-case Scenario (WCS) has been assessed and provide nature conservation advice on the significance of the any predicted impacts.		The Applicant's Marine Processes Technical Note [REP1-059] provides further information on the SEP/DEP export cable trench size, which we welcome. However, the worst case scenario(s) for infield and interlink cable trench sizes have not yet been clarified.		No change at Deadline 3.		As noted at ID 13 of Table 4.18.4 in The Applicant's Comments to Relevant Representations [REP1-033], cable installation by jetting technique is considered to be the worst-case scenario for suspended sediment concentrations and seabed level assessments in ES Chapter 6 Marine Geology, Oceanography and Physical Processes (MGOPP) [APP-092]. This would create a trench approximately 1m wide. The 5.2m width dimension described in Section 4.4.7.5.4 of Chapter 4 Project Description [APP-090], which also applies to interlink and infield cables, assumes cable burial using a cable plough and relates to the footprint of disturbance for ploughing which is not the worst-case scenario for suspended sediment concentrations and seabed level assessments in APP-092. The worst case volume of displaced sediment assuming cable burial by jetting is provided in Table 6-2 of APP-092.	No change at Deadline 5.		No change at Deadline 7		The Applicant reaffirms its comment made at Deadline 3.
E2	2	Natural England would welcome the provision of a subtidal crossing schedule for the proposed and existing cables due to make landfall at Weybourne. It would also be useful to provide information such as water depth at the cable crossings and their distance offshore. This is particularly important for those cable crossings in the nearshore part of the export cable corridor in order to understand potential impacts on sediment transport processes.		No change at Deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3.		As noted in the Outline CSCB MCZ CSIMP [APP-291] the offshore cable corridor has been sited to completely avoid the need for any cable crossings (which necessitate the use of external cable protection) in the MCZ (i.e. out to 11km offshore). The Applicant is committed to, if required, cutting a section of the disused Stratos cable to avoid the need for a cable crossing and therefore there would be no potential effect on sediment transport processes from the installation of external cable protection at cable crossings within the MCZ. Other offshore wind farm developments and cables are shown in Figure 16.3 of the ES [APP-128].	Natural England notes there has been no subtidal crossing schedule provided not examination. Therefore Natural England's position remains unchanged at Deadline 5.		No change at Deadline 7		The Applicant reaffirms its comment at Deadline 3 and maintains its position provided in ID 6 of Table 4.18.4 of The Applicant's Comments to Relevant Representations [REP1-033] that a formal offshore crossing schedule will be produced post-consent as part of the cable specification, installation and monitoring plan secured through the DMLs, once more accurate details on, for example, infield, interconnector and export cable routes and requirements are defined.

Point	Point Number(s) from Appendix E [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP AND DEP Appendix E - Marine Processes [RR-063]	RAG Status Rel and WR Rep	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Applicant's Comment D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D7	Applicant's Comment on D7
E3	3	The maximum dimensions of cable protection for crossings are given as 21m and 100m with the maximum height of cable crossings at 1.7m. However, in Chapter 6, Para. 371, it states that the height of the protrusion will be up to 0.5m in most cases which is also confirmed in Appendix 6.3 APP-182 for the Cromer Shoal MCZ. The maximum height of cable crossings should be clarified and consistent throughout all submitted documents. Furthermore, there are no cross-section or plan schematics of cable crossing layout, it would be helpful if these were provided in an updated chapter or part of a outlined named plan to further advise on potential impact to sediments transportation.		No change at Deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3.		As noted at ID 15 of Table 4.18.4 in The Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations [REP1-033] the height of cable protection will be up to 0.5m except at cable crossings where it could be up to 1.7m. As noted in the cell above, the Applicant has avoided the need for cable crossings in the MCZ.	No change at Deadline 5.		No change at Deadline 7		The Applicant reaffirms its comment at Deadline 3 and adds that the cable crossing layout / schematics will be provided post consent once specific details of the crossing locations and designs are understood.
Document Used: [APP-091] 6.1.5 Chapter 5 EIA Methodology													
E4	4	Para. 88 states that only projects which are well described and sufficiently advanced, with sufficient detail available will be included in the cumulative impact assessment. Please clarify a cut-off date for assessing whether or not to include a project, noting that several PEIRs (Section 42 consultations) are expected in February 2023. Natural England draws the Applicant's attention to our latest Best Practice Guidance 2022 of recommended tiers for scoping plans and projects for the cumulative environmental assessment and advises that assessments are updated accordingly. However, we do note that, since submission of our relevant/written representations, the submission dates for some of the PEIRs have been delayed to late spring. However, this is still within the examination timeframe for SEP and DEP		No change at Deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3.		As noted at ID 15 of Table 4.18.4 in The Applicant's Comments to Relevant Representations [REP1-033] the Applicant confirms that there was a cut off for inclusion of other offshore wind farms within the ES of May 2022. However, Table 6-42 of Chapter 6 MGOPP [APP-092] provides a summary of projects considered for the CIA in relation to marine geology, oceanography and physical processes. The closest other offshore wind farm to SEP and DEP is Race Bank (9km). Other offshore wind farms such as Outer Dowsing, North Falls and Five Estuaries which may be submitting PEIRs this spring are all over approximately 13km from SEP and DEP and therefore are screened out of the cumulative assessment.	No change at Deadline 5.		No change at Deadline 7		The Applicant reaffirms its comment made at Deadline 3.
Document used: [APP-181] 6.3.6.2 Volume 3: Appendix 6.2: Wave Climate Assessment													
E5	5, 6	Fig. 6-2 shows the dimensions of the GBS simulated by DIFFRACT for input to the wave model. This shows WCS turbine foundations for DEP and SEP. The maximum diameter at water level is 13m and the shaft at the seabed is 36m. However, in Section 4.4.3.3 of The Environmental Statement Chapter 4 [APP-090], it states that the WCS for 18+ MW WTG foundations is a maximum diameter at water level of 14m and shaft diameter at the seabed of 40m. Therefore, the WCS GBS foundations modelled have narrower dimensions at water level and at seabed than the WCS presented in Chapter 4 [APP-090] which would lead to slightly greater impact on the wave		No change at Deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3.		As noted at ID 15 of Table 4.18.4 in The Applicant's Comments to Relevant Representations [REP1-033] the Applicant confirms that there was a cut off for inclusion of other offshore wind farms within the ES of May 2022. The Applicant acknowledges that the GBS dimensions simulated by DIFFRACT are slightly smaller than the dimensions of the largest 18+MW turbine (18+MW = 14m at water level and shaft diameter at seabed of 40m). However, the wave climate assessment assumes that there would be up	No change at Deadline 5.		No change at Deadline 7		The Applicant reaffirms its comment at Deadline 3.

Point	Point Number(s) from Appendix E [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP AND DEP Appendix E - Marine Processes [RR-063]	RAG Status Rel and WR Rep	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Applicant's Comment D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D7	Applicant's Comment on D7	
		climate. Additionally, Para. 59 [APP-181] states that the GBS have diameters of 13m and 30m wide bases. This differs from the base diameter presented in Figure 6-2. Natural England advises that the assessment currently doesn't reflect the worst case scenario and advises that this needs addressing in an updated document before a >36m shaft diameter can be agreed with certainty.						to 30 of the DIFFRACT simulated turbines in DEP and 23 in SEP which is associated with the smaller 15MW turbine (compared to 24 and 19 respectively for an 18+MW turbine) which has a maximum diameter at the water level of 11m and shaft diameter at the seabed of 30m. Therefore, a worst-case assessment of a larger number of slightly smaller sized turbines has been provided.						
Document used: [APP-102] 6.1.16 Chapter 16 Petroleum Industry and Other Marine Users														
E6	7	There are potential cumulative impacts due to overlapping Operation and Maintenance (O&M) activities at Waveney, Blythe Hub and Elgood Wellhead. We note that Blythe Hub has been considered in Chapter 6, but not Waveney or Elgood. Natural England advise that Waveney and Elgood should be included in the cumulative impact assessment (CIA) to fully understand the potential impacts.		No change at Deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3.		As noted at ID 9 of Table 4.18.4 in The Applicant's Comments to Relevant Representations [REP1-033] the Waveney Gas Platform and Elgood Wellhead gas production platforms could have the potential for cumulative impacts during the operation of SEP and DEP. Both are single platforms supported by several legs through the water column and into the seabed. The addition of two more platforms to a DEP array of 30 foundations and 67 foundations in DOW (and associated offshore platforms), will cumulatively make little difference to the overall effect on waves, tidal currents, and sediment transport.	No change at Deadline 5.		No change at Deadline 7			The Applicant reaffirms its comment made at Deadline 3.
Document used: [APP-289] 9.5 Offshore In Principle Monitoring Plan (IPMP)														
E7	8	We note that whilst sandwave recovery/migration has been included for post-construction in the Tab. 3. of the IPMP, sandbanks have not. Natural England advise that sandbank monitoring should also be included in the IPMP to ensure that the null hypothesis is correct in relation to marine processes.		This item remains under consideration. Please see our advice in the IPMP.		No change at Deadline 3.		Noted. The Applicant is intending to update the Offshore IPMP [APP-289] at Deadline 4 and will consider include of monitoring of sandbanks as well as sandwaves.	As per our advice within Appendix E of our Relevant Representations [RR-063] and our response at Deadline 4 we continue to advise that there is a requirement extend the monitoring of sandwave recovery beyond that which is provided to further understand trends and patterns of morphological change. Additionally, there is a requirement to monitor change in sand bank topography within the array area and offshore cable corridors which should also be included within the IPMP. We advise the hypothesis to be tested is outlined. Please see our comments in Appendix A2.		No change at Deadline 7. Natural England understands the Applicant intends to submit an updated IPMP at Deadline 7.			The Applicant updated the Offshore IPMP (Revision C) [document reference 9.5] at Deadline 4 and Deadline 7 to seek to address the Natural England comments.
Document used: [APP-092] 6.1.6 Chapter 6 Marine Geology, Oceanography and Physical Processes														

Point	Point Number(s) from Appendix E [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP AND DEP Appendix E - Marine Processes [RR-063]	RAG Status Rel and WR Rep	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Applicant's Comment D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D7	Applicant's Comment on D7
E8	9	The text describes a sandbank in NW of DEP N array area and also a sandbank in the NW of DEP S array area. The bathymetry shows the presence of significant sandbanks, which are probably Cromer Knoll and Inner Cromer Knoll, but no information has been provided regarding their form, spatial extent, elevation, depth, rate of migration and stability. In order to understand impacts of the development on marine process associated with these sandbank features, please can the Applicant provide further information.		The Applicant has now provided further information in Marine Processes Technical Note [REP1-059] which addresses this evidence gap and this issue has now been resolved.				The Applicant welcomes this comment and considers this matter closed.					
E9	10	Natural England queries if there is an equivalent shallow geology schematic for the Interlink Cable Corridor to help inform advice on significance of impacts?		No change at Deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3.		As noted at ID 22 of Table 4.18.4 in The Applicant's Comments to Relevant Representations [REP1-033] there is no shallow geology schematic of the Interlink Corridor presented in the geophysical interpretive reports. However, in a broad sense the shallow geological make-up is similar to those of SEP, DEP North and DEP South presented as Plates 6.1 to 6.3 of the ES Chapter 6 MGOPP [APP092].	No change at Deadline 5.		No change at Deadline 7.		The Applicant reaffirms its comment made at Deadline 3.
E10	11	Natural England advises that the neap and spring tidal excursions should be provided. The spring tidal excursion is useful for estimating the potential extent of direct changes to flows as well as the anticipated maximum zone of influence for sediment plumes. We advise that the neap/spring tidal excursions should be quantified. It would also be useful for the Applicant to provide a map showing the spring tidal ellipses across the study area.		The Applicant has now provided further information in Marine Processes Technical Note [REP1-059] which addresses this evidence gap and this issue has now been resolved.				The Applicant welcomes this comment and considers this matter closed.					
E11	12	Para. 153. Please include information on the source of the cliff erosion rate and how the shoreline erosion has been taken into account in Chapter 3 (Site Selection and Assessment of Alternatives). Natural England advises that it is important to consider recent cliff and beach profile survey data, alongside longer-term records (i.e. years), in order to establish the baseline. It is also vital to consider climate change impacts on cliff retreat and beach downwearing. This information should be included in an updated chapter to ensure that impacts over the lifetime of the protects have be thoroughly assessed.		We continue to advise that the Applicant will need to consider seabed mobility here in order to assess cable burial success. Thus, this item remains under discussion.		No change at Deadline 3.		Appendix 6.3 Sedimentary Processes in the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ [APP-182] of the ES provides a detailed appraisal of potential sediment transport across the MCZ. In addition, an Export Cable Burial Risk Assessment is provided in Appendix 2 of the Outline CSCB MCZ CSIMP [APP-291].	No change at Deadline 5.		No change at Deadline 7.		Regarding cliff erosion, as noted by Natural England in response to ExA WQ3.3.3.3 in REP5-094: "...based on the information currently available, we are content that the proposed set back of the HDD entry point location onshore (landside) is appropriate." Regarding seabed mobility, The Applicant reaffirms its comment made at Deadline 3.
E12	13	The HR Wallingford (2002) suspended sediment concentration (SSC) data sets are old. Whilst the Cefas (2016) data are newer, they are not site-specific, instead referring to 'the seas around the UK'. SSC should ideally be collected throughout the water column over a range of representative tidal,		No change at Deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3.		As noted at ID 25 of Table 4.18.4 in The Applicant's Comments to Relevant Representations [REP1-033] the Applicant agreed with the ETG to use the Cefas (2016) average suspended sediment concentration dataset which was	No change at Deadline 5.		No change at Deadline 7. No further information received yet.		The Applicant reaffirms its comment made at Deadline 3. It is not standard for site specific data to be collected to inform suspended sediment concentration impacts.

Point	Point Number(s) from Appendix E [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP AND DEP Appendix E - Marine Processes [RR-063]	RAG Status Rel and WR Rep	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Applicant's Comment D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D7	Applicant's Comment on D7
		seasonal, and wave conditions. If data have been collected for DOW and/or SOW, those data would be considered appropriate and should be included.						obtained in a Geographic Information System (GIS) form and the data interrogated for the site. Therefore, the data is site specific and showed that average suspended sediment concentrations across SEP and DEP are 5-10mg/l between 1998 and 2015. The site specific data extracted from Cefas' dataset is provided in Figure 6.10 of the ES (APP-119). This is a recent long time series of data (17 years) and it is highly unlikely that the average concentrations up to the present day have changed.					
E13	14	Para. 145. The regional net sediment transport rates provided are now old (2002). Natural England's best practice (2021) advises that data older than five years should be used with care. Furthermore, it is not clear which geographical area these sediment transport rates relate to, and it would be useful to clarify this. Natural England advises that more recent regional net sediment transport data should be used and more context provided within an updated chapter on the regional net sediment transport rates in order to have any certainty in the conclusions drawn by the Applicant.		No change at Deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3.		As noted at ID 26 of Table 4.18.4 in The Applicant's Comments to Relevant Representations [REP1-033] the numbers for transport quoted in the HR Wallingford (2002) work are reproduced in the Shoreline Management Plan (SMP) for this coast and so are considered 'the most recent'. A search found no other estimates.	No change at Deadline 5.		No change at Deadline 7. No further information received yet.		The Applicant reaffirms its comment made at Deadline 3.
E14	15	Natural England welcomes the inclusion of sandbanks in the list of impact receptors. However, we believe it is important that the Applicant includes in this list, all marine protected areas that could be affected by changes to physical processes due to the proposed development (even if they are considered and assessed in other chapters). This should also include supporting habitats. Furthermore, all relevant marine protected areas should be identified on the appropriate figures or maps within this chapter.		We are content that Marine Protected Areas have now been identified on the Zone of Potential Influence map within the Marine Processes Technical Note [REP1-059].				The Applicant welcomes this comment and considers this matter closed.					
E15	16	Natural England notes that the 'Sand banks (and associated sandwaves)' Receptor Group does not include any mention of Sheringham Shoal, Pollard Bank, Cromer Knoll, Inner Cromer Knoll, sandwaves in SEP, sandbanks situated at the NW of DEP N array and in DEP S, and in the north of the cable corridor between DEP N array and SEP. Natural England advises that all sandbanks within the outer limits for the project, should be included and named to ensure that all potential impact pathways have been thoroughly assessed.		The Applicant has now provided further information in Marine Processes Technical Note [REP1-059] which addresses this evidence gap and this issue has now been resolved.				The Applicant welcomes this comment and considers this matter closed.					

Point	Point Number(s) from Appendix E [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP AND DEP Appendix E - Marine Processes [RR-063]	RAG Status Rel and WR Rep	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Applicant's Comment D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D7	Applicant's Comment on D7
E16	17	Para. 153. Please include information on the source of the cliff erosion rate and how the shoreline erosion has been taken into account in Chapter 3 (Site Selection and Assessment of Alternatives). Natural England advises that it is important to consider recent cliff and beach profile survey data, alongside longer-term records (i.e. years), in order to establish the baseline. It is also vital to consider climate change impacts on cliff retreat and beach downwearing. This information should be included in an updated chapter to ensure that impacts over the lifetime of the protects have be thoroughly assessed.		No change at Deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3.		Section 2.7 of Appendix 3.2 - Cable Landfall Concept Study [APP-176] includes consideration of coastal erosion which informed the concept design of the HDD. The 'Landfall HDD Profile Weybourne' figure shown on page 84 of that document includes an erosion profile and shows the distance between that and the HDD entry point. At the detailed design stage the Applicant will use the most up to date cliff retreat and beach profile data.	No change at Deadline 5.		Please see Natural England's advice in REP5-094. Although we are content that the proposed set back of the HDD entry point location onshore (landside) is appropriate. We would advise consideration of predicted cliff erosion profile data associated with the longer term (50-100 years). We would also advise the Applicant to seek the expert advice of North Norfolk District Council and the Environment Agency with regards to the latest information on coastal erosion and management at landfall.		The Applicant notes this can be carried out in the post-consent period during detailed design.
E17	20	Natural England queries if multiple coincident dredging operations are likely to occur during development and what would the worst case scenario would be? This could potentially lead to more spatially extensive and/or higher concentration sediment plumes. The WCS should be quantified in terms of suspended sediment concentration, plume extent, persistence and sediment deposition thickness. Natural England advises that further clarity is required within an updated chapter covering these points to ensure that the WCSs has been fully considered.		No change at Deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3.		As noted at ID 32 of Table 4.18.4 in The Applicant's Comments to Relevant Representations [REP1-033] suspended sediment concentrations arising from multiple coincident dredging operations could potentially interact to create a larger plume which could lead to greater thicknesses of deposition. However, the principle still holds true that the re-suspension of a (slightly) thicker deposit (maximum 3mm for a worst case of three overlapping plumes) would disperse rapidly and it would become immeasurable over a short period of time and have negligible impact on the seabed.	No change at Deadline 5.		No change at Deadline 7. No further information received yet.		The Applicant reaffirms its comment made at Deadline 3.
E18	21	Para. 180. The WCS for changes in SSCs due to seabed preparations for foundation installations would be associated with Gravity Base Structures (GBS). The discharge of dredged sediments during the preparation of GBS foundations will lead to elevated SSCs, and sediment plumes. There is a chance that sediments disturbed during construction of the SEP array, will enter the Inner Dowsing, Race Bank and North Ridge SAC (within 10km tidal excursion). The predicted deposition footprint has not, however, been provided for discharge of dredged material at the sea surface and near the seabed. Natural England advises that predicted deposition footprints from the sea surface and near seabed discharges of dredged material at the SEP array is provided by the Applicant. This would provide further information on the potential		No change at Deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3.		The Applicant has not quantified spatial distribution of deposition resulting from sediment plume dispersion for any of the offshore infrastructure. This is because the assessment was conceptual expert-based using the existing data from SOW / DOW as analogues. No bespoke modelling of sediment dispersion and subsequent deposition has been undertaken. The analogous SOW and DOW data suggests that worst-case thickness of sediment deposited from the plume would not likely exceed a maximum of 1mm and be less than 0.1mm over large areas of the seabed. After this initial deposition, this sediment will be continually re-suspended to reduce the thickness even further to a point where it will be	No change at Deadline 5.		No change at Deadline 7. No further information received yet.		The Applicant reaffirms its comment made at Deadline 3.

Point	Point Number(s) from Appendix E [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP AND DEP Appendix E - Marine Processes [RR-063]	RAG Status Rel and WR Rep	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Applicant's Comment D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D7	Applicant's Comment on D7
		effects due to discharged dredged material at the development site.						effectively zero. This will be the longer-term outcome once the sediment supply from foundation installation or export cable installation has ceased. Hence, the footprint of deposition from the plumes is irrelevant to the assessment because regardless of its geographical extent, it will have an immeasurable thickness once dredging has stopped.					
E19	24	Natural England notes that no sandwave levelling is expected for the "SEP in isolation" scenario because there are no sandwaves present along the ECC. Therefore, any requirement for sandwave levelling activities haven't been assessed. Please clarify whether the exclusion of sandwave levelling within SEP will be secured by a condition within the DML/DCO and/or named plan.		No change at Deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3.		As noted at ID 32 of Table 4.18.4 in The Applicant's Comments to Relevant Representations [REP1-033] the Applicant is not aware of any precedent in securing this type of 'nonactivity' within DMLs and does not consider that it is appropriate or required.	No change at Deadline 5.		No change at Deadline 7.		The Applicant reaffirms its comment made at Deadline 3.
E20	25, 26, 27	<p>Paras. 239-241. The SOW and DOW-based model simulation quantification of magnitude of change are useful analogues for sediment disturbed by export cable installation of the current proposals. However, it is not clear if/how the SOW/DOW max temporary disturbance widths for export cable installation and burial, or amount of sediment disturbed compare with those planned for SEP/DEP. Further more in Para. 239, it is stated that although SSCs will be elevated during the development, they are likely to be lower than concentrations during storm conditions (including the Dec 2013 storm surge), which are likely to drive greater changes to the seabed than those due to the OWF infrastructure.</p> <p>Para. 245 notes that elevated SSCs above prevailing conditions are anticipated at the HDD exit point, but that they are also likely to remain within the range of background nearshore levels. Para. 255 & 256. Results from the sediment dispersion modelling for the SOW and DOW export cables (Para.s 170 & 171 in Chapter 6), suggest that suspended load for disturbed mud would extend as a plume over <2km for SOW, and <1km for silt in either direction.</p> <p>In all instances, Natural England advises that, within an updated chapter, it should be shown how the SOW/DOW trench size and amount of disturbed sediment compare with those for SEP/DEP and quantitative evidence should be provided to support the predictions regarding SSCs. Until this is provided Natural</p>		The Applicant has provided further information in Marine Processes Technical Note [REP1-059] on the upscaled sediment disturbance volume, plume extent and deposition thickness for SEP/DEP export cable installation., which we welcome. We are now content to agree with the conclusions drawn here.				The Applicant welcomes this comment and considers this matter closed.					

Point	Point Number(s) from Appendix E [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP AND DEP Appendix E - Marine Processes [RR-063]	RAG Status Rel and WR Rep	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Applicant's Comment D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D7	Applicant's Comment on D7
		England is unable to support the conclusions drawn by the Applicant.											
E21	28	<p>Para. 255. Given that the ECC traverses the CSCB MCZ, it would be very helpful if the plume model data for SOW/DOW could also be provided as predicted deposition footprints for representative locations between the HDD exit location and seaward boundary of the MCZ. These should be representative of the different sedimentary zones along the ECC within the MCZ and also include the HDD exit location.</p> <p>Furthermore, it is not stated what the estimated deposited sediment thickness may be for the different sediment fractions (i.e. fine/medium/coarse) caused by the export cable installation. Can estimated deposited sediment thickness be provided for the different sediment fractions? If so, modelled deposition footprints and thickness should be provided for locations representative of the different sedimentary zones along the ECC within the MCZ and include the HDD exit location. Until this is provided we are unable to agree with the Applicant's conclusions relating to SSC deposition and potential impacts as a result of smothering</p>		Natural England welcomes the upscaled sediment disturbance volume, plume extent and deposition thickness for SEP/DEP export cable installation data provided by the Applicant in the Marine Processes Technical Note [REP1-059]. We are content with the updated information provided by the Applicant.			The Applicant welcomes this comment and considers this matter closed.						

Point	Point Number(s) from Appendix E [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP AND DEP Appendix E - Marine Processes [RR-063]	RAG Status Rel and WR Rep	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Applicant's Comment D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D7	Applicant's Comment on D7
E22	29	<p>In the Stage 1 CSCB MCZA (Doc Ref 5.6), the pressure 'Smothering and siltation rate changes (light)' has been used for the sensitivity assessment where 'light' deposition is defined as 'of up to 5cm of fine material added to the habitat in a single, discrete event', and 'heavy' deposition is up to 30cm of fine material. In Section 8.1.2.3 (Stage 1 CSCB MCZA), it states that deposits would be up to 3cm depth, but in 6.6.4.6, there is no similar estimate of deposited sediment thickness stated. Consequently, it is not evident whether the smothering and siltation rate changes (light) pressure is the most appropriate, or whether the sensitivity of the CSCB MCZ is 'negligible' as stated in Table 6-23 (Chapter 6), or the impact 'negligible adverse', given the predicted two year recovery time</p> <p>In Para. 259 & 262 (Chapter 6), it would be helpful if the rationale for the 3cm sediment deposition thickness could be provided and also the rationale for the negligible sensitivity assessment for the CSCB MCZ. Until this clarification is provided we are unable to agree with the Applicants conclusions</p>		No change at Deadline 2, awaiting clarification from the Applicant.		No change at Deadline 3.		<p>As noted at ID 32 of Table 4.18.4 in The Applicant's Comments to Relevant Representations [REP1-033] the 3cm of sediment deposition described in the ES [APP-092] is in reference to changes in seabed level due to drill arisings for installation of piled foundations for wind turbines and OSPs. It does not refer to sediment thicknesses generated by installation of the export cable. There has been a mistranslation of the information from the ES into the Stage 1 CSCB MCZA [APP-077] in this regard.</p> <p>There are no thicknesses of deposition from the plume presented in the ES for export cable installation. Information is presented on the destination of sand-sized material; it would settle out of suspension within less than 20m from the point of installation within the offshore export cable corridor and persist in the water column for less than half an hour. Almost no sand was predicted to be carried more than 100m from the cable.</p>	No change at Deadline 5.		No change at Deadline 7.		The Applicant reaffirms its comment made at Deadline 3.
E23	30, 48	<p>We note that no sandwave levelling is anticipated for the "SEP in isolation" scenario. However, it may be required in a "DEP in isolation" or SEP and DEP scenarios. This could lead to impacts on nearby subtidal geomorphological features (e.g. the Cromer Knolls, Sheringham Shoal) through sandwave levelling. We advise a precautionary approach is adopted with regards to direct impacts to sandbanks and morphological features across the DEP/SEP arrays and adjacent cable corridors due to sandwave levelling, and potential indirect effects on other receptors (e.g. CSCB MCZ and/or the East Anglia Coast).</p> <p>Natural England advises that impacts to subtidal geomorphological features due to sandwave levelling should be adequately assessed, and indirect effects on other receptors be considered in an updated chapter. An assessment should be carried out to provide reassurance that there will not be any long-term morphological effects. We advise that Table 6-46 may need revision following this work.</p>		In the Marine Processes Technical Note [REP1-059], the Applicant has provided a more detailed characterisation of the sandbanks and sandwaves that exist across the study area. We advise monitoring to establish long-term trends in the overall seabed bathymetry across the array site(s) through comparison of further bathymetry datasets from different time periods. We also advise that analysis of additional datasets from different time periods is needed to help establish whether sandwave morphological changes and migration rates are due to natural or anthropogenic drivers.		No change at Deadline 3.		<p>The Applicant has committed to monitoring of sand waves and sand banks within the SEP and DEP wind farm sites, as described in the Offshore IPMP [APP-289] which the Applicant is intending to update at Deadline 4.</p> <p>The Applicant has updated the Marine Processes Technical Note (Revision B) [document reference 13.5] to address the further comments received from Natural England in REP2-062, including those in relation to analysis of additional bathymetry datasets.</p>		No change at Deadline 7. Natural England understands the Applicant intends to submit an updated IPMP at Deadline 7.		The Applicant updated the Offshore IPMP (Revision C) [document reference 9.5] at Deadline 7 to seek to address Natural England's comments.	
E24	31, 32, 48	<p>Para. 292 & 293. The evidence from Race Bank OWF provides some useful insight to the potential impact of sandwave levelling at DEP N-DEP S. However, in order to understand</p>		The Applicant has now provided [REP1-059] a more detailed characterisation of the sandbanks and				The Applicant welcomes this comment and considers this matter closed.					

Point	Point Number(s) from Appendix E [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP AND DEP Appendix E - Marine Processes [RR-063]	RAG Status Rel and WR Rep	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Applicant's Comment D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D7	Applicant's Comment on D7
		<p>whether the sandwaves are likely to regenerate after levelling, or be adversely impacted along with any adjacent bank system, it is first necessary to assess the seabed morphology at the locations requiring sandwave levelling using bathymetric survey data. In turn, the anticipated ranges of natural seabed change, sandwave migration rates and expected sediment variability should be assessed. This would inform the baseline upon which morphological change and variability can be assessed throughout the project development and lifetime.</p> <p>This work should enable forecasting of site-specific sandwave regeneration timescale. We advise that anticipated ranges of natural seabed change, sandwave migration rates and anticipated sediment variability should be further assessed using bathymetric survey data, for those locations likely to require levelling (pre-sweeping). In addition, we are unable to agree with the magnitude of effects on bedload sediment transport for sandwave levelling within offshore cable corridors (presented in Table 6-26) owing to the uncertainty regarding sandwave recovery at SEP/DEP and potential impacts on adjacent bank systems. Natural England advise that the assessment described above should be carried out in order to gain more certainty regarding the likely regeneration of sandwaves following levelling. Until this is provided we are unable to agree with the Applicant's conclusions on sandwave recovery with any certainty.</p>		sandwaves that exist across the DEP N and DEP S Zones of Influence which will form a useful baseline upon which to compare future sandbank/sandwave morphological change trends and migration rates.									
E25	34	<p>Given the greater spatial extent of the combined SEP/SOW and DEP/DOW arrays and complex seabed topography, there is the potential for more spatial variability in tidal behaviour across the arrays. Yet, in Para. 314, it is stated that changes to seabed distribution due to turbine foundations at DOW were minimal, implying that changes to tidal currents (and waves) are local and do not have a significant effect on sediment transport further afield. Natural England advises that quantitative evidence to support this implication is provided so that the significance of the potential impacts can be considered further.</p>		Please see our comment to E30 on post-construction monitoring of DOW with regards to changes to seabed distribution.		No change at Deadline 3.		See response at E30.	No change at Deadline 5.		No change at Deadline 7.		The Applicant updated the Offshore IPMP (Revision C) [document reference 9.5] at Deadline 7 to seek to address Natural England's comments.

Point	Point Number(s) from Appendix E [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP AND DEP Appendix E - Marine Processes [RR-063]	RAG Status Rel and WR Rep	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Applicant's Comment D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D7	Applicant's Comment on D7
E26	36, 48	Para. 319 states that no significant impact on the tidal current regime is anticipated for SEP/DEP and therefore the impact on sandbanks is anticipated to be negligible adverse. However, we advise that a precautionary approach should be adopted. Given the greater spatial extent of the combined SEP/SOW and DEP/DOW scenarios, complex seabed topography, and potential for more spatial variability in tidal behaviour across the arrays the potential impacts on a nearby sandbank systems should be considered and assessed. Until this is provided Natural England is unable to agree with the Applicant's conclusion on the significance of the potential impacts		Please see our comment to E30 below. We would also advise that monitoring of the sandbank systems that exist across the DEP S and DEP N Zones of Influence is necessary in order to validate the Applicant's conclusions that the impacts on the sand banks due to the Project will be negligible.		No change at Deadline 3.		See response at E30.	"Please see Natural England's advice at Deadline 5 in Appendix A2 to the IPMP [REP4-014]. We welcome the inclusion of sandwave/bank migration and recovery monitoring. We advise the hypothesis to be tested is outlined."		No change at Deadline 7. Natural England understands the Applicant intends to submit an updated IPMP at Deadline 7.		The Applicant updated the Offshore IPMP (Revision C) [document reference 9.5] at Deadline 7 to seek to address Natural England's comments.
E27	37	Natural England are not able to agree with the assessment of 'Frequency' as 'Medium' in Table 6-31. We would advise that the 'Frequency' of the effect to the wave regime is 'High' rather than 'Medium' because the effect is permanent and occurring with a high frequency. Natural England advises that the assessment is updated accordingly to better determine impacts alone and cumulatively.		No change at Deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3.		As noted at ID 32 of Table 4.18.4 in The Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations [REP1-033] the Applicant agrees with this change, and the Frequency magnitude of waves during operation is High. This does not change the Magnitude of Effect, when the other factors (Scale, Duration, Reversibility) are considered in combination.	"Please see Natural England's advice at Deadline 5 in Appendix A2 to the IPMP [REP4-014]. We welcome the inclusion of sandwave/bank migration and recovery monitoring. We advise the hypothesis to be tested is outlined."		No change at Deadline 7.		The Applicant updated the Offshore IPMP (Revision C) [document reference 9.5] at Deadline 7 to seek to address Natural England's comments.
E28	38	Para. 334 states that changes to marine geology, oceanography and physical processes would be low in magnitude and largely confined to local wake or wave shadow effects attributable to individual WTG foundations. Natural England requests that evidence or analysis should be provided to support these conclusions. Until this evidence is presented we are unable to support the Applicant's conclusions.		The Applicant has provided the Marine Processes Technical Note (PINS Doc Ref No. 13.5), in which it is stated that 'There have been significant changes within the six sandwaves areas shown on Figure 14'. These changes were noticeable within the first year of construction of DOW. Therefore, we remain unable to support the Applicant's conclusions that 'changes to the marine geology, oceanography and physical processes would be 'small in geographical extent'. We would again advise monitoring of the sandbank systems across the study area post-construction in order to establish any long-term alterations in seabed morphology due to development-related changes in the sediment transport or hydrodynamic regimes.		No change at Deadline 3.		The Applicant has submitted the Marine Processes Technical Note (Revision B) (Tracked) [document reference 13.5.1] at Deadline 3 which provides further analysis of sandwave migration data from DOW.	in our D4 cover letter [REP4-049], we advised continued monitoring, in line with the Applicant's commitment in their Rev B IPMP [REP4-015], to establish a longer time series to inform understanding of trends and patterns of morphological change to validate predictions of sandwave recovery. Please also see our advice in Appendix A2 on the IPMP [REP4-014] at D5. PI		No change at Deadline 7. Natural England understands the Applicant intends to submit an updated IPMP at Deadline 7.		The Applicant updated the Offshore IPMP (Revision C) [document reference 9.5] at Deadline 7 to seek to address Natural England's comments.

Point	Point Number(s) from Appendix E [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP AND DEP Appendix E - Marine Processes [RR-063]	RAG Status Rel and WR Rep	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Applicant's Comment D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D7	Applicant's Comment on D7
E29	39	Para. 335 refers to 'the evidence from theoretical studies....', however it is not clear which theoretical studies are being referred to. Natural England requests that the predicted effects on sediment transport processes due to the O&M of SEP and DEP should be provided. For example, changes to the predicted frequency exceedance of the critical shear stress could be assessed. This could inform changes to the percentage of time that the spatially-varying typical seabed sediment across the development is predicted to be mobilised by tidal and wave processes. Natural England advises that the predicted effects on sediment transport processes due to the O&M of the development should be considered over the lifetime of the project and included in an updated assessment. Until this is provided Natural England advises that there is uncertainty in the conclusions drawn.		Please refer to our comment above.		No change at Deadline 3.		As noted at ID 32 of Table 4.18.4 in The Applicant's Comments to Relevant Representations [REP1-033] theoretical work referred to is the tidal currents analysis at DOW reported in Section 6.6.3.3 Theoretical Model Basis of ES Chapter 6 MGOPP [APP-092]. Also, 'the evidence from theoretical studies' should read 'the evidence from numerical modelling (waves) and theoretical studies (tidal currents)'.			No change at Deadline 7. Natural England understands the Applicant intends to submit an updated IPMP at Deadline 7.		The Applicant updated the Offshore IPMP (Revision C) [document reference 9.5] at Deadline 7 to seek to address Natural England's comments.
E30	40	Para. 337. Geophysical survey data from the existing OWFs are useful but conclusions drawn are too vague to provide any useful comparison with SEP/DEP. Natural England requests that further information such as when this survey was undertaken, what the minor and localised effects might be that remain, how the seabed is not greatly changed and since when. Furthermore, does the post-construction survey show any evidence of change to sandbank morphology or migration rate across DOW? This information is required to better determine potential changes to sandbank morphology, and provided the necessary evidence to support the Applicant's conclusions.		The Marine Processes Technical Note (Doc Ref No 13.5) provided by the Applicant shows that significant morphological change has occurred at a number of sandwave fields within the DOW array area since its construction. Therefore, we cannot agree with the conclusion that 'sandwave migrations are indicative of naturally occurring processes across the array site and are not driven by changes caused by DOW.' To support this conclusion would require further subsequent sandwave migration analysis.		No change at Deadline 3.		The Applicant has submitted the Marine Processes Technical Note (Revision B) (Tracked) [document reference 13.5.1] at Deadline 3 which provides further analysis of sandwave migration data from DOW.	Natural England welcomes the inclusion of additional bathymetric data within the Applicant's Technical Note [REP3-03]. However these data still do not cover a long enough time period, post completion of DOW to support the applicant's conclusions. In our D4 cover letter [REP4-049], we advised continued monitoring, in line with the Applicant's commitment in their Rev B IPMP [REP4-015], to establish a longer time series to inform understanding of trends and patterns of morphological change to validate predictions of sandwave recovery. See our advice in Appendix A2 on the IPMP [REP4-014] at D5. We advise the hypothesis to be tested is outlined.		No change at Deadline 7. Natural England understands the Applicant intends to submit an updated IPMP at Deadline 7.		The Applicant updated the Offshore IPMP (Revision C) [document reference 9.5] at Deadline 7 to seek to address Natural England's comments.
E31	41	Point 339. Predicted effects on sediment transport processes due to the O&M of the development have not been evaluated, neither have the sandbanks in the array(s) been sufficiently characterised to enable us to agree with the sensitivity and value assessment (Table 6-34). Natural England advises that further evidence should be provided to support this assessment, before conclusions can be confidentially supported.		Whilst the Applicant has now provided a more detailed characterisation of the sandbanks situated within the DEP N and DEP S Zones of Influence, operational phase impacts on sediment transport processes (and in turn seabed morphology) also need to be adequately considered. Therefore, this item remains under discussion.		No change at Deadline 3.		Any effect on sediment transport would be manifest as changes to the morphology of the sandbanks and sandwaves, and so a morphological approach was adopted. More information on the baseline sandbanks is provided in the Marine Processes Technical Note (Revision B) [document reference 13.5]. The magnitude of effects are considered appropriate based on the additional information provided on sandbanks, and the approach adopted in the	No change at Deadline 5.		No change at Deadline 7.		The Applicant reaffirms its comment made at Deadline 3.

Point	Point Number(s) from Appendix E [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP AND DEP Appendix E - Marine Processes [RR-063]	RAG Status Rel and WR Rep	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Applicant's Comment D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D7	Applicant's Comment on D7
								assessment of effects. The Applicant considers the Natural England request would require detailed sediment transport modelling, which is disproportionate to the potential effects during operation. The approach taken by the Applicant to use a conceptual assessment using changes in the morphology of the sand banks and sand waves as a proxy for sediment transport is considered to be proportionate and robust.					
E32	42, 43	The WCS (Para. 345) is for scour protection to be provided for all foundations, it is not clear whether a scour assessment has been carried out. Whilst Para. 347 states that it is likely that any secondary scour effects would be confined to within a few metres of the direct footprint of the scour protection material. We advise that a scour assessment and secondary scour assessments should be carried out and the impact of scoured material from around foundation structures in terms of elevated SSCs and resulting deposition should be considered to provide a WCS in relation to potential scour effects		No change at Deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3.		<p>As noted at ID 54 and 55 of Table 4.18.4 in The Applicant's Comments to Relevant Representations [REP1-033], no scour assessment has been carried out. An assumption has been made for the worst-case scenario that scour protection will be used wherever scour will occur, reducing sediment release to negligible quantities. A conservative worst-case scenario of all foundations having scour protection is considered for footprint loss.</p> <p>The limited geographical extent of secondary scour means that any impact would be nugatory. Hence, an assessment of secondary scour has not been undertaken within Chapter 6 MGOPP [APP-092]. However, the Offshore IPMP [APP-297] includes provision for monitoring of secondary scour around scour protection.</p> <p>If no scour protection is installed, then sea bed sediments and shallow near-bed sediments within SEP or DEP could be disturbed by scour around the foundations and any installed external cable protection. The worst-case scenario assumes that sediment would enter the water column at the sea bed causing a localised, gradual and medium-term release of suspended sediment at the point of scour and in its immediate vicinity. Mobilised sediment from scour would be transported by tidal currents in suspension in the water column, and would be 'trickle-fed' over a number of years until the scour pit reaches an equilibrium with the physical processes driving the scour. Conceptual evidence-based assessment suggests that, due to the predominance of medium and coarse grained sand across SEP and DEP offshore sites, most of the</p>	No change at Deadline 5.	Please see Natural England's advice regarding secondary scour to the ExAWQ3 [REP5-094] and to the ExAWQ4 in Appendix L4 at D7. Our advice remains unchanged.		<p>As per the Applicant's response at ID 8 of Table 4 of The Applicant's Response to the Examining Authority's Rule 17 Letter dated 12 July 2023 [document reference 22.2]</p> <p>As noted at ID 54 and 55 of Table 4.18.4 in The Applicant's Comments to Relevant Representations [REP1-033], no scour assessment has been carried out. An assumption has been made for the worst-case scenario that scour protection will be used wherever scour will occur, reducing sediment release to negligible quantities. A conservative worst-case scenario of all foundations having scour protection is considered for footprint / habitat loss.</p> <p>The limited geographical extent of secondary scour means that any impact would be nugatory. Hence, an assessment of secondary scour has not been undertaken within Chapter 6 Marine Geology, Oceanography and Physical Processes [APP-092]. Furthermore, as noted in The Applicant's Comments on Responses to the Examining Authority's Third Written Questions [REP6-013], the Applicant is not aware that there is any guidance on or information / data upon which to base an assessment of secondary scour or to estimate its potential scale. The Applicant understands that Natural England have previously signposted to Schultze et al. (2020) and Christiansen et al. (2022) as potential sources; however, the Applicant notes that these studies largely relate to turbulence in the wake of turbines which could cause scour (and increased suspended sediment concentrations), but do not provide any information on the potential for secondary scour. As previously noted by the Applicant, where scour is likely to occur, scour protection would be installed to prevent scour.</p> <p><u>The occurrence of secondary scour would not be anticipated to require</u></p>	

Point	Point Number(s) from Appendix E [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP AND DEP Appendix E - Marine Processes [RR-063]	RAG Status Rel and WR Rep	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Applicant's Comment D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D7	Applicant's Comment on D7
								sediment disturbed by scour at the sea bed would remain close to the bed and settle back to the bed rapidly. Some of the finer sand fraction from this release and the very small proportion of mud that is present are likely to stay in suspension for longer and form a very low concentration plume which would become advected by tidal currents. Due to the gradual development of the scour and the time scale over which this sediment will be gradually released into the water column, the concentrations would be indistinguishable from background levels.					additional scour protection (due to its likely small scale). However, the Applicant has assessed a worst-case scenario of up to 1.1km ² of habitat loss from the installation of wind turbine foundations with scour protection. No scour protection would be required along the offshore cable routes; however, the assessment of potential habitat loss impacts from the installation of external cable protection has been provided. The Applicant reiterates that it has committed through the Offshore IPMP (Revision C) [document reference 9.5] to monitor the extent of secondary scour (where scour protection is installed). Data from this monitoring could then be used to inform any future secondary scour assessment.
E33	44	Para. 378. A crossing is shown between the offshore ECC and the disused Stratos telecom cable in the CSCB MCZ. It is not stated what the depth of this crossing would be, however, if it is sited inshore of the closure depth, then this could have an effect on sediment transport in the nearshore. Natural England advise that if this crossing is located inshore of the closure depth, then the potential effect on sediment transport processes will need to be considered. Therefore, we would welcome commitments to cut and remove the section of disused cable to negate the need to place cable protection.		No change at Deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3.		See response at ID 2 of this table.	No change at Deadline 5.		No change at Deadline 7.		See response at E2
E34	46	Para. 395 states that it is not known whether cable repair and reburial will directly impact on sandbanks and sandwaves in the area during the operation phase. Natural England queries if there is any relevant evidence available from DOW/SOW that could be drawn upon here? Without this information we are unable to advise on the significance of any ongoing disruption to marine processes over the life time of the projects		No change at Deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3.		As described within Section 1.6.3.1 of the Outline CSCB MCZ CSIMP [APP-291], to date, no cable repair or remedial reburial works have been undertaken since SOW and DOW have been in operation.	No change at Deadline 5.		No change at Deadline 7.		The Applicant reaffirms its comment made at Deadline 3.
E35	47	Para. 416. The cumulative effect on sediment transport processes at sandbank systems is not discussed here but should be considered. Until this is provided we are unable to support the conclusions which have been drawn.		No change at Deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3.		The evidence base for assessments of changes to tidal currents across wind farm arrays has consistently demonstrated that changes in the tidal regime due to the presence of foundation structures would be both small in magnitude and localised in spatial extent. The greatest effect would be adjacent to each foundation with a return to baseline conditions in the farfield.	No change at Deadline 5.		No change at Deadline 7.		The Applicant reaffirms its comment made at Deadline 3.

Point	Point Number(s) from Appendix E [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP AND DEP Appendix E - Marine Processes [RR-063]	RAG Status Rel and WR Rep	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Applicant's Comment D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D7	Applicant's Comment on D7
								<p>Sandbanks are landscape-scale bedforms driven by large-scale regional tidal currents. Hence, the larger-scale (landscape) effect on nearby sandbank systems caused by small-scale changes to currents (and hence bedload sediment transport) restricted to areas adjacent to relatively small structures within this landscape would be immeasurable.</p> <p>Although the Zones of Potential Influence on the Tidal Regime (for both SEP/DEP and SOW/DOW together) based on tidal ellipse data extend over nearby sandbanks, the actual magnitude of change within these zones would be zero to very small. All the change (i.e. spatial variability) would be restricted to local areas around the foundations themselves and would not extend regionally into the Zone of Potential Influence.</p> <p>Hence, the assessment is already precautionary, and a more detailed regional view would be disproportionate to the potential effect that would occur, regardless of how complex the regional seabed is.</p>					

1.6 Applicant's comments on Tab F All Other Marine Matters of Natural England's Deadline 5 Risk and Issues Log

Point	Point Number(s) from Appendix F [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP AND DEP Appendix F - All Other Marine Matters [RR-063]	RAG Status Rel and WR Rep	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Applicant's Comment D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D7	Applicant's comment on D7
Document Used: [APP-093] 6.1.7 Chapter 7 Marine Water and Sediment Quality													
F1	4 & 6	In light of sediment disposal potentially across the construction area including Cromer Shoal MCZ, we consider pre-construction sediment contaminant monitoring will be required for the purposes of suitability for sediment disposal. We advise this must be agreed with the MMO/CEFAS and secured within the DCO/DML.		Please refer to the Deadline 2 cover letter, we continue to defer to the advice of Cefas and the MMO regarding the sufficiency of the sediment sampling.		No change at Deadline 3.		As described at ID 7 of Table 16 of the Draft SoCG: MMO (Revision B) [document reference 12.11], regarding the Disposal Site Characterisation Report (Revision B) [REP1-019], further contaminants sampling and analysis is being undertaken post-consent. Therefore, the licence for the disposal of sediment at sea will be applied for post-consent. Condition wording, as agreed with the MMO, to secure the requirement for post-consent contaminants sampling has been included with the draft DCO (Revision F) [document reference 3.1] at Deadline 3. The Applicant therefore proposes to withhold any further updates to the Disposal Site Characterisation Report until the post-consent stage when more accurate details on the design (e.g. foundation types) and therefore quantities of material that are required to be disposed of, are known. This will enable a more accurate assessment to be undertaken. This approach has been agreed with the MMO.	No change at Deadline 5. Please see Natural England's updated advice to the IPMP [REP4-015] in appendix A2 at Deadline 5.		No change at Deadline 7.		The Applicant notes this matter is not relevant to the Offshore IPMP. The Applicant has committed to undertake additional contaminants surveys post-consent and has agreed this with the MMO. As noted in the Final SoCG with the MMO (Revision D) [document reference 12.11]: <i>The MMO welcomes the Applicant's commitment to additional sampling post consent and has provided suggested wording in our Deadline 3 response which the Applicant has included in the draft DCO (Revision F) [document reference 3.1] at Deadline 3. Therefore this matter is agreed.</i>
Document Used: [APP-094] 6.1.8 Chapter 8 Benthic Ecology													
F2	8	Whilst Natural England welcomes the Applicant's commitment to decommission cable protection within the MCZ we advise that an Outline Decommissioning Plan should be provided at the consenting phase to secure and assess decommissioning activities in one location. However, regarding the decision to leave in-situ scour protection, surface laid cables and external cable and crossing protection outside the Cromer MCZ, we continue to advise that regardless of legislation, decommissioning should aim to remove infrastructure to avoid irreversible (permanent) habitat loss, thus returning the seabed habitat to its pre-developed baseline status as required by OSPAR.		No change at deadline 2		No change at Deadline 3.		Noted. Requirement 8 of the draft DCO (Revision F) [document reference 3.1] requires a written decommissioning programme to be submitted to the Secretary of State for approval before offshore works may commence. The Applicant does not consider that an outline version of this is required to be submitted pre-consent. During the post-consent stage when more accurate details of the project design are known, a decommissioning programme can be prepared based on those details, including the understanding of any requirement for external cable protection to be installed within the CSCB MCZ.	No change at Deadline 5.		No change at Deadline 7. Please also see our response to ExAQ4.3.4.3 in Appendix A4. Natural England cannot find any condition or requirement within the DCO, DMLs or the proposed MEEB Schedule which requires the cable protection to be removed within the MCZ at the point of decommissioning. Therefore, we would have to conclude that it has not been secured.		Removal of external cable protection within the MCZ is secured through the Outline CSCB MCZ CSIMP (Revision B) [document reference 9.7].

Point	Point Number(s) from Appendix F [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP AND DEP Appendix F - All Other Marine Matters [RR-063]	RAG Status Rel and WR Rep	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Applicant's Comment D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D7	Applicant's comment on D7
F3	10	Natural England welcomes the commitment to microsite around sensitive benthic features and habitats if identified by preconstruction surveys, such as those protected under Annex 1 and UK priority habitats identified under Section 41 of the NERC Act 2006. However, Natural England advises this commitment needs to be secured through a condition within the DCO/DML or within an outline named plan. Natural England agrees any Annex I habitat such as Sabellaria spinulosa reef habitat identified would be outside of a site designated for benthic features. However, with regard to footnote 6, we advise if Annex I habitat is identified the Applicant recognises their value to be equivalent to if they were within an MPA. This forms part of the UK government strategy of achieving the UK Marine Strategy of achieving Good Environmental Status (GES) of the UK wider seas regardless of whether sensitive species and habitats are located within an MPA network. We advise the Applicant to be fully committed to the protected status of protected sensitive habitats and species, regardless of whether they are located within a MPA.		No change at deadline 2		No change at Deadline 3.		<p>As noted at ID 4 of Table 4.18.5 in The Applicant's Comments to Relevant Representations [REP1-033],</p> <p>As secured through the DMLs, pre-construction surveys will be undertaken to identify any potentially sensitive features that are required to be avoided. The pre-construction survey methodology would be agreed with the MMO in consultation with Natural England. The survey design would be based on best practice at the time and is anticipated to consist of a mixture of geophysical, drop-down video (DDV) and grab surveys (as applicable) to ensure a comprehensive ground-truthing of the proposed final cable route design. Initial geophysical surveys will be reviewed with DDV groundtruthing surveys to confirm presence as appropriate. This shall then be used to inform detailed layout design and will inform the mitigation scheme requirements. If potentially sensitive benthic features are identified, the results of the survey will be discussed at that time with the MMO and Natural England to agree whether the features are required to be avoided through micro-siting.</p> <p>Condition 13(i) of Schedules 10 and 11 and Condition 12(j) of Schedules 12 and 13 of the draft DCO (Revision B) [AS-009] includes provision for a mitigation scheme for any benthic habitats of conservation, ecological and/or economic importance constituting Annex I reef habitats identified by pre-construction surveys and will be in accordance with the Offshore In Principle Monitoring Plan [APP-289]. This is the appropriate approach to mitigating impacts on benthic habitats of conservation, ecological and/or economic importance.</p>	No change at Deadline 5. Please see Appendix L3 for Natural England's response to EXA third Written Question Q3.3.1.5 at Deadline 5 on this matter.		No change at Deadline 7. Please also see our response to ExAQ4.3.1.3 in Appendix A4.		<p>See the Applicant's response to REP5-094 (NE's Appendix L3) in The Applicant's Comments on Responses to the Examining Authority's Third Written Questions [REP6-013].</p> <p>The Applicant has responded to Appendix L4 (Appendix A4 is presumed to be a typographic error from Natural England) in The Applicant's Comments on Natural England Deadline 7 Submissions [document reference 22.16].</p> <p>The Applicant has updated Condition 12(1)(j) of Schedules 12 and 13 (i.e. the transmission DMLs to which the MCZ is only relevant) of the draft DCO (Revision K) [document reference 3.1] to include provision within the mitigation scheme for mitigation of MCZ features.</p>
F4	11	Natural England welcomes the Applicant's consideration of the guidance documents as outlined. However, when developing outlined named plans, we advise that the Applicant also uses guidance developed by Natural England for "Environmental Considerations for Offshore Wind and Cable Projects". This includes "Offshore Wind Marine Environmental Assessments: Best Practice Advice for Evidence and Data Standards"		No change at deadline 2				Noted.					

Point	Point Number(s) from Appendix F [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP AND DEP Appendix F - All Other Marine Matters [RR-063]	RAG Status Rel and WR Rep	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Applicant's Comment D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D7	Applicant's comment on D7
		for baseline characterisation, pre-application, data and evidence expectations at examination and for post-consent monitoring. In addition, advice is also provided on "Nature considerations and environmental best practice for subsea cables in English inshore and UK offshore waters".											
F5	13	<p>Natural England welcomes the characterisation of the out-cropping chalk feature observed from seabed video imagery at Station EC-26 adjacent to landfall using guidance within NERR080 Natural England Marine Chalk characterisation Project.</p> <p>However, Natural England continues to advise that across much of Cromer Shoal MCZ there are areas of subtidal chalk lying underneath a thin veneer of sand/sediment which we also consider should be protected as outcropping chalk/subtidal Chalk Feature of Conservation Importance (FOCI). This is in accordance with our advice on fishing activities and would ensure consistency with MCZ assessments undertaken for other industries.</p>		No change at deadline 2		No change at Deadline 3.		<p>See ID 12 to 13 of Table 4.18.6 in The Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations [REP1-033] and the response provided at point F3 above.</p> <p>Also refer to the Applicant's response to Q2.3.2.3 [document reference 16.2] which addresses the avoidance of sub-cropping chalk.</p>	No change at Deadline 5. Please see REP3-147 for Natural England's response to the ExA written Questions Two Q2.3.2.2 at Deadline 2 and Appendix L3 at Deadline 5 for Natural England's response to EXA Third Written Question Q3.3.2.2 at Deadline 5 on this matter. Our advice remains unchanged.		Our advice remains unchanged at Deadline 7. Please also see our advice to ExA WQ4.3.2.2 in Appendix L4.		<p>See the Applicant's response to REP5-094 (NE's Appendix L3) in The Applicant's Comments on Responses to the Examining Authority's Third Written Questions [REP6-013].</p> <p>The Applicant has responded to Appendix L4 (in The Applicant's Comments on Natural England Deadline 7 Submissions [document reference 22.16]).</p> <p>Also refer to comments below under MCZ.</p>
F6	14	<p>We acknowledge the assessments for stony reef at Stations EC_03 and EC_24 were classed as 'low 'resemblance to stony reef according to Irving (2009 and Golding (2020) and therefore at these locations where seabed imagery was acquired there was insufficient evidence to classify as Annex I Reef Habitat. However we advise that the habitat classification for Station EC_03 of sublittoral coarse sediment (SS.SCS) and Station EC_24 of circalittoral mixed sediment (SS.SMx.CMx) are among the biotopes listed in Golding (2020) as biotopes where reef may be found. As such we continue to advise that the potential for stony reef Annex I habitat is not entirely ruled out from pre-construction survey assessment. We advise the Applicants commitment to avoid and microsite for Annex 1 habitats continues to include Annex I stony reef as a precautionary measure and as such is secured in DCO/dML named outline plans.</p>		No change at deadline 2		No change at Deadline 3.		<p>See ID 12 to 13 of Table 4.18.6 in The Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations [REP1-033] and the response provided at point F3 above.</p> <p>Also refer to the Applicant's response to Q2.3.2.3 [document reference 16.2] which addresses the avoidance of sub-cropping chalk.</p>	No change at Deadline 5. Please see Appendix L3 for Natural England's response to EXA third Written Question Q3.3.1.5 at Deadline 5 on this matter.		Our advice remains unchanged at Deadline 7. Please also see our advice to ExA WQ4.3.1.3 in Appendix L4.		<p>See the Applicant's response to REP5-094 (NE's Appendix L3) in The Applicant's Comments on Responses to the Examining Authority's Third Written Questions [REP6-013].</p> <p>The Applicant has responded to Appendix L4 (in The Applicant's Comments on Natural England Deadline 7 Submissions [document reference 22.16]).</p>

Point	Point Number(s) from Appendix F [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP AND DEP Appendix F - All Other Marine Matters [RR-063]	RAG Status Rel and WR Rep	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Applicant's Comment D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D7	Applicant's comment on D7
F7	15, 18	It is stated "A section of transect SS_21A in the SEP wind farm site represented the biotope A4.231 'Piddocks with a sparse associated fauna in sublittoral very soft chalk or clay". This biotope is classed as illustrative of the UK BAP priority habitat 'peat and clay exposures with piddocks'. We request that the Applicant provides clarification on the classification of this habitat and as a precautionary measure commitments to avoiding impacts to this feature if identified.		No change at deadline 2		No change at Deadline 3.		<p>As noted at ID 25 of Table 4.18.5 in The Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations [REP1-033], the biotope 'Piddocks with a sparse associated fauna in sublittoral very soft chalk or clay' (A4.231) was assigned to transect SS_21A. For context this biotope was only confirmed at one location in the western corner of the SEP wind farm site. To clarify the point raised by Natural England, the biotope is classed as an illustrative biotope of the UK Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) priority habitat 'peat and clay exposures with piddocks' (UK BAP, 2008).</p> <p>As described in ES Appendix 8.4 – SEP Benthic Habitat Report [APP-187]: "No specific assessment criteria have been defined for this habitat. However, when reviewing the geophysical and video data, identification of peat and/or clay seabed sediments would be further investigated for presence of piddocks and potentially the sponges <i>Dysidea fragilis</i> and <i>Suberites carnosus</i>, foliose red algae and the crabs <i>Necora puber</i> and <i>Cancer pagurus</i>, which are often associated with this habitat."</p> <p>The Applicant considers that the assessment provided appropriately differentiates between 'biotopes' (including A4.231) and 'Annex I and UK BAP priority habitats with the potential to be present in the benthic ecology study area'. With respect to the latter, pre-construction surveys will be undertaken to identify any potential Annex I / UK BAP priority habitats which, if required, will be avoided during detailed design. The commitment to undertake such a survey at the pre-construction stage is the normal and appropriate means of addressing such matters and the commitment remains the same regardless of the assessment outcome. Also refer to the response provided at point F3 above.</p>	As ID F6 above.		Our advice remains unchanged at Deadline 7. Please also see our advice to ExA WQ4.3.1.3 in Appendix L4.		<p>The Applicant reaffirms its comment made at Deadline 3.</p> <p>The Applicant has responded to Appendix L4 (in The Applicant's Comments on Natural England Deadline 7 Submissions [document reference 22.16]).</p>
F8	16	Please be advised that, <i>Sabellaria spinulosa</i> reef of all quality is protected under Section 40 and 41 of the Natural Environmental and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006. Therefore, outline DCO/dML named plans must be updated to demonstrate that due regard will be given to the conservation of		No change at deadline 2		No change at Deadline 3.		Noted. Refer to the response provided at point F3 above.	As ID F6 above, Natural England would wish to see an outline mitigation plan for benthic included as part of the consenting phase.		Our advice remains unchanged at Deadline 7. Please also see our advice to ExA WQ4.3.1.3 in Appendix L4.		See response at F3.

Point	Point Number(s) from Appendix F [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP AND DEP Appendix F - All Other Marine Matters [RR-063]	RAG Status Rel and WR Rep	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Applicant's Comment D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D7	Applicant's comment on D7
		this habitat where it forms definable reef.											
F9	19, 21, 23	In the context of the conservation objectives for the features /habitats within the Cromer MCZ, Natural England advises that the sensitivity of these habitats within the site should be considered high in recognition of their representative protection 'value' through the MCZ and not medium as classified by MarESA. We advise that the impact significance of 'moderate adverse' is applied to both the assessment of the habitats and biotopes within the MCZ and the WCS for Annex I / UK BAP priority habitat S. spinulosa reefs and the UK BAP priority habitat 'peat and clay exposures with piddocks'. The assessments should be updated to inform the HRA/MCZ Assessments.		No change at deadline 2		No change at Deadline 3.		As noted at ID 29 of Table 4.18.5 in The Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations [REP1-033], the Applicant notes Natural England's position. As described in Section 8.4.3.1.2 of Chapter 8 Benthic Ecology [APP-094], it is important to understand that value and sensitivity are not the same and are judged on a receptor by receptor basis. A receptor could be of high value (e.g. Annex I habitat) but have a low or negligible physical/ecological sensitivity to an effect. Similarly, low value does not equate to low sensitivity. The value is considered, where relevant, as a modifier for the sensitivity assigned to the receptor, based on expert judgement. The Applicant maintains that since the outcropping chalk feature of the MCZ will be avoided by HDD, the worst case sensitivity of identified habitats and biotopes potentially subject to temporary disturbance or long term habitat loss impacts within the MCZ is considered to be medium. Therefore, it follows that the impact significance conclusions are also unchanged.	No change at Deadline 5.		Our advice remains unchanged at Deadline 7.		The Applicant reaffirms its comment made at Deadline 3.
F10	20	We advise that a commitment is required to mitigate potential operational impacts during any operational and maintenance (O&M) activities to ensure that every effort is made to avoid impacts to Annex I / UK BAP habitats if naturally present on the surrounding seabed.		No change at deadline 2		No change at Deadline 3.		See the Outline Offshore Operations and Maintenance Plan (Revision C) [document reference 9.9] which describes the process for managing potential impacts during the operational phase.	No change at Deadline 5. Please see Natural England's response in Appendix L3 to the ExA Third Written Question Q3.12.2.3 to the OOMP [REP3-060]		Our advice remains unchanged at Deadline 7.		See the Applicant's response to REP5-094 (NE's Appendix L3) in The Applicant's Comments on Responses to the Examining Authority's Third Written Questions [REP6-013].
F11	22	Impact 3: Long Term Habitat Loss. Natural England welcomes the commitment, as also outlined in the Outline CSCB MCZ CSIMP, to the use of removable rock bags as cable protection, thus minimising permanent habitat loss within the MCZ. However, every effort should be made to minimise the need for cable protection within the MCZ. Natural England advises that commitment to undertaking a stepwise approach through the mitigation hierarchy.		No change at deadline 2		No change at Deadline 3.		Noted. As described in the Outline CSCB MCZ CSIMP [APP-291] the Applicant will make reasonable endeavours to bury offshore export cables and thus minimise the requirement for external cable protection within the MCZ.	No change at Deadline 5 Please refer to Comer MCZ ID G11 to G19.		Our advice remains unchanged at Deadline 7.		The Applicant reaffirms its comment made at Deadline 3. See response to G11 to G19 in Section 1.7 below.
Document Used: [APP-188] Appendix 6.3.8.5 – Benthic Habitat Mapping													

Point	Point Number(s) from Appendix F [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP AND DEP Appendix F - All Other Marine Matters [RR-063]	RAG Status Rel and WR Rep	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Applicant's Comment D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D7	Applicant's comment on D7
F12	24	Figs. 22 and 23 provides best available evidence of sediment most likely to support herring spawning and sand eel habitats. We advise that this highlights the importance of DEP N to sand eels and thereby Annex I Sandwich terns. We advise further consideration is given to removal of turbines from DEP N		No change at deadline 2		No change at Deadline 3.		<p>See ID 34 of Table 4.18.5 in The Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations [REP1-033], as noted by the Applicant in Chapter 9 Fish and Shellfish Ecology [APP095] and as agreed with the MMO and Cefas [RR-053], efforts to quantify impacts to spawning grounds are likely to provide inaccurate and/or misleading figures for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spawning areas can change over time or become recolonised. • Whilst spawning and nursery ground maps are used to provide the most recent and appropriate information to identify spawning areas, they do not fully define/consider/identify: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All potential areas of spawning. • Any habituation that may occur i.e., identify areas where higher densities of spawning are present. • Specific substrate requirements e.g., substrates which are more suitable within wider broadscale sediments. • More suitable topography e.g., ridges/edges of sandbanks where sandeel may spawn or furrows where herring may spawn. • Environmental factors that may influence spawning intensity such as temperature, oxygenation, natural disturbance, anthropogenic disturbance etc. <p>Regarding the point in relation to mitigation hierarchy, see the Applicant's response to this point in its responses to Appendix B of Natural England's Relevant Representation [REP1-033].</p>	No change at Deadline 5.		No change at Deadline 7.		The Applicant reaffirms its comment at Deadline 3 and further notes that the Offshore IPMP (Revision C) [document reference 9.5] has been updated to include proposals for sandeel monitoring to inform Sandwich tern prey availability.
Document Used: [APP-190] Appendix 6.3.9.1 – Fish and Shellfish Ecology Baseline Technical Report													

Point	Point Number(s) from Appendix F [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP AND DEP Appendix F - All Other Marine Matters [RR-063]	RAG Status Rel and WR Rep	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Applicant's Comment D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D7	Applicant's comment on D7
F13	25, 26	Natural England note that data from otter trawl surveys in 2005 and 2008 showed that herring was the most abundant species caught. Additionally, pre and post-construction herring spawning surveys were conducted in 2009 and 2010. Both data sets support herring being a key prey resource for Annex I Sandwich terns in the second part of the breeding season. However, in both instances, Natural England acknowledges the age of the data. And, while we defer to CEFAS for recommendations of further data sources to complement this data and potential requirement for pre-construction surveys, we highlight the wider ecosystem benefits in terms of management measures for Annex I birds from further data collection. Natural England will continue to discuss this with the Applicant and other interested parties.		No change at deadline 2		No change at Deadline 3.		Noted. The Applicant has attended an initial meeting with Natural England, the MMO and Cefas to discuss potential evidence gathering with respect to Sandwich tern prey species and will maintain the dialogue.	No change at Deadline 5.		No change at Deadline 7.		As above, the Offshore IPMP (Revision C) [document reference 9.5] has been updated to include proposals for sandeel monitoring to inform Sandwich tern prey availability.
Document Used: [APP-192] Appendix 6.3.10.2 – Underwater Noise Modelling Report													
F14	27	Natural England advise further underwater noise assessment is undertaken which includes concurrent piling from SEP and DEP. However, Natural England defers to CEFAS to assess the outcomes from this additional assessment for fish species.		No change at deadline 2		No change at Deadline 3.		As noted at ID 29 of Table 4.18.5 in The Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations [REP1-033], simultaneous piling is defined in ES Chapters 9 and 10 as 'A scenario where two piles are installed at the same time at different locations.'. This is the same as concurrent piling however the Applicant has used 'concurrent' when referring to general offshore construction activities that are being undertaken in tandem in order to differentiate between piling and 'other' construction activities that could emit underwater noise if activities are occurring at the same time. Simultaneous piling is possible should SEP and DEP be constructed concurrently. In this scenario, one piling operation could occur in the SEP wind farm site at the same time (i.e. simultaneously) as a piling operation in the DEP wind farm site (one piling operation per Project). A scenario whereby simultaneous piling could occur solely within the SEP wind farm site or solely within the DEP wind farm site could also potentially occur however simultaneous piling is unlikely to occur (see Marine Mammals Technical Note and	No change at Deadline 5.		No change at Deadline 7. We continue to defer to CEFAS for their expertise on this matter.		The Applicant updated Appendix 10.2 Underwater Noise Modelling Report (Revision C) [document reference 6.3.10.2] at Deadline 7 and again at Deadline 8 to resolve the few minor remaining comments from the MMO / Cefas and this is reflected as Agreed in the Final SoCG with the MMO (Revision D) [document reference 12.11]. Therefore, this matter is resolved.

Point	Point Number(s) from Appendix F [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP AND DEP Appendix F - All Other Marine Matters [RR-063]	RAG Status Rel and WR Rep	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Applicant's Comment D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D7	Applicant's comment on D7										
								<p>Addendum [document reference 16.14]).</p> <p>To clarify, the worst-case scenario for underwater noise assessments for marine mammal receptors is based on simultaneous piling and for fish receptors is based on sequential piling (within the same 24 hour period).</p> <p>Updated assessments based on simultaneous and sequential piling are provided in the Marine Mammals Technical Note and Addendum [document reference 16.14].</p>															
Document Used: [APP-296] 9.9 Offshore Operation and Maintenance Plan (OOMP)																							
F15	28, 29, 30, 31, 21	<p>Natural England advises that because O&M activities are only mentioned and not clearly defined we do not believe that they have been assessed and therefore further information is required to undertake any HRA/MCZ assessment.</p> <p>Natural England advises more information is required on what is considered to be 'corrective work' and if that is permitted on the DML. The following information is required to assess the impacts from O&M activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of vessel transits per activity per day/month • Timing of planned maintenance work • Agree what are emergency works • Separate out inside MCZ with outside MCZ and other designated sites • Monitoring to be undertaken to inform 5 yearly review • How often will a sub-bottom profiler be used and how will the noise be taken account of • Volume of additional scour prevention around the turbines over the project lifetime • If scour/cable protection in new location – where, how much etc. • Confirm bird scarers are not noisy scarers which can disturb Annex I birds • More detail on the use of drones for offshore inspections 		Within our cover letter at Deadline 2 we have provided clarification regarding the deployment of cable protection, both within and outside of designated sites, after construction has completed. This includes the need for additional marine consents to cover said works.		No change at Deadline 3.		<p>As per the Applicant's response at ID 41 of Table 4.18.5 in The Applicant's Comments to Relevant Representations [REP1-033]:</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Number of vessel transits per activity per day/month</td> <td>These are assessed within the relevant ES chapters (Chapters 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 13).</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Timing of planned maintenance work</td> <td>The MMO would be notified of any of the works being undertaken.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Agree what are emergency works</td> <td>These aren't listed in the Outline OOMP (Revision C) [document reference 9.9].</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Separate out inside MCZ with outside MCZ and other designated sites</td> <td>See the Outline OOMP (Revision C) [document reference 9.9] however has been updated.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Monitoring to be undertaken to inform 5 yearly review</td> <td>Monitoring would be undertaken in accordance with the Monitoring Plan which would inform the O&M Plan review updates. Conditions 13(1)(f) and 14(1)(f) in the</td> </tr> </table>	Number of vessel transits per activity per day/month	These are assessed within the relevant ES chapters (Chapters 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 13).	Timing of planned maintenance work	The MMO would be notified of any of the works being undertaken.	Agree what are emergency works	These aren't listed in the Outline OOMP (Revision C) [document reference 9.9].	Separate out inside MCZ with outside MCZ and other designated sites	See the Outline OOMP (Revision C) [document reference 9.9] however has been updated.	Monitoring to be undertaken to inform 5 yearly review	Monitoring would be undertaken in accordance with the Monitoring Plan which would inform the O&M Plan review updates. Conditions 13(1)(f) and 14(1)(f) in the	Please see Natural England's response in Appendix L3 to the ExA Third Written Question Q3.12.2.3 to the OOMP [REP3-060].		Our advice remains unchanged at Deadline 7.		See the Applicant's response to REP5-094 (NE's Appendix L3) in The Applicant's Comments on Responses to the Examining Authority's Third Written Questions [REP6-013]. The Applicant maintains its position the Outline OOMP (Revision C) [REP3-058] as currently drafted, is appropriate.
Number of vessel transits per activity per day/month	These are assessed within the relevant ES chapters (Chapters 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 13).																						
Timing of planned maintenance work	The MMO would be notified of any of the works being undertaken.																						
Agree what are emergency works	These aren't listed in the Outline OOMP (Revision C) [document reference 9.9].																						
Separate out inside MCZ with outside MCZ and other designated sites	See the Outline OOMP (Revision C) [document reference 9.9] however has been updated.																						
Monitoring to be undertaken to inform 5 yearly review	Monitoring would be undertaken in accordance with the Monitoring Plan which would inform the O&M Plan review updates. Conditions 13(1)(f) and 14(1)(f) in the																						

Point	Point Number(s) from Appendix F [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP AND DEP Appendix F - All Other Marine Matters [RR-063]	RAG Status Rel and WR Rep	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Applicant's Comment D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D7	Applicant's comment on D7
								<p>relevant DMLs specify that the OOMP must be resubmitted and reviewed every 3 years therefore ensuring continual review of the position in relation to cable protection and scour protection alongside all other operation and maintenance activities and will enable the MMO to continually review at the appropriate time during operation whether or not a new consent/license is required for any further deployment of cable protection or scour protection.</p> <p>How often will a sub-bottom profiler be used and how will the noise be taken account of</p> <p>Volume of additional scour prevention around the turbines over the project lifetime</p> <p>If scour/cable protection in new location – where, how much etc.</p>					
								<p>As and when required with more specific details to be reflected in the Final OOMP noting that this will be managed as a live document.</p> <p>As noted in the Outline OOMP (Revision C) [document reference 9.9], unless the total area of scour protection installed for the chosen foundation type exceeds that assessed in the ES, or a period of five years has elapsed since the completion of construction</p>					

Point	Point Number(s) from Appendix F [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP AND DEP Appendix F - All Other Marine Matters [RR-063]	RAG Status Rel and WR Rep	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Applicant's Comment D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D7	Applicant's comment on D7
								<p>then no additional marine license would be required. However, approval from the MMO will be required prior to the installation of additional scour protection in different locations. If these conditions were not met then a new marine license would be required.</p> <p>Confirm bird scarers are not noisy scarers which can disturb Annex I birds</p> <p>More detail on the use of drones for offshore inspections</p>					
								<p>As noted, these are 'passive' and therefore are not noise emitting however this is clarified in the Outline OOMP (Revision C) [document reference 9.9].</p> <p>As and when required with more specific details to be reflected in the Final OOMP noting that this will be managed as a live document.</p>					

1.7 Applicant's comments on Tab G Cromer MCZ of Natural England's Deadline 5 Risk and Issues Log

Point	Point Number(s) Appendix G [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP AND DEP Appendix G - Cromer MCZ [RR-063]	RAG Status Rel and WR Rep D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Applicant's Comment D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D7	Applicant's comment on D7	
Broadscale theme 1: Small Scale Losses														
G1	1	Natural England doesn't agree with the Applicant's Stage One MCZ assessment in relation to the defining the magnitude of impacts because the assessment has been approached from an EIA perspective rather than one considering whether or not the conservation objectives for the site will be hindered. Please see Annex 1 of [RR-063] Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP AND DEP Appendix G - Cromer MCZ for further details on Natural England's standard position.		No change at deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3.		As noted at ID 1 of Table 4.18.6 in The Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations [REP1-033] : The Applicant has followed the available guidance for MCZA as detailed in Section 2.2 of the Applicant's MCZA (APP-077) . This includes the MMO 2013 MCZ and marine licensing guidance, as well as Natural England's own guidance (2020) on how to use the Conservation Advice Packages for Environmental Assessments. The assessment methodology defines criteria for magnitude of effect which includes consideration of amongst other things, duration of the loss, scale of the loss and impact on structure, functioning or supporting processes of the habitat. In order to determine the sensitivity of the protected features of CSCB MCZ, Natural England's Advice on Operations (AoO) which indicates the current condition of protected features and the sensitivity of each receptor to relevant pressures was used. Following determination of effect magnitude and receptor sensitivity, the Stage 1 assessment then goes on to consider the risk that SEP and/or DEP could hinder the conservation objective of maintaining the protected features of the CSCB MCZ in a favourable condition or restoring them to favourable condition. The assessment uses Natural England's Supplementary Advice on Conservation Objectives (SACO). SACOs present attributes which are ecological characteristics or requirements of the designated species and habitats within a site. The listed attributes are considered to be those which best describe the site's ecological integrity and which, if safeguarded, will enable achievement of the Conservation Objectives.		No change at Deadline 5.		No change at Deadline 7.		The Applicant reaffirms its comment made at Deadline 3.

Point	Point Number(s) Appendix G [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP AND DEP Appendix G - Cromer MCZ [RR-063]	RAG Status Rel and WR Rep D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Applicant's Comment D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D7	Applicant's comment on D7
								Therefore, the Applicant considers that the correct approach to Stage 1 assessment has been followed.					
G2	2	Whilst Natural England acknowledges that the MCZ consists of broadscale habitat types rather than features akin to Annex I habitats there are areas that are FOCI or have broadscale habitat sub features that provide a defined function with differing sensitivity in which impacts should be avoided. Unless the Applicant can suitably avoid, reduce or mitigate impacts to these features we believe that a Stage 2 assessment is required.		No change at deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3.		<p>The Applicant's position is that it has suitably avoided, reduced or mitigated impacts as set out in the MCZA [APP-077] and associated documents including the Outline CSIMP [APP-291].</p> <p>As noted at ID 2 of Table 4.18.6 in The Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations [REP1-033]:</p> <p>The surveys undertaken to inform the assessments that have been undertaken at this stage of the Projects are characterisation surveys with the aim of describing the receiving environment that may be impacted by the proposed works and providing information on which to base the assessments. The methodology for the benthic characterisation survey and subsequent data analysis was agreed with Natural England and the MMO through the EPP (see ES Chapter 8 Benthic Ecology, [APP-094]). Characterisation surveys are distinct to pre-construction surveys. The latter aim to confirm the presence and location of sensitive features and to establish the environmental baseline for monitoring purposes, closer to the point of construction.</p> <p>As secured through the DMLs, pre-construction surveys within the MCZ will be undertaken to identify any potentially sensitive features that are required to be avoided. The pre-construction survey methodology would be agreed with the MMO in consultation with Natural England. The survey design would be based on best practice at the time and is anticipated to consist of a mixture of geophysical, DDV and grab surveys (as applicable) to ensure a comprehensive ground-truthing of the proposed final cable route design. Initial geophysical surveys will be reviewed with DDV groundtruthing surveys to confirm presence as appropriate. This shall then be used to inform detailed layout design and will inform the mitigation scheme requirements. If potentially sensitive benthic</p>	No change at Deadline 5.		No change at Deadline 7.		The Applicant has amended Condition 12(1)(j) of Schedules 12 and 13 of the draft DCO (Revision K) [document reference 3.1] to include the designated features of the MCZ (refer also to the Applicant's response to point 3 (a) of the 12 July 2023 Rule 17 letter [document reference 22.2]).

Point	Point Number(s) Appendix G [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP AND DEP Appendix G - Cromer MCZ [RR-063]	RAG Status Rel and WR Rep D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Applicant's Comment D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D7	Applicant's comment on D7
								features are identified, the results of the survey will be discussed at that time with the MMO and Natural England to agree whether the features are required to be avoided through micro-siting. This is the routine and accepted approach for dealing with such matters. Condition 13(i) of Schedules 10 and 11 and Condition 12(j) of Schedules 12 and 13 of the draft DCO (Revision F) [document reference 3.1] includes provision for a mitigation scheme for any benthic habitats of conservation, ecological and/or economic importance constituting Annex I reef habitats identified by pre-construction surveys and will be in accordance with the Offshore IPMP [APP-289]. This is the appropriate approach to mitigating impacts on benthic habitats of conservation, ecological and/or economic importance.					
G3	3	Para. 193 [APP-077]. Natural England advises that calculating impacts as a percentage of the whole MCZ is misleading given the size of the site. The impacts from SEP and DEP combined are still sizeable at 0.19ha from cable protection. Natural England queries if further refinement of the assessment relating to feature extent could be undertaken?		No change at deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3.		As noted at ID 3 of Table 4.18.6 in The Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations [REP1-033], impacts are provided as a percentage against each relevant MCZ feature (broad-scale habitats) within Table 8-2 and Table 8-3 of the MCZA [APP-077]. The provision of percentage areas impacted across the whole MCZ provides wider context. Further refinement of the assessment relating to feature extent is not needed.	No change at Deadline 5.		No change at Deadline 7.		The Applicant reaffirms its comment made at Deadline 3.
Broad-scale theme 2: Lasting Habitat Change/loss													
G4	4	Natural England welcomes consideration of removal of cable protection at the time of decommissioning. If removal could be achieved, impacts would still last for the lifetime of the infrastructure (40 years) and potentially longer as a residual impact. Therefore, because this impact is lasting/long term and site recovery wouldn't be assured, Natural England's view is that reasonable scientific doubt would likely remain regarding the impact of the proposals on the conservation objectives for the site. Accordingly, we advise that a more precautionary approach is required when considering the generational impacts to the designated site features both		No change at deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3.		See ID 4 of Table 4.18.6 in The Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations [REP1-033]. No further comments.	No change at Deadline 5. We draw the ExA attention to the updated supplementary advice included within the conservation advice package for this site		Our position remains unchanged at Deadline 7. Please see our response to ExAWQ4.3.4.4 in Appendix L4 where a link is provided to the recently published Cromer Shoal Conservation Advice Package. We also note that decommissioning cable protection is not secured. Please see our response to ExAQ4.3.4.3 in Appendix L4.		The Applicant has updated the Stage 1 MCZA [document reference 5.6] at Deadline 7 to include reference to the recently published Cromer Shoal Conservation Advice Package, and has provided an updated cumulative assessment of the external cable protection on the Bacton pipelines based on the information in that document. Decommissioning of external cable protection is secured through the Outline Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds (CSCB) Marine Conservation Zone (MCZ) Cable Specification, Installation and Monitoring Plan (CSIMP) (Revision B) [document reference 9.7]. It is also included (ID 8.13) in the Schedule of Mitigation and

Point	Point Number(s) Appendix G [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP AND DEP Appendix G - Cromer MCZ [RR-063]	RAG Status Rel and WR Rep D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Applicant's Comment D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D7	Applicant's comment on D7
		alone and cumulatively and potential requirement for MEEB to offset these impacts.											Mitigation Routemap Revision B [document reference 6.5].
Broadscale theme 3: Significance of Impact - Alone													
G5	5, 6	Natural England doesn't agree with the Applicant's conclusion in Para. 268 of [APP-077] that there will be no significant risk of the activity hindering the achievement of the conservation objectives for Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds (CSCB) MCZ. Of particular concern is the area of mixed sediment within the cable corridor, which has a more diverse community. Should cable protection be placed in this location then Natural England advises the conservation objectives to restore/maintain features will not be achieved.		No change at deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3.		With respect to mixed sediment, the Applicant responded to this comment in detail at ID 6 of Table 4.18.6 in The Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations [REP1-033] and the matter was also discussed at ISH6 [EV-084] [EV-088]. Those points are not repeated here but the Applicant confirms that its position has not changed. It is noted that in their pre-hearing submission dated 23 March 2023 [AS-041], Natural England states that "...it is unlikely that further mitigation measures can be implemented...". Also refer to the Applicant's response to Q2.3.4.10 [document reference 16.2].	No change at Deadline 5. Please see Appendix L3 for Natural England's response to EXA third Written Questions at Deadline 5 on this matter.		Our position remains unchanged at Deadline 7. Please see our response to ExAWQ4.3.4.1 in Appendix L4.		See the Applicant's response to REP5-094 (NE's Appendix L3) in The Applicant's Comments on Responses to the Examining Authority's Third Written Questions [REP6-013] .
Broadscale theme 4: Significance of Impact - In combination/cumulative (including TIERS)													
G6	7, 8	Whilst, the Marine and Coastal Access Act (2009) does not provide any legislative requirement for explicit consideration of in combination or cumulative impact assessment to be undertaken when assessing the impacts of licensable activities upon an MCZ; we agree with the MMO in considering that in order to fully discharge regulatory duties under section 69 (1) of the MCAA, in combination and cumulative effects must be considered. We acknowledge that Para. 31 of the Stage 1 MCZ Assessment [APP-077] considers TIERS to inform such an assessment. However, we advise that the 2013 guidance on TIERS has been updated in Natural England's Best Practice Guidance. see Para. 8 App. G of [RR-063].		No change at deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3.		See ID 7 and 8 of Table 4.18.6 in The Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations [REP1-033] . No further comments.	No change at Deadline 5.		No change at Deadline 7.		No further comments.

Point	Point Number(s) Appendix G [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP AND DEP Appendix G - Cromer MCZ [RR-063]	RAG Status Rel and WR Rep D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Applicant's Comment D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D7	Applicant's comment on D7
G7	9, 10, 11, 12	<p>Natural England advises that due to existing/predicted impacts from post designation sustainable development the site's carrying capacity for further development is compromised. This will be reflected in the updated Conservation Advice due to be published in Spring 2023.</p> <p>Natural England considers the operational and maintenance phase activities for DEP (and or) SEP combined with existing Windfarm and Oil and Gas projects will result in lasting habitat change / physical disturbance which will further hinder the conservation objectives of the CSCB MCZ. The risk of, and observed, reduction in designated habitat extent which has occurred and/or is predicted to arise from the above developments has meant that the MCZ is highly likely to be taken further away from its required conservation state in the future. Unless these unanticipated significant impacts on the MCZ are addressed, Natural England advises that the overall coherence of the national site network as designated is at risk from a lasting habitat change/loss over the lifetime of the consented/built projects.</p> <p>We strongly advise that Applicant's potentially affecting the MCZ will need to intensify their use of the mitigation hierarchy to avoid, reduce and mitigate their impacts to a level where such effects cannot arise.</p>		No change at deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3.		<p>See ID 9 to 11 of Table 4.18.6 in The Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations [REP1-033].</p> <p>No further comments.</p>	<p>Natural England advises the Conservation Advice Package for CSCB MCZ published in May 2023 supports our position. We draw the ExA attention to our advice within the Supplementary Advice section. Our advice remains unchanged.</p>		<p>Our position remains unchanged at Deadline 7. Please see our response to ExAWQ4.3.4.4 in Appendix L4 where a link is provided to the recently published Cromer Shoal Conservation Advice Package.</p>		<p>The Applicant has updated the Stage 1 MCZA [document reference 5.6] at Deadline 7 to include reference to the recently published Cromer Shoal Conservation Advice Package, and has provided an updated cumulative assessment of the external cable protection on the Bacton pipelines based on the information in that document.</p> <p>On the final point, it is noted that in their pre-hearing submission dated 23 March 2023 [AS-041], Natural England states that "...it is unlikely that further mitigation measures can be implemented...".</p>
Broadscale theme: Impacts to Chalk													
G8	13	<p>Whilst Natural England agrees that areas of current outcropping chalk have been identified from the geophysical survey it does not agree with the Applicant's assessment that CSCB MCZ Subtidal Chalk FOCI is are restricted to these areas. Across much of the site there are areas of subtidal chalk lying underneath a thin veneer of sand/sediment i.e. subcropping chalk. We advise that chalk with sediment veneer should be considered as subtidal chalk feature (HOCI 20) when assessing</p>		No change at deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3.		<p>See ID 12 to 13 of Table 4.18.6 in The Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations [REP1-033].</p> <p>Also refer to the Applicant's response to Q2.3.2.3 [document reference 16.2] which addresses the avoidance of sub-cropping chalk.</p>	<p>Please see REP3-147 for Natural England's response at Deadline 3 to the ExA Second Written Questions Q3.3.2.2 and Appendix L3 at Deadline 5 for Natural England's response to EXA Third Written Question Q3.3.2.2 at Deadline 5 on this matter. Our advice remains unchanged.</p>		<p>Please see our response to ExAWQ4.3.2.2 in Appendix L4. Natural England has provided advice at [REP5-094] which remains unchanged. We advise based on the Applicant's response to the ExAWQ3 [REP5-049], the SoS will need to make a risk-based decision on the acceptability of the potential impacts to designated site features.</p>		<p>See the Applicant's response to the Examining Authority's Third Written Questions [REP5-049], Q3.3.2.1, namely that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The Applicant has set out a process within the Outline CSCB MCZ CSIMP (Revision B) [document reference 9.7] and ICBS [APP-292] to avoid and/or minimise the potential for interaction with sub-cropping chalk. Preliminary assessment already undertaken clearly indicates the potential to select a route within the export cable corridor that minimises

Point	Point Number(s) Appendix G [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP AND DEP Appendix G - Cromer MCZ [RR-063]	RAG Status Rel and WR Rep D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Applicant's Comment D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D7	Applicant's comment on D7
		impacts. This is in accordance with our advice on fishing activities. We advise that any assessments are updated accordingly.											interaction with the areas considered to be most challenging to cable burial. 3. Sub-cropping chalk cannot be considered to be of equal value with outcropping chalk in terms of the conservation objectives (noting the evidence that the Applicant has provided to support this position). That chalk with sediment veneer should be considered as subtidal chalk feature in the manner suggested by NE is a bare assertion without any reasoning or supporting evidence.
G9	14	We note that the Applicant's sensitivity biotope mapping ([APP-079] 5.6.2 Appendix 2) is based on the veneer within the glacial channel rather than the sub cropping chalk, which does not align with our advice (point G7). Thereby whilst we may be able to agree with an assessment that indicates that if cables are installed as described within the veneer, chalk will not be physically impacted, this position would change should cable protection be proposed in these areas no matter the current stability of the sediments within the glacial channel.		No change at deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3.		As above	Please see REP3-147 for Natural England's response at Deadline 2 and Appendix L3 for Natural England's response to EXA Third Written Questions at Deadline 5 on this matter. Our advice remains unchanged.		As above our advice remains unchanged at Deadline 7.		See the Applicant's response to REP5-094 (NE's Appendix L3) in The Applicant's Comments on Responses to the Examining Authority's Third Written Questions [REP6-013].
G10	15	Natural England advises against locating the HDD exit pits in any area of sub cropping chalk and wishes to emphasise the significance of the potential impacts will increase if this can't be secured in the DCO/dML.		No change at deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3.		Refer to the Applicant's response to Q2.3.2.1 [document reference 16.2] which addresses the impact to chalk features at the HDD exit pits. This confirms that the HDD exit will be located within the deep infilled channel cut through the chalk to 17m below the seabed, filled with Weybourne Channel deposits (Appendix 6.3 of the ES Sedimentary Processes [APP-182] - visible on Figure 3.4), located across the export cable corridor from approximately 750m to 1.5km offshore. Given the depth of overlying sediment deposits there is no potential for exposure of chalk in this area (the depth of the excavation is only up to 1m, as described at Section 5.4.2.5 of the MCZA [APP-077]). The detail and precise location of the HDD exit pit would be confirmed post-consent and approved by the MMO as part of the CSIMP, as required by condition 12(e) in Schedules 12 and 13 of the	Please see Natural England's response in Appendix L3 to Q3.3.2.2.		Our advice remains unchanged at Deadline 7.		The Applicant updated the Outline CSCB MCZ CSIMP (Revision B) [document reference 9.7] at Deadline 7 to secure the HDD exit location in the Weybourne Channel deposit as requested by Natural England.

Point	Point Number(s) Appendix G [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP AND DEP Appendix G - Cromer MCZ [RR-063]	RAG Status Rel and WR Rep D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Applicant's Comment D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D7	Applicant's comment on D7
								draft DCO (Revision F) [document reference 3.1]. As such the Applicant considers that this point can be closed.					
Broadscale theme 5: Mitigation - Standard Best Practice mitigation and application to SEP/DEP													
G11	16b	Reduce number of export cables though use of HVDC system or coordinated approach with other projects – Norfolk Projects: [APP-077] Section 5.1 (Para. 47) notes the potential for progressing a single ops serving both windfarms. Natural England is most supportive of this option due to the ecological benefits both for marine and terrestrial receptors. Otherwise, we would strongly encourage commitment to an integrated transmission system being progressed with HDD ducts for both SEP and DEP being installed when the first project constructs to reduce the impacts.		No change at deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3.		No further comments.	No change at Deadline 5.		No change at Deadline 7.		No further comments.
G12	16e	Micrositing cables around reef and other features of ecological importance: Natural England notes that this is referred to in the various SEP and DEP documents for the MCZ, but equally this is not secured as a condition on the face of the DCO/dML. Natural England would welcome this being secured as a condition. See item A4 of the DCO/DML tab.		No change at deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3.		See ID 18 of Table 4.18.6 in The Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations [REP1-033]: Condition 13(i) of Schedules 10 and 11 and Condition 12(j) of Schedules 12 and 13 of the draft DCO (Revision F) [document reference 3.1] include provision for a mitigation scheme for any benthic habitats of conservation, ecological and/or economic importance constituting Annex I reef habitats identified by pre-construction surveys and will be in accordance with the Offshore IPMP [APP-289].	No change at Deadline 5. Please see Appendix L3 for Natural England's response to EXA third Written Question Q3.3.1.5 and Q3.3.2.3 at Deadline 5 on this matter. Natural England advises that recently consented offshore windfarm projects (notably EA1N/EA2) have included a mitigation plan which outlines mitigation measures including benthic that have been committed to by the Applicant. Natural England would wish to see an outline mitigation plan for benthic included as part of the consenting phase.		Please see our response to ExAWQ4.3.1.3 in Appendix L4. Natural England continues to advise that an outline Benthic Mitigation Scheme is submitted during examination. We note a condition (Schedule 10 Part 2 Condition 13(1i)) has been included in the DCO, however, this only considers Annex 1 habitats and not features of the MCZ.		See the Applicant's response to REP5-094 (NE's Appendix L3) in The Applicant's Comments on Responses to the Examining Authority's Third Written Questions [REP6-013].
G13	16f	Sandwave levelling to reduce risk of free spanning cables and requirement for external cable protection: Natural England notes that there is no requirement for this mitigation measure within the MCZ, but would welcome this mitigation measure being secured.		No change at deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3.		Sandwave levelling is not a requirement in the MCZ (nor any part of the export cable corridor). The four areas identified that may require sandwave levelling (pre-sweeping) are described at paragraph 165 of ES Chapter 4 Project Description [APP-090]. As such this mitigation does not apply and this point can be resolved.	The Applicant has provided further information regarding monitoring in the REP4-015, however, Natural England considers that further detail is needed		No change at Deadline 7. Natural England continues to advise that an outline Benthic Mitigation Scheme is submitted during examination.		Sandwave levelling is not relevant to the MCZ.
G14	16g	Adoption of the reburial hierarchy with external cable protection being last resort – Whilst reburial is mentioned in various documents the reburial hierarchy is not. An outline of the process for reburial should be included with the MCZ Cable		No change at deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3.		See ID 20 of Table 4.18.6 in The Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations [REP1-033]: Section 1.6.5.2 of the Outline CSCB MCZ CSIMP [APP-291] includes a protocol for export cable remedial reburial including					The Applicant reaffirms its comment made at Deadline 3.

Point	Point Number(s) Appendix G [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP AND DEP Appendix G - Cromer MCZ [RR-063]	RAG Status Rel and WR Rep D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Applicant's Comment D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D7	Applicant's comment on D7
		Specification, Installation Plan and Monitoring Plan [APP-291].						(paragraph 69): "the Applicant has made the commitment to attempt to rebury any cables which do become exposed within the MCZ during operation prior to the installation of any external cable protection (Chapter 4 Project Description (document reference 6.1.4)).". Also included in Table 4 of the same document. As such the Applicant considers that this point can be closed.					
G15	16h	Pre consent undertake a cable burial risk assessment using geotech data to focus cable protection requirements to areas where cables are likely to be sub-optimally buried e.g. mixed sediment - to apply for a realistic worse-case scenario: Whilst, the Applicant has undertaken a cable burial study 9.7.1 and 9.7.2 [APP-292 and 293] these are only interim and are reliant on being updated post consent. Therefore, there is no indication of the areas most likely to require cable protection. We advise that more information is required at the consenting stage.		No change at deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3.		See Table 4.18.6 in The Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations [REP1-033, particularly ID 12 to 13 (subcropping chalk) and ID 6 (mixed sediment)] (also refer to G5 above). As explained at ISH 6 [EV-084] [EV-088], the Applicant has provided very detailed information at the consenting stage to assist in dealing with these matters as reflected in the Outline CSIMP [APP-291], including use of lessons learnt from the existing SOW and DOW, a geotechnical survey, a draft export cable risk assessment [APP-293] and the interim cable burial study [APP-292]. These documents will be updated pre-construction, as is the routine and accepted approach, to take account of the detailed route engineering studies and the selection of the cable burial tool. For this reason, it is not possible to provide further information at this stage, nor should it be required. The Applicant considers that this point can be closed.					The Applicant reaffirms its comment made at Deadline 3. For the avoidance of doubt, the Applicant undertook a geotechnical survey in 2021 to help inform the cable burial and protection requirements, as set out in the Interim Cable Burial Study [APP-292] and Outline CSCB CSIMP (Revision B) [document reference 9.7]. These documents will be updated pre-construction, as is the routine and accepted approach, to take account of the detailed route engineering studies and the selection of the cable burial tool. For this reason, it is not possible to provide further information at this stage, nor should it be required.
G16	16j	Requirement to install cable protection with the minimal footprint: Natural England notes that concrete/glass reinforced plastic protection covers have been included as an option to reduce the footprint of any cable protection. But this still has similar impacts to concrete mattresses. Therefore, given the Applicant's requirement to bury the cables options to secure surface laid cables have not been considered. We advise that this is considered further by the Application as part of the consenting phase.		No change at deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3.		As noted in the MCZA [APP-077] and Outline CSIMP [APP-291] unprotected surface laid cables, including pinning to the sea bed, was considered but removed from the project design envelope at the pre-application stage. This was primarily due to snagging concerns with fishing vessels, as well as the additional disturbance to fishing activity that would arise through the presence of surface marker buoys for the lifetime of the Projects. The Applicant confirms that this position has not changed.					The Applicant reaffirms its comment made at Deadline 3.

Point	Point Number(s) Appendix G [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP AND DEP Appendix G - Cromer MCZ [RR-063]	RAG Status Rel and WR Rep D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Applicant's Comment D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D7	Applicant's comment on D7
G17	16l	No use of jack –up barges along export cable routes through benthic MPAs: Natural England advises further consideration of this mitigation measure in the operation and maintenance plan 9.9 [APP-296]		No change at deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3.		This matter was discussed at ISH 6 [EV-084] [EV-088] where the Applicant explained that the use of a small jack-up vessel was only required at the HDD exit point for construction. This remains the case and as explained at ID G10 above the HDD exit will be located within the deep infilled channel cut through the chalk to 17m below the seabed, filled with Weybourne Channel deposits and so will not impact on subcropping chalk.	Please see Appendix L3 for Natural England's response to EXA third Written Questions at Deadline 5 on this matter.		No change at Deadline 7.		See the Applicant's response to REP5-094 (NE's Appendix L3) in The Applicant's Comments on Responses to the Examining Authority's Third Written Questions [REP6-013].
G18	16m	No cable protection in fisheries byelaw areas to avoid hindering reef recovery, noting that cable may still go through the outskirts of these areas: Natural England notes that there has been no consideration of the potential fisheries byelaw areas and potential to hinder the positive environmental outcomes with Cromer Shoal MCZ that they are designed to achieve. We would welcome further consideration of this.		No change at deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3.		See ID 26 of Table 4.18.6 in The Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations [REP1-033]: The fisheries byelaw area in the CSCB MCZ covers the majority of the site, including the area covered by the export cable corridor. Therefore, if cable protection is required the Byelaw area will not be able to be avoided. The Byelaw is considered within the cumulative effects Section 9 of the Stage 1 CSCB MCZ Assessment [APP-077]. The Byelaw is considered to have a positive effect on the broadscale habitat features by reducing pressures from fishing activities.	No change at Deadline 5.		No change at Deadline 7.		The Applicant reaffirms its comment made at Deadline 3.
G19	16n	Designing rock armouring to mirror the structure and function of geogenic reef: Due to the requirement to remove the cable protection at the time of decommission this is not considered a viable mitigation option for these projects.		No change at deadline 2.				No further comments.					n/a
Broadscale theme 6: Mitigation - Sediment Deposition													
G20	17	Natural England would welcome more information on how, if required (based on the installation technique), sediment will be removed at the exit pit(s), stored and redistributed. And how impacts to surrounding features can be avoided/reduced. We advise that Section 8 of the [APP-077] MCZ Stage I assessment requires more detail and consideration of this aspect.		No change at deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3.		See ID 28 of Table 4.18.6 in The Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations [REP1-033]. See also response to Q2.3.2.1 [document reference 16.2] where it is further explained that: The Applicant notes that a potential concern relates to whether sediment will be returned within an area of similar sediment type. We consider that this will be the case in this instance since the excavated sediments will be backfilled into the same location that they were removed from and the excavated sediments are likely to be relatively homogenous in nature on	Please see Natural England's response in Appendix L3 to Q3.3.3.1. at Deadline 5		No change at Deadline 7.		See the Applicant's response to REP5-094 (NE's Appendix L3) in The Applicant's Comments on Responses to the Examining Authority's Third Written Questions [REP6-013].

Point	Point Number(s) Appendix G [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP AND DEP Appendix G - Cromer MCZ [RR-063]	RAG Status Rel and WR Rep D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Applicant's Comment D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D7	Applicant's comment on D7
								<p>account of the depth (17m) within which the Weybourne Channel deposits have infilled the channel as described above.</p> <p>A second potential concern relates to the possible mobility of the deposited sediment before it is backfilled. The sediment removed from the Weybourne Channel will be predominantly cohesive (compacted over 1,000s of years) laminated sandy clay. Sub-bottom profiles distinguish these sediments from an underlying unit of older sand and gravel, which is unlikely to be penetrated during excavation. Due to its cohesive nature, the sediment that is sidecast will be in the form of aggregated 'clasts' that will remain on the seabed rather than being disaggregated into individual fine sediment components. Because of their potential size, future transport of the aggregated clasts in the sidecast material would be limited, and most would remain static on the seabed. If left for a significant amount of time (decades), the flow of tidal currents over the sidecast material would gradually winnow (there would be a gradual disaggregation of the clasts into their constituent particle sizes) the topmost clasts. However, given there will be a relatively short period of time (approximately nine months) between sidecasting and backfill, the loss of particulate material from the clasts through winnowing will be negligible.</p> <p>The Applicant considers that this point can be closed.</p>					
Broadscale Theme 7: Secondary Scouring													
G21	18	Natural England notes that secondary scouring needs further consideration in the [APP-077] Stage I MCZ assessment (para. 192, 197 and 209) in relation to impacts to sediment transportation		No change at deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3.		<p>The Applicant considers that the limited geographical extent of secondary scour means that the potential impact would be nugatory. Hence, an assessment of secondary scour has not been undertaken within Chapter 7 MGOPP [APP-119]. However, the Offshore IPMP [APP-297] includes provision for monitoring of secondary scour around scour protection.</p> <p>If no scour protection is installed, then sea bed sediments and shallow near-bed sediments within SEP or DEP</p>	Please see Natural England's response in Appendix L3 to Q3.3.3.2. at Deadline 5		Please see Natural England's response in Appendix L4 to Q4.3.3.1.		See the Applicant's response to REP5-094 (NE's Appendix L3) in The Applicant's Comments on Responses to the Examining Authority's Third Written Questions [REP6-013].

Point	Point Number(s) Appendix G [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP AND DEP Appendix G - Cromer MCZ [RR-063]	RAG Status Rel and WR Rep D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Applicant's Comment D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D7	Applicant's comment on D7
								could be disturbed by scour around the foundations and any installed external cable protection. The worst-case scenario assumes that sediment would enter the water column at the sea bed causing a localised, gradual and medium-term release of suspended sediment at the point of scour and in its immediate vicinity. Mobilised sediment from scour would be transported by tidal currents in suspension in the water column, and would be 'trickle-fed' over a number of years until the scour pit reaches an equilibrium with the physical processes driving the scour. Conceptual evidence-based assessment suggests that, due to the predominance of medium and coarse grained sand across SEP and DEP offshore sites, most of the sediment disturbed by scour at the sea bed would remain close to the bed and settle back to the bed rapidly. Some of the finer sand fraction from this release and the very small proportion of mud that is present are likely to stay in suspension for longer and form a very low concentration plume which would become advected by tidal currents. Due to the gradual development of the scour and the time scale over which this sediment will be gradually released into the water column, the concentrations would be indistinguishable from background levels.					
Document Used: [APP-080] 5.6.3 Assessment of Sea Bed Disturbance Impacts from Unexploded Ordnance (UXO) Clearance													
G22	19	Natural England welcomes the consideration of ORDTER (2018) when considering the potential size of UXO detonation craters. However, we advise that further information is required in relation to the depth of any crater and the impacts this may have on any subcropping chalk, peat and clay. In particular if chalk, peat/clay or mixed sediment are impacted features likely to destroyed as part of any explosion. Limited evidence is presented to demonstrate that the structure and function will fully recover. In addition, we advise that impacts from UXO detonations are considered in-combination with Hornsea Project Three.		No change at deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3.		As agreed with the MMO and Natural England through the evidence plan process, UXO will be a separate Marine Licence post consent (see SoCGs: Draft SoCG with Natural England (Offshore) [REP2-044] and Draft SoCG with MMO (Revision B) [document reference 12.11]). During the Marine Licensing process, an accurate assessment of the potential impact (including potential cumulative and in-combination impacts) on benthic communities taking account of the number of UXO to be detonated, their locations, and the method of UXO clearance, will be undertaken in consultation with the MMO and Natural England. If there are	No Change at Deadline 5.		No change at Deadline 7.		The Applicant reaffirms its comment made at Deadline 3.

Point	Point Number(s) Appendix G [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP AND DEP Appendix G - Cromer MCZ [RR-063]	RAG Status Rel and WR Rep D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Applicant's Comment D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D7	Applicant's comment on D7
								<p>UXO identified for explosion within proximity of potentially sensitive benthic habitats then strategies for avoidance and mitigation will be discussed at that time. The Applicant is not aware of any other studies of UXO impacts on benthic communities however it is anticipated that the width and depth of any crater will be dependent on the size of the UXO, the method of detonation, and the underlying sediment and geology.</p> <p>As noted in response to second written question Q2.12.2.7, the preferred method of UXO detonation is a low order clearance technique such as deflagration whereby explosive energy is reduced – see Section 1.4.2.1 of Draft MMMP (Revision B) [REP1-013].</p> <p>Since the number of UXO required to be cleared is unknown, and a detailed assessment will be undertaken based on the actual number and size of UXO to be cleared at that time, the Applicant does not propose to provide any further updates to the Assessment of Sea Bed Disturbance Impacts from Unexploded Ordnance (UXO) Clearance [APP-080]. As noted in that document, the assessment was provided for information purposes only in response to stakeholder comments (see Section 4 of the Stage 1 CSCB MCZ [APP-077].</p>					
Document Used: [APP-081] 5.6.4 Appendix 4 - Assessment of Potential Impacts on Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds Marine Conservation Zone Features from Planting of Native Oyster Beds													
G23	20, 21, 22, 23	Natural England advises that the idea behind the MEEB option is sound i.e. the recreation of mixed sediment/reef epifauna communities in a new location. Natural England highlights the importance of the existing mixed sediment within the Cromer Shoal MCZ. The Cromer Shoal MCZ mixed sediment in this location has several sub features to that of the generic habitat type and there is no current requirement to restore/enhance these habitats. Natural England therefore advises against the placement of clutch and restoration of an Oyster bed in the middle of a mixed sediment area. For this to be considered as additionality we		Natural England supports the changes to address our concerns in relation to the location of the proposed Oyster Bed.				The Applicant notes that Natural England supports the changes to address its concerns in relation to the location of the proposed Oyster Bed. The Applicant believes this RAG status should be green as is agreed in ID 4 of Table 2.10 of the Draft SoCG with Natural England (Offshore) [REP2-044].					n/a

Point	Point Number(s) Appendix G [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP AND DEP Appendix G - Cromer MCZ [RR-063]	RAG Status Rel and WR Rep D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Applicant's Comment D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D7	Applicant's comment on D7
		advise that it would be better to extend/enhance the area of the mixed sediment on the boundary with impoverished coarse sediment e.g. in the centre of the 'c' shaped mixed sediment area or north/south of the blue rectangle.											
Document Used: [APP-083] 5.7.1 Appendix 1 - In-Principle Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds (CSCB) Marine Conservation Zone (MCZ) Measures of Equivalent Environmental Benefit (MEEB) Plan & [APP-084] 5.8 Strategic and Collaborative Approaches to Compensation and Measures of Equivalent Environmental Benefit													
G24	24, 25	Natural England advises that regardless of the potential project progression scenarios the size/scale of oyster bed is dependent on ecological functionality and therefore will not change. Natural England recognises the time required for ecological functionality to occur and therefore would advise the implementation of oyster restoration prior to the cable installation but reflecting that it may not be fully delivering at time of cable installation. (Para. 93)		No change at deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3.		As agreed through the evidence plan process, in order for the MEEB to be deemed successful, a self-sustaining reef would be required to be maintained. The Applicant has calculated that, once fully functioning, a 10,000m ² reef would be self-sustaining (see the In-Principle CSCB MCZ MEEB Plan [APP-083]). As noted at ID 6 of Table 2-10 of the Draft SoCG with Natural England (Offshore) [REP2-044], Natural England state that <i>'the scientific evidence used to inform a 10,000m² restoration area to enable a self-sustaining reef is agreed.'</i> Regarding timescales these are set out within the Without Prejudice DCO Drafting Revision B [REP2-011].	Please see Natural England's response in Appendix L3 to Q3.3.4.2. at Deadline 5		Please see Natural England's response in Appendix L4 to Q4.3.4.1.		See the Applicant's response to REP5-094 (NE's Appendix L3) in The Applicant's Comments on Responses to the Examining Authority's Third Written Questions [REP6-013].
G25	26	Natural England advises that removal of anthropogenic marine debris will not provide the necessary compensation measure alone, but could form part of a package with something much more substantive or a positive Net Gain option. As with our advice to the Secretary of State (dated 20 January 2022) on Hornsea Project Three, it is challenging to demonstrate that this option will offset habitat loss.		No change at deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3.		Noted. The Applicant's preferred option for delivery of MEEB is the planting of native oyster bed within the CSCB MCZ. The requirement for potential other MEEB options would be discussed and agreed with the MEEB Steering Group as part of adaptive management.	No change at Deadline 5.		No change at Deadline 7.		The Applicant reaffirms its comment made at Deadline 3.
G26	28	Natural England recommends working with local fishermen to source the clutch as has been done on previous projects (Section 8.4.3.1 of [APP-083]) and would welcome any commitment that could be made to this end.		No change at deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3.		As noted in Section 8.4.3.2 of the In-principle CSCB MCZ MEEB Plan (Revision C) [REP2-020], the Applicant would, as far as possible, seek to use suppliers and partners from within the Norfolk region, providing benefits to local communities.	No change at Deadline 5.		No change at Deadline 7.		The Applicant reaffirms its comment made at Deadline 3.
Document Used: [APP-182] 6.3.6.3 Environmental Statement Appendix 6.3 - Sedimentary Processes in the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ & [APP-183] 6.3.6.4 Environmental Statement Appendix 6.4 - Sheringham Shoal Nearshore Cable Route - BGS Shallow Geological Assessment													

Point	Point Number(s) Appendix G [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP AND DEP Appendix G - Cromer MCZ [RR-063]	RAG Status Rel and WR Rep D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Applicant's Comment D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D7	Applicant's comment on D7
G27	30	Natural England notes the age of the data presented in APP-182 and advises that consideration of more recent data included within other documents gives a more holistic characterisation of the site. Of particular note is the use of these data as evidence of the stable nature of the sediment along the glacial channel.		No change at deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3.		Appendix 6.3 - Sedimentary Processes in the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ [APP-182] uses all of the data that was available at the time of writing (July 2020). As set out in Sections 3 and 4 of the report this includes the site specific geophysical data that Equinor collected in 2019, as well as a variety of other historical data collected across the existing SOW and DOW projects and more widely since approximately 2013. As such the Applicant has reviewed and used a very significant amount of data over a long period of time to inform its characterisation of the site and, specifically, to help understand how the site has changed over that time due to natural processes. Relative to most new OWF developments this is a unique position to be in and the Applicant has worked hard to maximise the value obtained for the purpose of informing its assessment, as reflected in the report. The Applicant considers that this point can be closed.	No change at Deadline 5.		No change at Deadline 7.		The Applicant reaffirms its comment made at Deadline 3.
G28	31, 32	Natural England notes that, in some places, sediment veneer is likely to be less than 1m, with 0.3 -1.25m stated at Section 5.1.2.[APP-182]. Natural England advises that impacts to chalk should be avoided either through installation or further external cable protection. As per comments G8, G9 and G10, Natural England advise that sediment veneers over chalk to constitute a subtidal chalk feature (HOCI 20). Natural England advises that impacts to peat and clay should also be avoided from cable installation and potential cable protection.		No change at deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3.		See the Applicant's response to G8, G9 and G10 above.	No change at Deadline 5.		Our advice remains unchanged at Deadline 7. Please our response to ExAQ3.2.2 in Appendix L4.		No further comment.
Document Used: [APP-283] 8.1 Cable Statement													
G29	33	Natural England would welcome the adoption of an integrated system and therefore concurrent development. If the projects are taken forward separately then we would strongly advise the Applicant to commit to installing the cable ducts for both projects when the first project is installed as per several other local major development projects. Natural England advises that should		No change at deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3.		Noted – as set out in the Scenarios Statement [APP-314], the preferred option is a development scenario with an integrated transmission system, providing transmission infrastructure which serves both of the wind farms, where both Projects are built concurrently. However, given the different commercial ownerships of each Project, alternative development scenarios such as a separated grid option will allow SEP and	No change at Deadline 5.		No change at Deadline 7.		The Applicant reaffirms its comment made at Deadline 3.

Point	Point Number(s) Appendix G [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP AND DEP Appendix G - Cromer MCZ [RR-063]	RAG Status Rel and WR Rep D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Applicant's Comment D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D7	Applicant's comment on D7
		this approach be adopted then many of the transmission asset impacts will be significantly reduced.						DEP to be constructed in a phased approach, if necessary. Therefore, the DCO application seeks to consent a range of development scenarios in the same overall corridors to allow for separate development if required, and to accommodate either sequential or concurrent build of the two Projects.					
Document Used [APP-291] 9.7 Outline Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds (CSCB) Marine Conservation Zone (MCZ) Cable Specification, Installation and Monitoring Plan (CSIMP)													
G30	34	Natural England advises that prior to construction, sign off of this document should be required in consultation with the relevant SNCB.		No change at deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3.		Noted. The final CSCB MCZ CSIMP would be agreed with the MMO in consultation with Natural England.			No change at Deadline 7.		The Applicant reaffirms its comment made at Deadline 3.
G31	35	Natural England advises that where there is shallow veneer there should be a commitment to undertake ongoing monitoring and management .		No change at deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3.		The appropriate pre and post-construction survey requirements are included in the draft DCO (Revision F) [document reference 3.1], with the surveys being carried out in accordance with the Offshore IPMP [APP-289]. Areas of shallow veneer (and any other priority areas or features for ongoing monitoring) will be informed through a combination of the pre-construction surveys, the outcome of the installation process and the emerging outcomes from the post-construction surveys, as per the routine approach to such matters. Provision for adaptive management in the context of environmental monitoring is included within the Offshore IPMP [APP-289].	No change at Deadline 5.		No change at Deadline 7.		The Applicant reaffirms its comment made at Deadline 3.
G32	36	Natural England notes that the information included in Fig. 2 and supporting text (1.3.1 para.12) doesn't reflect the more detailed information in 6.3.8.5 [APP-188] Fig. 14. Natural England advises the CSIMP is amended with the more detailed information provided in Environmental Statement [AP-188] given the purpose of this document.		No change at deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3.		Noted and agreed. Within the next iteration of the document, the Applicant will update this figure to reflect the project-specific benthic habitat mapping as shown in Figure 7-2 of the Stage 1 CSCB MCZ Assessment [APP-077].	No change at Deadline 5.		No change at Deadline 7.		The figure has been updated in the Outline CSCB CSIMP (Revision B) [document reference 9.7] as suggested at Deadline 3.
G33	37	Natural England highlights that the cable installation plan will need to take into consideration potential impacts to other designated sites. For example, potential disturbance/displacement impacts to Annex I Red Throated Diver and possible implications of mitigating impacts to the Greater Wash SPA.		No change at deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3.		The Applicant has included a best practice protocol for minimising disturbance on red-throated divers within the Outline PEMP (Revision C) [document reference 9.10]. This is considered to be the most appropriate document for managing potential impacts on red-throated diver in the post-consent phase.	No change at Deadline 5.		No change at Deadline 7.		The Applicant has committed to a seasonal restriction on export cable laying activity within the SPA as secured by Condition 24 of Schedules 12 and 13 of the draft DCO (Revision K) [document reference 3.1] and therefore potential impacts on RTD from cable installation would be avoided.

Point	Point Number(s) Appendix G [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP AND DEP Appendix G - Cromer MCZ [RR-063]	RAG Status Rel and WR Rep D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Applicant's Comment D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D7	Applicant's comment on D7
G34	38	Natural England highlights the need for the implementation of adaptive management measures should monitoring demonstrate the impacts are greater than predicted or unforeseen. Natural England recommends that this is incorporated into the CSIMP. See item A21 of the DCO/DML tab.		No change at deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3.		Provision for adaptive management in the context of environmental monitoring is included within the Offshore IPMP [APP-289] which is considered to be the most appropriate document to secure adaptive management.	Please also see Natural England's advice in Appendix A2 to the IPMP [REP4-015] on this matter. The Applicant has included proposed monitoring. However, Natural England has requested further detail.		No change at Deadline 7. Natural England understands the Applicant intends to submit an updated IPMP at Deadline 7.		The Applicant has amended Condition 20 of Schedules 10 and 11 and Condition 19 of Schedules 12 and 13 of the draft DCO at Deadline 7 (see draft DCO (Revision J) [document reference 3.1]) to include an additional sub-paragraph (6) as follows: <i>(6) In the event that the reports provided to the MMO under sub-paragraph (4) identify a need for additional monitoring, the requirement for any additional monitoring will be agreed with the MMO in writing and implemented as agreed.</i> The Applicant refers to its response to WQ4.11.8.2 (The Applicant's Responses to the Examining Authority's Fourth Written Questions [document reference 21.5]).
G35	39	Natural England advises that monitoring will be required to inform the as yet to be agreed 5 yearly review of the Operations and Maintenance plan. Natural England recommends this monitoring requirement is acknowledged in the CSIMP.		No change at deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3.		Noted. Within the next iteration of the document, the Applicant will include reference to the five yearly review period of the Outline OOMP (Revision C) [document reference 9.9].	No change at Deadline 5. Please also see Natural England's response in Appendix L3 to Q3.12.2.3. at Deadline 5.		No change at Deadline 7.		See the Applicant's response to REP5-094 (NE's Appendix L3) in The Applicant's Comments on Responses to the Examining Authority's Third Written Questions [REP6-013].
G36	40	Natural England advises that any increase in the footprint of cable protection within the MCZ during the operational phase of the project will require a separate marine licence due to the potential impacts to designated site features which may have changed over time.		No change at deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3.		Additional external cable protection during the operational phase, if it were required, is not included in the DCO application.	No change at Deadline 5. No change at Deadline 5. This requires being secured in the Outline Operations and Maintenance Plan. Please also see Natural England's response in Appendix L3 to Q3.12.2.3. at Deadline 5.		Our advice remains unchanged at Deadline 7.		As secured through the Outline OOMP (Revision C) [REP3-058], up to 1,800m ² of external cable protection within the CSCB MCZ has been assessed in the Stage 1 CSCB MCZ Assessment (Revision B) [document reference 5.6]. Unless the area of external cable protection installed exceeds this or a period of one year (which the Applicant further reduced from five to seek to reach agreement with Natural England) has elapsed since the completion of construction then no additional marine licence is required. This is considered to be appropriate. Also see the Applicant's response to REP5-094 (NE's Appendix L3) in The Applicant's Comments on Responses to the Examining Authority's Third Written Questions [REP6-013].
Document Used [APP-293] 9.7.2 Appendix 9.7.2 - Export Cable Burial Risk Assessment													
G37	41	Natural England advises that standard best practice to inform the cable burial risk assessment is to undertake geotechnical investigations prior to submission. However, for these projects we advise that the geotechnical and cable installation data from Dudgeon OWF is the best		No change at deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3.		Whilst cable route specific geotechnical data was not available at the time the draft Export Cable Burial Risk Assessment [APP-293] was completed (October 2020), geotechnical investigations (cone penetrometer testing and vibrocores) were undertaken by Equinor in Q4 2021, including	No change at Deadline 5.		No change at Deadline 7.		The Applicant reaffirms its comment made at Deadline 3.

Point	Point Number(s) Appendix G [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP AND DEP Appendix G - Cromer MCZ [RR-063]	RAG Status Rel and WR Rep D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Applicant's Comment D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D7	Applicant's comment on D7
		available evidence available. We would expect additional geotechnical data to be collected prior to cable installation to inform the necessary regulatory sign off in consultation with Natural England and this should be secured in the DCO/dML or named plan						within the export cable corridor as it passes through the MCZ. These were undertaken largely to help inform the ongoing consenting and assessment processes with respect to the MCZ, including the development of the CSIMP [APP-291] and ICBS [APP-292]. As set out at paragraph 22 of the CSIMP, interpretation of the geotechnical survey results was ongoing at the point of submission of the DCO application. As such, details of the finalised export cable corridor and any necessary micro-siting within the CSCB MCZ will be provided in the final CSIMP, informed by the relevant pre-construction surveys, including the 2021 geotechnical investigations.					

1.8 Applicant's comments on Tab H SLVIA of Natural England's Deadline 5 Risk and Issues Log

Point	Point/Paragraph Number(s) from Appendix H [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP AND DEP Appendix H - Seascape and Landscape Visual Impact Assessment (SLVIA) - [RR-063]	RAG Status Rel and WR Rep D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D7	Applicant's comment on D7
Broadscale Theme 1: "Statutory Purpose of the Norfolk Coast Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (NCAONB)"												
H1	11	Natural England agrees with the conclusion drawn in Para. 591 of 6.1.25. [APP-111] that the effects on the statutory purpose of the NCAONB will be adverse and agrees that the effects of DEP on the statutory purpose of the NCAONB will be of a lesser extent compared to those from SEP. However, Natural England disagrees with the impact significance concluded within the 6.1.25. SVIA [APP-111] and maintains that the effects are significant and adverse.		No change at deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3		No change at Deadline 5		No change at Deadline 7.		The Applicant's position remains as set out in their responses to ID 12 in Table 4.18.7 of The Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations [REP1-033].
H2	12, 13, 16f	The difference between the Applicant's judgement of impact significance on the NCAONB and Natural England's judgement of impact significance has increased since the assessment within the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR), without any obvious justification from the Applicant to the change in the assessment. Natural England welcomes the adjustments made by the Applicant to the indicative layouts of the SEP and DEP array. However, we have not seen an appraisal of these changes within the SVIA, and do not agree that this design change is enough to mitigate the impacts to sufficiently decrease the impact significance of SEP and DEP on the NCAONB.		No change at deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3		No change at Deadline 5		No change at Deadline 7.		The Applicant's position remains as set out in their responses to IDs 12 and 17f in Table 4.18.7 of The Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations [REP1-033]; which states that the judgements presented in the PEIR are the same as those presented in ES Chapter 25 SVIA [APP-111] at paragraphs 532 to 534.
H3	14, 15	Natural England maintains that the overall potential impact from SEP and DEP on the statutory purpose of the NCAONB will be major-moderate, adverse, unacceptable, and significant in EIA terms. Natural England believes that SEP and DEP will harm the natural beauty of the NCAONB because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Heights of turbines mean they will be highly apparent from the NCAONB and degrade the wilderness special quality for which NCAONB was designated. • Closest coastlines to SEP and DEP combined are within NCAONB and SEP in isolation within the NCAONB and the North Norfolk Heritage coast (NNHC). • Contrast in apparent height between turbines proposed for SEP and DEP and those at existing Offshore Wind Farms (OWF) will significantly and adversely degrade the quality of views from the AONB. The contrast will create a visually cluttered seascape when viewed from the NCAONB and NNHC. • Presented visualisations [APP-135 to APP-152] show a clear curtaining effect when SEP and DEP are viewed for the NCAONB created by the joining together of the proposed projects with existing OWF. • The perception of wildness, remoteness, and tranquillity (QNB 6) that users of the NCAONB experience will be degraded. • Existing wind farms have already compromised the statutory purpose of the NCAONBs. We further advise that it would be impossible for SEP and DEP to not present a further and significant impact to that which has already occurred. However we believe that the SVIA conclusions do not reflect this.		No change at deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3		No change at Deadline 5		No change at Deadline 7.		The Applicant's position remains as set out in their responses to IDs 14 and 15 in Table 4.18.7 of The Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations [REP1-033].
Broadscale Theme 2: "Conclusion of the SVIA - Assessing the effects of OWF on the statutory purpose of the designated landscape"												

Point	Point/Paragraph Number(s) from Appendix H [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP AND DEP Appendix H - Seascape and Landscape Visual Impact Assessment (SLVIA) - [RR-063]	RAG Status Rel and WR Rep D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D7	Applicant's comment on D7
H4	Point 2, 16a, 16b	Para. 76 of the SEP and DEP SLVIA [APP-111] implies that the Landscape Institute's core guidance (Para. 3.35, GLVIA3) provides a threshold of impact significance in EIA terms; and that this threshold sits above 'moderate significance'. However, as stated in Para. 3.32 of the GLVIA3 this significance rating has no meaning in relation to the EIA Regulations. There is no single approach to assessing the effects of OWFs on the statutory purpose of designated landscapes, and the GLVIA3 does not provide a lead on this subject.		No change at deadline 2.								
H5	Point 2, 16c, 16d, 16e	Natural England agrees with Paras. 125 and 129 [APP-111]. We would like to emphasise that the stretch of coastline belonging to the NCAONB is ca. 65km long and contains many of the features and special qualities which merited the area's designation as an AONB. While the conclusion made in Para. 591 A [APP-111] that 'SEP and DEP would not be visible from many areas of the AONB' is correct, it is also correct that extensive views of SEP and DEP will be available from the majority of the NCAONB coastline. This conclusion could suggest that impacts on the seascape, landscape and visual resources will be minimal and could be misleading to a non-landscape specialist trying to understand the assessment.		No change at deadline 2.								
Broadscale Theme 3: "Requirement for a Cumulative Impact Assessment"												
H6	17, 18a, 18b, 18c, 18d, 18e	We advise that the full impact of SEP and DEP on the NCAONB cannot be understood without conducting a Cumulative Impact Assessment (CIA). This CIA should answer the question "What is the additional harm to the AONB from the turbines proposed by SEP and DEP?" and include projects for which consent has been sought or granted, as well as those already in existence. This is a separate assessment to the in-combination assessment of the SEP and DEP projects alone and together, already contained within the SVIA. As stated in an Expert topic group (ETG) held on 1 July 2021, the CIA is required to fully consider impacts from SEP and DEP on the statutory purpose of the NCAONB.		No change at deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3		No change at Deadline 5		No change at Deadline 7.		The Applicant's position remains as set out in their responses to ID 19 and 20a to 20e in Table 4.18.7 of The Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations [REP1-033].
H7	18f	The visualisations appended to ES chapter 25 [APP-135 to APP-152] should be used to develop conclusions as the compounding of visual impact effects will affect the statutory purpose of the NCAONB. We advise that the key policy test is the further harm to the seascape setting of the NCAONB and the consequences that this has on the already compromised statutory purpose of the NCAONB.		No change at deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3		No change at Deadline 5		No change at Deadline 7.		The Applicant's position remains as set out in their responses to ID 20f in Table 4.18.7 of The Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations [REP1-033].
H8	18g	Applicant agreed to supply text at the ETG meeting on 2nd February 2022 detailing a comparison between SEP and DEP and other consented arrays visible from the NCAONB. We note that this document is not part of ES. We advise that such a document should be included as part of the determination process to assist the ExA and the decision maker.		No change at deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3		No change at Deadline 5		No change at Deadline 7.		The Applicant's position remains as set out in their responses to ID 20g in Table 4.18.7 of The Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations [REP1-033].
Broadscale Theme 5: "Comments on Document 9.25 [APP-311] Impacts on the QNB of NCAONB"												
H9	Point 4	The overarching NPS for EN-1 (Para. 5.9.9) confirms that decisions to consent SEP and DEP should have regard to the specific statutory purposes of nationally designated landscapes. Natural England advises that SEP and DEP will adversely affect special quality 6 of the NCAONB: 'sense of remoteness, tranquillity, and wildness' (QNB 6).		No change at deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3		No change at Deadline 5		No change at Deadline 7.		The Applicant's position remains as set out in their responses to ID 23 in Table 4.18.7 of The Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations [REP1-033].

Point	Point/Paragraph Number(s) from Appendix H [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP AND DEP Appendix H - Seascape and Landscape Visual Impact Assessment (SLVIA) - [RR-063]	RAG Status Rel and WR Rep D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D7	Applicant's comment on D7
H10	19b, 19c	Natural England disagrees with the assessment of QNB 6 in Para. 509 [APP-111]. Adverse effects of existing OWFs on QNB 6 are already reported within the NCAONB Management plan. SEP and DEP will add larger turbines into the seascape setting of the NCAONB, which will cause a further, and significant loss to QNB 6. The statement 'Offshore wind farms are, however, already visible from the AONB...' (Paras. 522 and 531 of the SEP and DEP SLVIA [APP-111]) does not justify the further loss of a sense of remoteness, tranquillity, and wildness from SEP and DEP. The assessment of QNB 6 does not specify the user groups impacted.		No change at deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3		No change at Deadline 5		No change at Deadline 7.		The Applicant's position remains as set out in their responses to ID 22b in Table 4.18.7 of The Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations [REP1-033] .
H11	19d	Natural England is unclear about what "Dark Skies would be affected to a degree" means and how much "skyglow" SEP and DEP will create (Para. 529 [APP-111]). Further to this, there is a conflict between a statement in Tab. 1-2 of Document 9.25 [APP-311] which states that SEP and DEP 'would not create any additional skyglow' and Para. 529 [APP-111] which states that 'Dark skies would be affected to a degree'. We note that the Light Pollution Planning Practice Guidance (Para. 003) states that 'Lighting near or above the horizontal is usually to be avoided to reduce glare and sky glow', and we note that the SEP and DEP site is on the horizon when viewed from the NCAONB. Natural England advises that the Applicant gives further consideration is to this.		No change at deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3		No change at Deadline 5		No change at Deadline 7.		The Applicant's position remains as set out in their responses to ID 22d in Table 4.18.7 of The Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations [REP1-033] .
H12	19e	Natural England is concerned that the three night-time visualisations indicate a wide expanse of light across the horizon with no clear breaks. For instance in Figure 25.21 [App-138], Figure 25.24 [APP-141] and Figure 25.26 [APP-143] where the pattern of lights appears particularly cluttered. We agree with some parts of Para. 251 of the SVIA [APP-111]: that the spread and increased height of lighting 'would be more noticeable'; and that the spread of lighting across the view would be a visual issue. However, there is no indication of 'if' and 'how' this can be addressed.		No change at deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3		No change at Deadline 5		No change at Deadline 7.		As per the Applicant's response at ID 22e in Table 4.18.7 of The Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations [REP1-033] , Natural England's position is noted. The Applicant also notes that aids to navigation (marking and lighting) will be deployed in accordance with the latest relevant available standard industry guidance and as advised by Trinity House, Maritime and Coastguard Agency (MCA), Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) and Ministry of Defence (MoD), as appropriate.
H13	19e	Natural England does not understand the statement 'only where it has been judged that there would be a difference between day-time and night-time views has this been noted within the assessment' (Para. 252 of the SEP and DEP SVIA [APP-111]). We advise that day and night views are fundamentally different, not least because visual perception at night is dictated by lights and illuminations rather than distance, with the perception of latter being radically altered at night. Natural England is therefore unable to agree with justification used by the Applicant to draw their conclusions.		No change at deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3		No change at Deadline 5		No change at Deadline 7.		The Applicant's position remains as set out in their responses to ID 22f in Table 4.18.7 of The Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations [REP1-033] .
Broadscale Theme 5: "Comments on Document 9.25 [APP-311] Impacts on the QNB of NCAONB"												
H14	20	Natural England advises that the NCAONBs Qualities of Natural Beauty (QNBs) 2, 3 and 6 (as described within the NCAONB Management Plan) will not be conserved and enhanced by SEP and DEP and that it will be possible to secure sufficient mitigation to counter this affect.		No change at deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3		No change at Deadline 5		No change at Deadline 7.		The Applicant's position remains as set out in their responses to ID 5 in Table 4.18.7 of The Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations [REP1-033] .

Point	Point/Paragraph Number(s) from Appendix H [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP AND DEP Appendix H - Seascape and Landscape Visual Impact Assessment (SLVIA) - [RR-063]	RAG Status Rel and WR Rep D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D7	Applicant's comment on D7
H15	Table 1 QNB2	Strong and distinctive links between land and sea: Natural England's advice is that SEP and DEP should be judged on the additional impact it would have upon the statutory purpose of the NCAONB. Natural England believes that the Sheringham Shoal array has already compromised the statutory purpose of the NCAONB. The addition of SEP and DEP into the seascape of the NCAONB can only further degrade the quality of the setting and by extension the NCAONB. Natural England queries how the addition of much larger turbines, with a greater spread across the seascape, and with additional lighting would allow the assessment of QNB 2 to remain Amber.	Red	No change at deadline 2.	Red	No change at Deadline 3	Red	No change at Deadline 5	Red	No change at Deadline 7.	Red	The Applicant's position remains as set out in their responses to IDs 3, 4, 5, 15, 19 and 20 in Table 4.18.7 of The Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations [REP1-033].
H16	Table 1-2 QNB3	Diversity and integrity of landscape, seascape and settlement character: Natural England disagrees with the applicant's RAG status of Amber. It suggests the RAG status should be Red. See broadscale theme point 8 (Points H28 to H32) for rationale.	Blue	No change at deadline 2.	Blue							
H17	Table 1-2 QNB6	Sense of remoteness, tranquillity and wildness: Natural England disagrees with the applicant's RAG status of Amber. It suggests the RAG status should be Red. See section 4 (Points H9 to H13) for rationale.	Blue	No change at deadline 2.	Blue							
Broadscale Theme 6: "Design Objective 11 distinctive and unique character of the local landscape / seascape, including the Norfolk Coast AONB and views out to sea"												
H18	Point 6	Natural England supports in principle the Design Objective 11 although we are uncertain as to how the design of SEP and DEP meets this objective.	Yellow	No change at deadline 2.	Yellow	No change at Deadline 3	Yellow	No change at Deadline 5	Yellow	No change at Deadline 7.	Yellow	The Applicant's position remains as set out in their responses to ID 46 in Table 4.18.7 of The Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations [REP1-033].
H19	21a	Natural England acknowledges the changes made to the layout of the indicative turbine locations since the consultation on the Section 42 Consultation. Whilst we welcome these changes we still advise that significant adverse effects persist.	Blue	No change at deadline 2.	Blue							
H20	21b	Natural England disagrees with the statement that the NCAONB 'will not be directly impacted by the proposed offshore arrays' (Para. 3.3.5 of the 9.26 Offshore Design Statement [APP-312]) as no evidence has been provided to support this statement. We would also like to clarify that SEP and DEP would be visible to the human eye between the shoreline (low water mark) and 1km from the shoreline as the montages for the inland viewpoints located within the NCAONB (well beyond 1km from the shoreland) clearly show the turbines of SEP and DEP.	Red	No change at deadline 2.	Red	No change at Deadline 3	Red	No change at Deadline 5	Red	No change at Deadline 7.	Red	The Applicant's position remains as set out in their responses to ID 26b in Table 4.18.7 of The Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations [REP1-033].
H21	21f	From a seascape perspective, Natural England supports, in principle, the layout objectives described in section 6.3.4 of the Design Statement (Document 9.26)[APP312]. Specific comments addressed in H26 to H29.	Blue	No change at deadline 2.	Blue							
H22	Table 2 Layout objective 1	Produce visually balanced and coherent layout of turbines when seen from key viewpoints, demonstrating a good rhythm, spacing: We support this objective. It would be useful for the Applicant to provide a commentary on why the indicative turbine locations have changed, and whether these changes can be formalised within the design as part of the consenting phase.	Yellow	No change at deadline 2.	Yellow	No change at Deadline 3	Yellow	No change at Deadline 5	Yellow	No change at Deadline 7.	Yellow	The Applicant's position remains as set out in their responses to ID 27 in Table 4.18.7 of The Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations [REP1-033].

Point	Point/Paragraph Number(s) from Appendix H [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP AND DEP Appendix H - Seascape and Landscape Visual Impact Assessment (SLVIA) - [RR-063]	RAG Status Rel and WR Rep D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D7	Applicant's comment on D7
H23	Table. 2 Layout objective 2	Achieve an appropriate scale in terms of distribution of turbines in relation to the coastal topography: We support this objective, although note that the difference in height between the existing arrays (to blade tip height; 132m for Sheringham Shoal, 187m for Dudgeon and 265-330m for SEP and DEP) will in practice make this very difficult to achieve. Therefore, Natural England is unclear as to how this objective will be achieved.		No change at deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3		No change at Deadline 5		No change at Deadline 7.		The Applicant's position remains as set out in their responses to ID 28 in Table 4.18.7 of The Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations [REP1-033].
H24	Table. 2 Layout objective 3	Achieve simple visual relationship with skyline, avoiding variable spacing and overlapping of turbines within an array or significant outliers: We support this objective, although note that this will be a difficult objective to achieve due to the extensive length of coastline from which the SEP and DEP will be visible (upwards of 65km). Natural England is unclear where the SEP and DEP SVIA [APP-111] reports on this objective with respect to the visualisations provided within the ES, or whether the Applicant considers this objective met, and if so, how?		No change at deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3		No change at Deadline 5		No change at Deadline 7.		The Applicant's position remains as set out in their responses to ID 29 in Table 4.18.7 of The Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations [REP1-033].
H25	Table. 2 Layout objective 4	Achieve satisfactory visual relationship (balanced, ordered, coherent and clearly legible) with existing arrays: We support this objective, although note that the difference in height between the existing arrays and those of SEP and DEP will in practice make this very difficult to achieve. Natural England is unclear where the SEP and DEP SVIA [APP-111] reports on this objective with respect to the visualisations provided within the ES, or whether the Applicant considers this objective met, and if so, how?		No change at deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3		No change at Deadline 5		No change at Deadline 7.		The Applicant's position remains as set out in their responses to ID 30 in Table 4.18.7 of The Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations [REP1-033].
Broadscale Theme 7: Visualisations showing how 53 265m high turbines may appear in views from the NCAONB should be used to inform the EIA process "Worst Case Scenario Options"												
H26	23, 24a	Natural England's advises that the impact to the statutory purpose of the NCAONB should WCS1 be the option carried forwards, needs to be understood and its likely effect on the NCAONB assessed. Further, a scenario with turbines of heights between 256 to 330m, and of a number between 30 and 53, may also constitute an additional Worst Case Scenario. However, we advise that visualisations of Worst Case Scenario 2 should inform the decision making process. A greater number of smaller turbines, up to 53 turbines of 265m, would still result in a significant adverse effect on the statutory purpose of the NCAONB.		No change at deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3		No change at Deadline 5		No change at Deadline 7.		The Applicant's position remains as set out in their responses to ID 33 in Table 4.18.7 of The Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations [REP1-033].
H27	24c	Natural England notes that the proposed substation(s) will be constructed to a height of 50m above HAT, at an unspecified distance from the coast. Natural England advise that the minimum distance from the coast is provided within the project's core information so that its likely effects on the NCAONB can be appropriately screened within the EIA. Further, it is unclear to Natural England whether the substation within the SEP project area would be larger or higher (than 50m) in the development scenario where it is the only substation to serve both the SEP and DEP offshore wind array areas.		No change at deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3		No change at Deadline 5		No change at Deadline 7.		The Applicant's position remains as set out in their responses to ID 34c in Table 4.18.7 of The Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations [REP1-033].
Broadscale Theme 8: "Sensitivity of Landscape Character Types"												
H28	Point 8, 25a, Table 4	Natural England's advice on the sensitivity of the Landscape Character Types within the coastal areas of the NCAONB sits in agreement with the North Norfolk Landscape Sensitivity Assessment 2021, and in disagreement with the judgements made within the ES. Natural England's advice on the impact significance of SEP and DEP on these landscape types has not		No change at deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3		No change at Deadline 5		No change at Deadline 7.		The Applicant's position remains as set out in their responses to IDs 35 and 36 in Table 4.18.7 of The Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations [REP1-033].

Point	Point/Paragraph Number(s) from Appendix H [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP AND DEP Appendix H - Seascape and Landscape Visual Impact Assessment (SLVIA) - [RR-063]	RAG Status Rel and WR Rep D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D7	Applicant's comment on D7
		changed (Table 4 [RR-063]) and remain Major-Moderate, significant in EIA terms and adverse.										
H29	25bi	Natural England advises that the susceptibility of the character of Drained Coastal Marshes, Coastal Shelf, and Open Coastal Marsh is 'high' for the reasons outlined within Table 5 of App. H [RR-063]). We advise that the assessment should be updated to reflect this.		No change at deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3		No change at Deadline 5		No change at Deadline 7.		The Applicant's position remains as set out in their responses to ID 36b i in Table 4.18.7 of The Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations [REP1-033].
H30	25bii	We remain in disagreement with the DEP and SEP SVIA [APP-111] judgements regarding the magnitude of effects from SEP and DEP on Drained Coastal Marshes, Coastal Shelf, and Open Coastal Marsh.		No change at deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3		No change at Deadline 5		No change at Deadline 7.		The Applicant's position remains as set out in their responses to ID 36b ii in Table 4.18.7 of The Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations [REP1-033].
H31	25biii	Regarding the sensitivity of Drained Coastal Marshes, Coastal Shelf, and Open Coastal Marsh to SEP and DEP. Natural England is in agreement with the landscape sensitivity judgements within Table 5.1 of the North Norfolk Landscape Sensitivity Assessment 2021. We draw the ExA's attention to the fact that the minimum turbine heights of SEP and DEP (265m) is over twice the turbine height used to inform the judgements contained within the North Norfolk Landscape Sensitivity Assessment 2021.		No change at deadline 2.								The Applicant's position remains as set out in their responses to ID 36b iii in Table 4.18.7 of The Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations [REP1-033].
H32	25biv	We note inconsistencies in judgements on the scales of effect from SEP and DEP on landscape character. The SIVA states that effects on landscape character along the Norfolk coastline, from where SEP and DEP will be visible, would be 'at most, small scale effects' (Para. 303 SEP and DEP SVIA [APP-111]). This statement contradicts analyses shown within Table 25-16 (SEP and DEP SVIA [APP-111]), which report up to medium scales of effect; a judgement which Natural England also disagrees with. We advise that further clarity is needed on this within the assessments		No change at deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3		No change at Deadline 5		No change at Deadline 7.		The Applicant's position remains as set out in their responses to ID 36b iv in Table 4.18.7 of The Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations [REP1-033].
Broadscale Theme 9: "Scale of effects on SEP and DEP on statutory purpose of the NCAONB from the agreed representative viewpoints"												
H33	Point 9, 26a, 26b	Natural England remains in disagreement with the Applicant on the scale of effects from SEP and DEP on the Statutory purpose of the NCAONB from the agreed representative viewpoints.		No change at deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3		No change at Deadline 5		No change at Deadline 7.		The Applicant's position remains as set out in their responses to ID 41 in Table 4.18.7 of The Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations [REP1-033].
Broadscale Theme 10: "LVIA Landscape Baseline and Assessment"												
H34	28	A vital mitigation measure during the construction phase, should both projects be approved, is for the onshore cabling to be installed simultaneously and not sequentially. If sequential installation is progressed then the first project must install the infrastructure for both projects. The importance of the AONB justifies the most effective mitigation being applied as is consistent with the approach agreed for East Anglia offshore windfarms.		No change at deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3		No change at Deadline 5		Please see NE cover letter Deadline 7. Natural England re-iterates this a vital mitigation measure to minimise visual and ecological impacts during construction.		The Applicant's position remains as set out in their responses to ID 44 in Table 4.18.7 of The Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations [REP1-033].
H35	29	Natural England advises that close attention is made to the advice of the NCAONB Partnership and relevant local authorities. These local partners have knowledge and understanding of the immediate landscape through which the cable corridor will pass.		No change at deadline 2.						Please see our response to ExAQ4.18.1.1. We note the Norfolk Coast partnership now defers to Natural England for the remainder of examination.		The Applicant notes and reaffirms their position as set out in their response to ExA Q4.18.1.1.

1.9 Applicant's comments on Tab I Terrestrial Ecology of Natural England's Deadline 5 Risks and Issues Log

Point	Point Number (s) from Appendix I [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP AND DEP Appendix I - Terrestrial Ecology [RR-063]	RAG D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Applicant's comment D3	RAG Status D5	Applicant's comment D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Applicant's comment on D7
Document Used: Document Used: [APP-090] 6.1.4 Chapter 4 Project Description															
I1	3	The method for some crossings has yet to be confirmed within the Crossing Schedule. Natural England seeks to be consulted on, and be provided with all relevant evidence, for all undecided crossing locations prior to construction commencing otherwise there is a concern that protected species may be negatively impacted by the project. Natural England requests that this is secured in the equivalent of an Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Strategy (OLEMS) document.		As per our Appendix I2 advice at Deadline 2, we welcome the Applicant's suggestion for a Committed Scheme and programme for each watercourse. We would welcome clarification of review of outline schemes during the consenting phase.		No change at Deadline 3		No Comment at D3		<p>The Outline Code of Construction Practice (Revision E) [document reference 9.17], Outline Ecological Management Plan (Revision C) [REP3-068] and the Outline Landscape Management Plan (Revision D) [document reference 9.18] submitted are outline documents at this stage of the application and detail the broad principles which would be followed.</p> <p>The Outline Code of Construction Practice (Revision E) [document reference 9.17] contains mitigation measures for watercourse crossings (Section 7.1.3). The Applicant has commitment to producing a Water Crossing Scheme for each watercourse crossing, diversion and reinstatement. This will include site specific details regarding sediment management and pollution prevention measures. The Outline Code of Construction Practice is secured by Requirement 19 of the draft DCO (Revision H) [document reference 3.1] and as set out within the Requirement: <i>'No phase of the onshore works may commence until a code of construction practice (which must accord with the outline code of construction practice) for that phase has been submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority following consultation as appropriate with... Natural England...'</i></p> <p>The Applicant considers that the concerns of Natural England have been addressed.</p>	Natural England notes the Applicant's updated commitment within the Outline Code of Construction Practice (OCoCP) Section 2.5.10 Revision C [REP3-065] that crossing locations will be agreed with the relevant planning authority post consent. Natural England wishes to be included as a named consultee. If this can be agreed this matter is resolved		Natural England advises this has been agreed and secured within the OCoCP and DCO). We consider this matter to be resolved. Natural England wishes to be included as a named consultee. If this can be agreed this matter is resolved.		<p>Noted. The Applicant refers Natural England to Requirement 19(1) of the draft DCO (Revision K) [document reference 3.1] which states: <i>"No phase of the onshore works may commence until a code of construction practice (which must accord with the outline code of construction practice) for that phase has been submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority following consultation with the Environment Agency, relevant statutory nature conservation bodies and, if applicable, the MMO."</i> [underline added]</p> <p>The Applicant notes that the planning authority in discharging the CoCP will require to consult with Natural England, as statutory nature conservation body. The Applicant considers this matter resolved.</p>

Point	Point Number (s) from Appendix I [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP AND DEP Appendix I - Terrestrial Ecology [RR-063]	RAG D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Applicant's comment D3	RAG Status D5	Applicant's comment D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Applicant's comment on D7	
Document Used: [APP-106] 6.1.20 Chapter 20 Onshore Ecology and Ornithology																
12	4, 10, 11, 38	<p>Natural England advises that in order to have confidence in mitigation measures further consideration is required within an OLEMS of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitoring and implementation of emergency management measures in the event of a bentonite breakout, Natural England advises based on an assessment of potential impacts to white-clawed crayfish and invertebrate species. Reporting mechanisms for all bentonite breakouts within designated sites should be reported to Natural England within 24 hours and before clean-up operations begin. must be assessed and a suitable emergency plan put in place. Restoration of the River Wensum Natural England advises the HDD compound on the flood plain of the River Wensum is aligned restored in accordance with the River Wensum Restoration Strategy and the River Wensum SAC Conservation Objectives Supplementary Advice. Restoration of appropriate soil/ground moisture conditions so that water levels are continuously at or just above the ground surface throughout the year. Monitoring for bentonite breakouts throughout HDD beneath the relevant watercourses, with a commitment to cease drilling and enact remedial measures immediately upon discovery of a breakout. Natural England advises that a commitment to Use of best available techniques and a precautionary methodology is included in the OLEMS. See Item I21 below. 		No change at Deadline 2. As per our Appendix I2 advice at Deadline 2 we advise further information is needed within the OLEMS to address our concerns. Item remains under discussion.		No change at Deadline 3. Please see our further advice regarding bentonite breakout in Appendix I4.		No Comment at D3		<p>The Outline Code of Construction Practice (Revision E) [document reference 9.17], Outline Ecological Management Plan (Revision C) [REP3-068] and the Outline Landscape Management Plan (Revision D) [document reference 9.18] submitted are outline documents at this stage of the application and detail the broad principles which would be followed.</p> <p>The Outline Code of Construction Practice (Revision E) [document reference 9.17] contains mitigation measures for sediment management (Section 7.1.1), pollution prevention (Section 7.1.2) and bentonite breakout (7.1.4). All of which are secured by Requirement 19 of the draft DCO (Revision H) [document reference 3.1].</p> <p>A Bentonite Breakout Plan, as required by the CoCP, would be developed prior to construction and would be informed by further detailed design and surveys including hydrofraction survey at all drill sites. A site-specific risk assessment would then be undertaken as part of the post consent detailed design process (see paragraph 131 of the Outline Code of Construction Practice (Revision E) [document reference 9.17]. This will include measures to ensure drilling stops once a breakout is reported (there will be a drop in pressure at the drill head).</p> <p>The Applicant confirms the inclusion of the following requirement in the Outline Code of Construction Practice (Revision D) [REP4-016], para. 133: "All bentonite breakouts within</p>		"Natural England welcomes the commitment within the Section 7.1.4 of the OCoCP Revision C [REP3-065] that in the event of a Bentonite Breakout, Natural England will be notified within 24 hours.		We note and welcome that the OCoCP contains mitigation measures for sediment management, pollution prevention and bentonite breakout, and that a bentonite breakout plan will be developed post consent. Also that the HDD compound located on the floodplain of the river Wensum (but outside the SSSI and SAC) will be restored in accordance with the River Wensum Restoration Strategy and the River Wensum SACO as committed within the outline EMP [REP3-068]. However, we advise that until an outline bentonite mitigation plan is agreed, Natural England is unable to conclude with certainty that the likelihood of AEol to the white-clawed crayfish, brook lamprey and bullhead features of the River Wensum SAC can be avoided. Please see our advice on these measures in Appendix L5. Natural England requests to be a named consultee of these plans once developed.		<p>The Applicant reaffirms its comment at Deadline 5.</p> <p>A Bentonite Breakout Management Plan will be developed prior to construction. This will be informed by further detailed design and surveys including hydrofraction survey at all drill sites. A site-specific risk assessment would then be undertaken as part of the post consent detailed design process.</p> <p>The Applicant refers Natural England to Requirement 19(1) of the draft DCO (Revision K) [document reference 3.1] which states: No phase of the onshore works may commence until a code of construction practice (which must accord with the outline code of construction practice) for that phase has been submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority following consultation with the Environment Agency, Natural England and, if applicable, the MMO.</p> <p>The Applicant has made the following update to the Outline Code of Construction Practice (Revision G) [document reference 9.17, paragraph 143], to be submitted at Deadline 8 as further reassurance to Natural England: To further reduce the risk of AEol to the River Wensum SAC, Natural England will be consulted in addition to seeking the Environment Agency's agreement to the Bentonite Breakout Management Plan when developing mitigation measures for crossing the River Wensum.</p>

Point	Point Number (s) from Appendix I [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP AND DEP Appendix I - Terrestrial Ecology [RR-063]	RAG D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Applicant's comment D3	RAG Status D5	Applicant's comment D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Applicant's comment on D7
										<p><i>designated sites are to be reported to Natural England as soon as possible and within 24 hours."</i></p> <p>The Applicant confirms that the HDD compound located on the floodplain of the river Wensum (but outside the SSSI and SAC) will be restored in accordance with the River Wensum Restoration Strategy and the River Wensum SAC conservation objectives. This is stated within the Outline Ecological Management Plan (Revision C) [REP3-068, Section 4.1]. The Ecological Management Plan is secured by Requirement 13 (Ecological management plan) of the draft DCO (Revision H) [document reference 3.1].</p> <p>The Outline Ecological Management Plan (Revision C) [REP3-068] and the Outline Landscape Management Plan (Revision D) [document reference 9.18] include a range of best available techniques and precautionary methodology.</p> <p>The Applicant considers that the concerns of Natural England have been addressed.</p>					
13	5, 33	<p>In order to future proof the project and enable long term environmental gains, Natural England highlights the importance of the Applicant committing to undertaking the following in combination with the EPS mitigation licences for bats, and badger and DCN DLL:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pre-construction habitat surveys to identify if any changes to the draft mitigation licence is required. • Reasonable Avoidance Measures (RAMS) – GCN, also of benefit to other amphibians and also reptiles. • Post-monitoring surveys followed up by changes to mitigation where mitigation is proven to be ineffective. 		No change at Deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3		No Comment at D3		<p>The Applicant has committed to a range of pre-construction ecological surveys, the results of which will be used to inform the mitigation required for habitats and/or species. The Applicant's proposed approach to pre-construction onshore ecological and ornithological surveys is detailed in the Outline Ecological Management Plan (Revision C) [REP3-068, Appendix A].</p> <p>As detailed in the Outline Ecological Management Plan (Revision C) [REP3-068, Section 2.3.7] the</p>	Natural England notes the Applicant's updates to the management plans. The ability to be flexible in relation to mitigation measures remains unresolved.		<p>We note and welcome the Applicant's clarification regarding pre-construction surveys and RAMS. We advise the Applicant provides further detail within the Outline EMP with regards to post construction monitoring to ensure mitigation measures remain adaptive should they not be effective.</p>		<p>The Applicant reaffirms its comment at Deadline 5.</p> <p>The Applicant retains flexibility in relation to mitigation because pre-construction surveys could have a bearing on the design/scope of the mitigation approaches.</p>

Point	Point Number (s) from Appendix I [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP AND DEP Appendix I - Terrestrial Ecology [RR-063]	RAG D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Applicant's comment D3	RAG Status D5	Applicant's comment D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Applicant's comment on D7
										<p>Applicant is committed to going beyond the requirements of the District level License (DLL) during preconstruction activities and will be applying a number of techniques to reduce the probability of impacting great crested newt, collectively termed 'Reasonable Avoidance Measures' (RAMs).</p> <p>The Applicant's commitments to post construction monitoring and replanting is presented in the Outline Ecological Management Plan (Revision C) [REP3-068, Section 5.3].</p> <p>The Ecological Management Plan is secured by Requirement 13 (Ecological management plan) of the draft DCO (Revision H) [document reference 3.1].</p> <p>The Applicant considers that the concerns of Natural England have been addressed.</p>					
14	6	Natural England advises pre-construction surveys should ensure that a full assessment of the impacts can be made and the loss of breeding habitat for arable nesting species such as skylark are quantified. Further details for pre-consent are required on how impacts on the loss of nesting habitat can be mitigated for. Natural England advises details of mitigation should be provided in the OLEMS and secured in the DCO.		No change at Deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3		No Comment at D3		<p>The pre-construction survey effort will include an Extended UK Habitat classification survey of the entire Order Limits. This survey will identify and map habitats such as uncultivated fields and field margins, which can be used to inform the mitigation requirements for species affected by works to these habitats. Mitigation measures are outlined in the Outline Ecological Management Plan (Revision C) [REP3-068, 2.3.2], and include measures such as an ECoW to monitor for nesting birds with a commitment not to commence works in areas where to do so would pose a realistic risk of displacing nesting birds.</p> <p>The Applicant considers that the concerns of Natural</p>	No change at Deadline 5		Natural England welcomes the Applicant's clarification regarding mitigation measures for skylark and should they be found to be present prior to construction activities (i.e. no site clearance would be undertaken). Natural England would also welcome a commitment by the Applicant to having an ECoW enforcing an appropriate (to the location and species) works exclusion zone whilst the nest is in use.		<p>The Applicant reaffirms its comment at Deadline 5.</p> <p>The Applicant confirms that a commitment has also been made in the Outline Code of Construction Practice (Revision G) [document reference 9.17] to appoint an Environmental Clerk of Works (paragraph 27).</p> <p>The Applicant is committed to adopting suitable avoidance of any active nests found by the ECoW during nesting bird checks.</p> <p>The Applicant refers Natural England to the Outline Ecological Management Plan (Revision E) [document reference 9.19, paragraph 89] which includes details of exclusion zones: The ECoW would advise on retention of an appropriate exclusion zone around the nest until this time. That advice will be</p>

Point	Point Number (s) from Appendix I [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP AND DEP Appendix I - Terrestrial Ecology [RR-063]	RAG D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Applicant's comment D3	RAG Status D5	Applicant's comment D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Applicant's comment on D7
										England have been addressed.					based on species type and sensitivity but will be at least 5m and marked out to prevent accidental disturbance (advice on the most appropriate technique for the species and location being provided by the ECoW).
I5	7	The order limits are within 100 metres of two ancient woodlands (Smeeth Wood and Colton Wood). To ensure all impacts have been fully assessed the Zones of Influence (Zol) for Ancient Woodland should be clearly stated within the OLEMS with consideration given to any potential edge effects.		No Change at Deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3. Natural England welcomes the Applicant's submission of the Addendum to the Environmental Statement Chapter 20, Onshore Ecology and Ornithology, Revision A [REP2-053] setting out a more detailed presentation of the existing assessment of the potential effects of air quality on ecological receptors. Please see our further advice in Appendix I4 regarding the Zones of influence for Ancient Woodland and consideration of their potential edge effects and inclusion within the Ecological Management Plan (EMP).		No Comment at D3		<p>The Applicant refers Natural England to the Outline Ecological Management Plan (Revision C) [REP3-068, Section 2.2], which provides details on Tree Root Protection Plans and buffer zones for woodland and trees. These requirements are mirrored in the Outline Code of Construction Practice (Revision E) [document reference 9.17, Section 3.3.1] which states that a 30m buffer from the ancient woodland, Colton Wood, will be maintained at all times in which no construction vehicles and machinery will enter and no materials or activities will take place. The Applicant confirms both Smeeth Wood and Colton Wood would be avoided. Smeeth Wood is located approximately 170 metres from the edge of the Order Limit which is a suitable buffer between the woodland and construction works.</p> <p>In addition, buffer zones surrounding retained areas of woodland and trees will have a radius of at least 12 times the stem diameter of the tree (or 15 times the stem diameter for veteran/ancient trees) as advised by the Arboriculturist and informed by Tree Protection Plans. RPAs around hedgerows will be assessed by the ECoW [REP4-016, para.61].</p> <p>The Outline Code of Construction Practice is</p>	Please see Natural England's response to items I14 and I19 below.		Please see Items I14, I18 and I19 below.		<p>The Applicant reaffirms its comment at Deadline 5.</p> <p>In addition, the Outline Code of Construction Practice (Revision E) [document reference 9.17, Section 2.5.11], states: "The buffer zone should be 5 metres from the edge of the tree's canopy if that area is larger than 15 times the tree's diameter. This will create a minimum root protection area."</p> <p>The Applicant considers that the concerns of Natural England have been addressed.</p>

Point	Point Number (s) from Appendix I [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP AND DEP Appendix I - Terrestrial Ecology [RR-063]	RAG D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Applicant's comment D3	RAG Status D5	Applicant's comment D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Applicant's comment on D7
										secured by Requirement 19 of the draft DCO (Revision H) [document reference 3.1]. The Ecological Management Plan is secured by Requirement 13 (Ecological management plan) of the draft DCO (Revision H) [document reference 3.1]. The Applicant considers that the concerns of Natural England have been addressed.					
I6	8, 27-29, 59-61	Suitable mitigation measures should be put in place to minimise the impact to protected bird species during the breeding season. We advise the Applicant to commit to pre-construction surveys to inform adoption of appropriate mitigation measures. The OLEMS should be updated to include more detailed mitigation measures including (but not exclusively): works must avoid the main bird breeding season (March to August inclusive) and include vegetation clearance for skylark deterrent for sensitive habitats; pre-construction checks by an ECOW to confirm the absence of nesting birds; suitable buffer of 5m for any active nests encountered; breeding bird habitat creation and enhancement. We advise the area outlined for tree clearance in Weybourne Wood to be undertaken in the autumn (September to November inclusive) to avoid impacts during the main breeding season to the Schedule 1 species crossbill. If pre-construction bird surveys reconfirm the presence of breeding sand martins within the bank which would be impacted by construction, we advise suitable mitigation measures must be followed.		No Change at Deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3		No Comment at D3		The Applicant refers Natural England to the Outline Ecological Management Plan (Revision C) [REP3-068, Section 2.3.2] which outlines the key mitigation measures proposed by the Applicant in relation to breeding birds, including Skylark and Crossbill. The Applicant confirms that mitigation measures advised by Natural England are included within the Outline Ecological Management Plan (Revision C) [REP3-068]. The Applicant considers that the concerns of Natural England have been addressed.	Natural England is not aware of any update in relation to this issue. If there has been an update, direction is provided by the Applicant.		The Applicant has addressed our concerns within the EMP [REP3-068]. Natural England considers this item is resolved.		

Point	Point Number (s) from Appendix I [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP AND DEP Appendix I - Terrestrial Ecology [RR-063]	RAG D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Applicant's comment D3	RAG Status D5	Applicant's comment D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Applicant's comment on D7
17	9	Alderford Common SSSI and the River Wensum are important foraging areas for several species of bats including barbastelle. Please also see points I28 to I32 for risks and issues raised by Natural England on this matter. Natural England advises that commitments should be made and secured by the Applicant to undertake updated pre-construction surveys where trees have been assessed as having potential to support roosting bats and are likely be impacted by the development works.		No Change at Deadline 2. We defer our response regarding issues relating to bats to Deadline 3.		No change at Deadline 3. Natural England welcomes the submission of the Bats technical Note. Please see Natural England's advice in Appendix I3 to the 13.10 Bats - Alderford Common SSSI and Swannington Uppgate Common SSSI Technical Note [REP1-063] and related comments to the Outline Code of Construction Practice [REP1-24] and Ecological management Plan [REP1-028].		No Comment at D3		The Applicant refers Natural England to The Applicant's Response to Natural England's Deadline 3 Submission [REP4-031] for its full response. The pre-construction walkover survey of the whole route (consisting of an Extended UK Habitat classification survey) will appraise the potential for protected species including a ground level appraisal of the Bat Roost Potential (BRP) of all trees. Any trees which are found to have Moderate or High BRP in accordance with Bat Conservation Trust criteria, will be subject to further surveys and, if necessary, mitigation under the terms of a Natural England approved EPS Mitigation Licence. There is also a commitment to brief all tree surgeons (as site personnel) working on tree removal for SEP and DEP to the requirements set out in the EMP and the site-wide ecological requirements, which would include the potential presence of bat roosts [REP3 060, Section 1.2.4]. The Applicant considers that the concerns of Natural England have been addressed.	No change at Deadline 5. Please see items I28 to I32 below.		Natural England welcomes the Applicant's clarification that updated pre-construction surveys will be undertaken as outlined in the EMP [REP3-068]. Natural England advises this matter is resolved.		
18	11	Himalayan balsam was recorded within the DCO order limits and noted as predominately along watercourses such as tributaries of the Wensum at Swannington and on the Rivers Tud and Bure. We advise mitigation to avoid the spread of Himalayan balsam and other Invasive Non-Native Species (INNS) must be detailed in the OLEMS. Natural England advises further precautionary and preventative measures should be put in place during construction to minimise the risk of spreading American signal crayfish or associated crayfish plague and with the correct control measures		No Change at Deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3. However, we would anticipate methods for controlling the spread of Himalayan balsam being included in the named mitigation plans to ensure that the conservation objectives for the designated sites are not hindered		No Comment at D3		Details of mitigation and best practice measures to prevent the spread of non-native invasive species are detailed within the Outline Code of Construction Practice (Revision E) [document reference 9.17, Section 9] and Outline Ecological Management Plan (Revision C) [REP3-068, Section 2.3.9]. The Applicant has committed via the Outline Code of Construction Practice (Revision E) [document reference 9.17]	No change at Deadline 5. Please also see Natural England's response to ExA WQ3.12.2.3 in relation to the PEMP [REP3-060].		Natural England welcomes the Applicant's clarification which details of mitigation is included within the Outline CoCP [REP5-030] and EMP [REP3-068]. While it is our preference that an outline INNS management plan is submitted prior to the close of examination, we acknowledge Natural England will be a named consultee for this plan. Therefore for		

Point	Point Number (s) from Appendix I [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP AND DEP Appendix I - Terrestrial Ecology [RR-063]	RAG D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Applicant's comment D3	RAG Status D5	Applicant's comment D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Applicant's comment on D7
		put in place and fully detailed in the OLEMS. Weybourne Stream, River Glaven, River Bure, unnamed tributary of the rivers are of particular concern.								to producing an Invasive Non-Native Species Management Plan, to be agreed with the Environment Agency and Natural England in advance of construction, which will set out measures to prevent transfer of invasive plant or animal species between watercourses. The Outline Code of Construction Practice is secured by Requirement 19 of the draft DCO (Revision H) [document reference 3.1]. The Ecological Management Plan is secured by Requirement 13 (Ecological management plan) of the draft DCO (Revision H) [document reference 3.1]. The Applicant considers that the concerns of Natural England have been addressed.			the purposes of examination we consider this matter closed.		
19	5, 12	Natural England is aware that a draft LONI has been obtained for badger. We advise the OLEM should secure preconstruction badger survey covering areas with previously confirmed setts, plus the whole of the DCO area (including previously inaccessible areas) and the 30m buffer and include those sets previously recorded as disused. We advise the findings from the pre-construction surveys, to be completed within two months of submitting the licence application should be used to identify if any changes to the draft mitigation licence requirement is required.		As per our Appendix 12 advice at Deadline 2, we advise clarification is provided that pre-construction badger surveys will extend into inaccessible areas of the DCO boundary. Item remains under discussion.		No change at Deadline 3		No Comment at D3		The Applicant has committed to completing a pre-construction badger survey covering the Order Limits and a surrounding 30m buffer as detailed in the Outline Ecological Management Plan (Revision C) [REP3-068, Appendix A]. This will include the sections of the Order Limits which were previously inaccessible. The Applicant considers that the concerns of Natural England have been addressed.	Natural England notes the Applicants commitment to completing a pre-construction survey covering the order limits and surrounding 30m buffer will include previously inaccessible areas. We advise the Applicant includes this commitment within the OEMP to resolve this issue.		The Applicant has committed to completing a pre-construction badger survey covering the Order Limits and a surrounding 30m buffer as detailed in the Outline Ecological Management Plan (Revision C) [REP3-068, Appendix A]. This will include the sections of the Order Limits which were previously inaccessible. Natural England advises this matter is now resolved.		
110	14, 58	At Deadline 1 Natural England has submitted best practice advice for mitigation measures to be adopted to mitigate disturbance impacts to the North Norfolk Coast (NNC) SPA pink footed goose feature. During examination we will work with the Applicant to secure this in the DCO.		No change at Deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3. Natural England is currently working with the Applicant to agree appropriate mitigation for pink-footed geese. However, for Natural England to agree with any proposed mitigation we will also need to have certainty that this mitigation will be put into effect. This		No Comment at D3		The Applicant is in dialogue with Natural England regarding Pink-footed geese and is seeking clarity on a number of points on the guidance produced by Natural England. Of note, further clarity is sought regarding how mitigation (if required) could be managed from a practical perspective.	No change at Deadline 5. Natural England is continuing to work with the Applicant on this matter.		We understand the Applicant does not wish to progress best Practice guidance for PFG mitigation. Therefore, there is insufficient time remaining within the examination to inform an agreed PFG mitigation plan. The Applicant has committed to a pink		In order to secure practical mitigation measures that are proportionate to the development and to have the certainty that the mitigation can be delivered, the Applicant has updated the OEMP (Revision D) [document reference 9.19 submitted at Deadline 7) to include a commitment to provide an Mitigation Plan with an example of a

Point	Point Number (s) from Appendix I [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP AND DEP Appendix I - Terrestrial Ecology [RR-063]	RAG D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Applicant's comment D3	RAG Status D5	Applicant's comment D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Applicant's comment on D7
						will require a requirement within the DCO or a condition within the deemed marine licence schedules to ensure enforcement of the required mitigation. Natural England notes that under the Planning Act process it is for the Applicant to draft the DCO and the conditions within. However, we are willing to engage with the Applicant on a condition, which could be submitted on a without prejudice basis should we fail to reach agreement on the need for such mitigation.							footed geese mitigation plan within the Outline EMP and to further engage with NE post examination. As our concerns as to what the PFG mitigations will include remain outstanding, our position is that we are unable to provide the decision maker the necessary comfort that appropriate mitigation measures will be adopted to remove or reduce the risk of the likelihood of AEOI to the pink-footed geese feature of the North Norfolk Coast SPA and Ramsar. Natural England advises that a condition is added to the DCO (See Tab A DCO) that ensures that until the PFG mitigation measures are agreed no works can commence.		suitable measure, which is readily available and could be used if necessary. In summary, with more detail in the OEMP, the outline mitigation proposed includes: A survey to identify fields suitable for foraging pink-footed geese. Monitoring by the ECoW of those fields between November and January. Cessation of works in and around those fields if pink-footed geese are present. The EMP prepared post-consent will provide the full details of delivery in a Pink-footed Goose Mitigation Plan. That Plan will be approved by the relevant LPAs in consultation with Natural England. The Applicant also refers to its response within The Applicant's Response to the Examining Authority's Rule 17 Letter dated 12 July 2023 [document reference 22.2].
111	15, 32	Natural England advises all effort to deter reptiles from site and to encourage reptiles to move to adjacent sites should be implemented within the mitigation measures to reduce potential injury and/or harm to reptiles. We suggest manipulation of habitats to discourage reptiles from using the site should be employed in the first instance. We advise the creation of habitat to replace those habitats destroyed is included in the OLEMS. Pre-construction walkover surveys to identify any new areas of suitable reptile habitat which become established in the period between surveys and construction is to be carried out and detailed in the OLEMS.		Natural England has provided further advice in Appendix 12 advice at Deadline 2. Item remains under discussion.		No change at Deadline 3		No Comment at D3		The Applicant refers Natural England to The Applicant's comments on Natural England's Deadline 2 Submissions [REP3-108]. The Outline Ecological Management Plan (Revision C) [REP3-068, Appendix A] details that pre-construction reptile surveys would only be completed if new areas of suitable reptile habitat are found during the pre-construction Extended UK Habitat classification surveys, or if new information on reptile distribution comes to light (such as NBIS records). In the event that new sites are surveyed for reptiles and these surveys confirm the presence of reptiles, this information will be submitted to the relevant planning authority, along	No change at Deadline 5. Natural England would like to know how our comments have been taken into account.		Following review of the EMP Revision [REP3-068] we consider our concerns regarding the mitigation measures for reptiles are addressed and therefore this matter is resolved.		

Point	Point Number (s) from Appendix I [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP AND DEP Appendix I - Terrestrial Ecology [RR-063]	RAG D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Applicant's comment D3	RAG Status D5	Applicant's comment D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Applicant's comment on D7
										with a proposed mitigation approach for the site/s, as part of the submission of results of preconstruction surveys. Requirement 13 (Ecological management plan) of the draft DCO (Revision H) [document reference 3.1] states that: No phase of the onshore works may commence until a written ecological management plan (which accords with the outline ecological management plan and the relevant recommendations of appropriate British Standards or Industry Guidance) for that phase reflecting the survey results and ecological mitigation, enhancement and biodiversity net gain measures included in the environmental statement has been submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority in consultation with the relevant statutory nature conservation bodies and (where works have potential to affect wetland habitat) the Environment Agency. The Applicant considers that the concerns of Natural England have been addressed.					
I12	I6, 50	We encourage the Applicant to work alongside Norwich Western Link [RR-065] to ensure mitigation covers all areas of concern and to achieve potential enhancement proposals for species and habitats. We emphasise the importance of minimising habitat loss, fragmentation and disturbance to a range of species and habitats including breeding birds, and bats. Please see new R&I item I37 in relation to Natural England's intention to gather evidence from next year to build an appreciation of whether notification of the Wensum Woodlands SSSI is appropriate.		No change at Deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3. Please see our advice to R&I Point I7 above and I37 below.		No Comment at D3		Noted. The Applicant will continue to work with Norwich Western Link.	No change at Deadline 5.		Natural England welcomes the Applicant's clarification to work with the Norwich Western Link Road Scheme, therefore this matter is resolved.		

Point	Point Number (s) from Appendix I [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP AND DEP Appendix I - Terrestrial Ecology [RR-063]	RAG D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Applicant's comment D3	RAG Status D5	Applicant's comment D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Applicant's comment on D7
I13	17, 23, 24, 34, 45	<p>Due to current issues with partial and full discharges of DCO requirements relating to separate Ecological Management Plan (EMP) and Landscape Management Plan (LMP) for other offshore windfarm NSIPs, Natural England advises that the separate EMP and LMP documents are combined to form the Outline Landscape Ecological Management Strategy (OLEMS) in order to lessen the burden on all parties and avoid multiple consultations.</p> <p>Our Relevant/Written Representation highlights a number of points we would like to see included in the OLEMS and we will review upon submission.</p> <p>Natural England advises pre-construction walk over surveys are carried out to validate whether habitats have changed significantly since the 2020 and 2021 surveys and whether protected species surveys are required with details included in the OLEMS. Natural England also recommends that the OLEMS (to be submitted with the final DCO application) contains a commitment to post-construction surveying/monitoring for designated habitats and species that will be affected, such as hedgerows used by bats, grasslands, ponds, GCN, cereal field margins, etc. to ensure that mitigation/restoration measures have been successful. If not we would advise that the onus remains on the Applicant until this is remediated</p>		No change at Deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3. We await further revision of the EMP and LMP with respect to our advice.		No Comment at D3		<p>The Applicant has discussed combining the OLMP and OEMP with other stakeholders. Whilst the Applicant acknowledges Natural England's position and acknowledges that there may be occasions where these documents overlap, it is of the view that the OEMP and OLMP should remain separate, to help expedite the discharge of Requirements.</p> <p>The Applicant has updated the OEMP and OLMP and refers Natural England to the latest version of these documents:</p> <p>Outline Ecological Management Plan (Revision C) [REP3-068].</p> <p>Outline Landscape Management Plan (Revision D) [document reference 9.18].</p> <p>Pre-construction ecological surveys planned by the Applicant are detailed in Appendix A of the Outline Ecological Management Plan (Revision C) [REP3-068].</p>	<p>"As advised in our cover letter at Deadline 4 [REP4-049] Natural England continues to advise that the separate EMP and LMP documents are combined to form the Outline Landscape Ecological Management Strategy (OLEMS) in order to lessen the burden on all parties and avoid multiple consultations.</p> <p>Natural England notes the Applicants intention that Post-construction monitoring surveys would be informed by the findings of the pre-construction surveys. Any requirement for remedial measures would be informed by the findings of the post construction monitoring surveys, although the principles of remediation would be outlined within the final Ecological Management Plan. Natural England advises this intention is secured within the EMP and DCO."</p>		<p>Our position regarding combining the Outline EMP and LMP into a single OLEMS plan remains unchanged at Deadline 7. Natural England welcomes that the pre-construction surveys are detailed in Appendix A of the Outline EMP Rev C [REP3-068]. Ecological Management Plan (Revision C) [REP3-068]. We continue to advise any requirement for remedial measures would be informed by the findings of the post construction monitoring surveys, although the principles of remediation would be outlined within the final Ecological Management Plan. Natural England advises this intention is secured within the EMP and DCO. But we do not have the commitments to provide further comfort to the SoS on the acceptability of this.</p>		<p>The Applicant reaffirms its comment at Deadline 5.</p> <p>The Applicant reiterates that it has committed to producing a separate Outline Ecological Management Plan (Revision E) [document reference 9.19] and Outline Landscape Management Plan (Revision D) [REP5-031]. These are secured via Requirement 13 and 11 of the draft DCO (Revision K) [document reference 3.1], respectively.</p>
Document Used: [APP-108] 6.1.22 Chapter 22 Air Quality															
I14	18, 25	<p>River Wensum SSSI and Colton Wood ancient woodland are sensitive to dust impacts. Colton Wood and the unnamed ancient woodland (near Ketteringham) are stated as having 'high' sensitivity. Natural England advises clarification is needed as to whether these sites will be further impacted. The Zones of Influence (ZoI) for Ancient Woodland should be clearly stated with consideration given to any potential edge effects.</p>		No change at Deadline 2.		No Change at Deadline 3. Natural England welcomes the Applicant's submission of the Addendum to the Environmental Statement Chapter 20, Onshore Ecology and Ornithology, Revision A [REP2-053]. Please see our further advice in Appendix I4 regarding the ZoI for Ancient Woodland at		No Comment at D3		<p>The Applicant refers Natural England to the Outline Ecological Management Plan (Revision C) [REP3-068, Section 2.2], which provides details on Tree Root Protection Plans and buffer zones for woodland and trees. These requirements are mirrored in the Outline Code of Construction Practice (Revision E) [document</p>	<p>"We note mitigation for air emissions is included in Section 8 of the OCoCP (Revision D) [REP4-017] with a commitment to finalising this post consent in the detailed design phase of influence. Natural England requests to be a named consultee of this management plan.</p>		No change at Deadline 7.		<p>The Applicant confirms that the Outline Code of Construction Practice (Revision E) [document reference 9.17, Section 2.5.11], has been updated to include: "The buffer zone should be 5 metres from the edge of the tree's canopy if that area is larger than 15 times the tree's diameter. This will create a minimum root protection area."</p>

Point	Point Number (s) from Appendix I [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP AND DEP Appendix I - Terrestrial Ecology [RR-063]	RAG D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Applicant's comment D3	RAG Status D5	Applicant's comment D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Applicant's comment on D7
						Colton Wood for consideration of their potential edge effects. For the River Wensum SSSI, we advise the Applicant assesses features/vegetation present that may be affected, within 200m of the construction traffic so that suitable mitigation can be put in place. These details should be included within the Outline Ecological Management Plan (EMP) and Code of Construction Plan (CoCP).				reference 9.17, Section 2.5.11). The Applicant considers that the concerns of Natural England have been addressed.	Natural England welcomes the inclusion of the 30m buffer zone for Colton Wood is added to Section 3.3.1 of the OCoCP Revision [REP3-065]. Please see our advice to point I18 on replicating the information on tree and woodland buffer zones in the OCoCP and OEMP REP3-068]. As advised at Deadline 2, the effects on air quality requires consideration of a large buffer zone (https://www.gov.uk/guidance/ancient-woodland-ancient-trees-and-veteran-trees-advice-for-making-planning-decisions). The onus will be on the Applicant to demonstrate it is sufficient."				The Outline Code of Construction Practice is secured by Requirement 19 of the draft DCO (Revision K) [document reference 3.1] and as set out within the Requirement: <i>'No phase of the onshore works may commence until a code of construction practice (which must accord with the outline code of construction practice) for that phase has been submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority following consultation as appropriate with... Natural England...'</i> The Applicant notes Natural England's comment in relation to buffer zones. The Applicant carried out a supplementary and detailed assessment of the potential impacts of air pollution on ecological receptors, including ancient woodland, submitting this at Deadline 2 [REP2-053]. That assessment included consideration of buffer zones and no need for additional buffer zones beyond those already included in the OEMP (Revision E) [document reference 9.19] and CoCP (Revision E) [document reference 9.17 were identified.
Document Used: [APP-282] 6.5 Schedule of Mitigation and Mitigation Routemap															
I15	19	It is noted that reptile translocation may be required for three sites. If translocation is required, Natural England advises the receptor site would require reptile surveys to be carried out to establish the current reptile population at the relocation site and determine whether the site has capacity for an additional population. This survey will need to be secured in the OLEMs		No change at Deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3		No Comment at D3		The Applicant refers Natural England to The Applicant's comments on Natural England's Deadline 2 Submissions [REP3107, Appendix A]. This illustrates the very small scale of habitat which could be impacted and from which slow worms could need to be moved (as a last resort in the event that habitat manipulation and management is not successful at discouraging slow worms from this area).	"Natural England notes there has been no update to this mitigation schedule. Therefore Natural England's position remains unchanged at Deadline 5."		This has been included in the EMP Revision C, para 55-62. Therefore Natural England consider this matter to be resolved.		

Point	Point Number (s) from Appendix I [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP AND DEP Appendix I - Terrestrial Ecology [RR-063]	RAG D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Applicant's comment D3	RAG Status D5	Applicant's comment D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Applicant's comment on D7
										<p>Note that the maximum count of slow worms recorded during the surveys at Hickling Lane was one adult, so the maximum count is one not two. The area of suitable reptile habitat along Hickling Lane extends over an extensive linear corridor alongside this ancient green lane, which extends beyond the Order Limits, where there is an established mosaic of habitat features (grassy margins, scrub, ponds, hedgerows, trees, fallen wood etc.), so the very minor incursion/loss of habitat which may impact a small part of one component of this habitat (estimate c.35 square metres of tussocky grassland around base of an electricity pylon) would be expected to have a negligible and temporary impact on the viability of this much wider area of reptile habitat.</p> <p>The Applicant considers that the concerns of Natural England have been addressed.</p>					
116	20, 30, 57	Natural England advises soft-felling should be carried out as a precautionary measure on those trees with potential (moderate and high) for roosting bats, even where bats have not been identified as roosting during surveys. Pre-construction surveys comprising a ground-level appraisal of bat roost suitability/potential, followed by bat roost emergence/re-entry surveys of any trees with High or Moderate bat roost potential which are to be removed or impacted upon should be included in the Schedule of Mitigation and Mitigation Route Map and detailed in the OLEMS. An EPS mitigation licence will still be required if future surveys record no evidence of bats roosting in trees in which roosting was previously recorded.		No change at Deadline 2.		Natural England welcomes the Applicant submission of the Bats technical Note. Please see Natural England's advice in Appendix I3 to the 13.10 Bats - Alderford Common SSSI and Swannington Uppgate Common SSSI Technical Note [REP1-063]. Natural England welcomes that all trees with High, Moderate or Low bat roost potential will be soft-felled and that where roosting bats have been recorded within trees the EPS mitigation licence will likely include the use of soft-felling.									

Point	Point Number (s) from Appendix I [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP AND DEP Appendix I - Terrestrial Ecology [RR-063]	RAG D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Applicant's comment D3	RAG Status D5	Applicant's comment D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Applicant's comment on D7
I17	21, 35-37	Pre-works and post-construction mitigation measures including construction exclusion zones are proposed in the Invertebrate Survey Report [APP-224] and includes "Manipulation of dune communities to create mobile dune systems, with associated bare ground and habitat niches, are encouraged in other areas in the UK through the Dynamic Dunescapes initiative". Natural England advises these are detailed in the Schedule of Mitigation and Mitigation Route Map and incorporated into the OLEMS.		No change at Deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3.		No Comment at D3		The Applicant refers Natural England to The Applicant's comments on Natural England's Deadline 2 Submissions [REP3-037] in which it confirms that dune communities are entirely avoided via the use of HDD. Therefore, this measure is no longer necessary. The Applicant considers that the concerns of Natural England have been addressed.	Natural England notes there has been no update to this mitigation schedule. Therefore Natural England's position remains unchanged at Deadline 5.		No change at Deadline 7.		The Applicant reaffirms its comment at Deadline 5.
Document Used: [APP-302] 9.17 Outline Code of Construction Practice															
I18	22	Woodland/Hedgerow Protection has not included protection for individual trees, including veteran and TPO trees. Natural England advises this should be identified through the Tree Protection Plan. We advise The Code of Construction Practice should be informed by the Tree Protection Plan and Hedgerow Mitigation Plans and Method Statements (as specified in the Outline Ecological Management Plan and to be included in the OLEMS).		Natural England has provided further advice in Appendix I2 advice at Deadline 2 to the OCoCP. Item remains under discussion.		No change at Deadline 3.		No Comment at D3		The Applicant refers Natural England to the Outline Code of Construction Practice (Revision E) [document reference 9.17, Section 2.5.11], which commits the Applicant to the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A suitably qualified Arboriculturist will be appointed by the Principal Contractor. The Arboriculturist will oversee the installation of construction exclusion zones to encompass Root Protection Areas (RPAs) around existing woodland and trees. These buffer zones will be maintained throughout the works period. Buffer zones surrounding retained areas of woodland and trees will have a radius of at least 12 times the stem diameter of the tree (or 15 times the stem diameter for veteran/ancient trees) as advised by the Arboriculturist and informed by Tree Protection Plans. RPAs around hedgerows will be assessed by the ECoW. The Applicant considers that the concerns	Natural England welcomes the inclusion of details of individual tree protection within the OCoCP Revision C [REP3-065]. This is in line with our standard advice (https://www.gov.uk/guidance/ancient-woodland-ancient-trees-and-veteran-trees-advice-for-making-planning-decisions). Please note this standing advice also states "The buffer zone should be 5 metres from the edge of the tree's canopy if that area is larger than 15 times the tree's diameter. This will create a minimum root protection area." We advise this is included within this paragraph to resolve this issue. We welcome this will form part of the Tree Protection plan and suitably advised by an arboriculturist.		In order to resolve this issue, Natural England awaits an update to the OCoCP as advised at Deadline 5. Also see R&I item I20 below.		The Outline Code of Construction Practice (Revision E) [document reference 9.17, Section 2.5.11], states: "The buffer zone should be 5 metres from the edge of the tree's canopy if that area is larger than 15 times the tree's diameter. This will create a minimum root protection area."

Point	Point Number (s) from Appendix I [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP AND DEP Appendix I - Terrestrial Ecology [RR-063]	RAG D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Applicant's comment D3	RAG Status D5	Applicant's comment D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Applicant's comment on D7
										of Natural England have been addressed.					
Document Used: [APP-228] 6.3.20.15 Arboricultural Report and [APP-304] 9.19 Outline Ecological Management Plan															
119	25, 18	Buffer zones for ancient woodlands have not been specified in the EMP [APP-304]. Natural England advises that buffer zones should be included to reflect the habitat and potential impact pathways from development. Where assessment shows impacts are likely to extend beyond this distance, such as the effect of air pollution from development then there may need a larger buffer zone. We advise that the management of buffers should be incorporated into the OLEMS.		No change at Deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3.		No Comment at D3		The Applicant refers Natural England to the Outline Ecological Management Plan (Revision C) [REP3-068, Section 2.2], which provides details on Tree Root Protection Plans and buffer zones for woodland and trees. These requirements are mirrored in the Outline Code of Construction Practice (Revision E) [document reference 9.17, Section 2.5.11]. The Applicant considers that the concerns of Natural England have been addressed.	"Natural England welcomes the addition of the specified 30m buffer zone for Colton Wood added to Section 3.3.1 of the OCoCP Revision C [REP3-065]. In addition, we welcome the inclusion of individual tree buffer zone and within the EMP Revision C [REP3-069] detailing the 15m buffer zone around areas of woodland (in accordance with our standard advice https://www.gov.uk/guidance/ancient-woodland-ancient-trees-and-veteran-trees-advice-for-making-planning-decisions). We advise each management plan should outline both the buffer around woodland and that around individual tree for consistency. Once these updates are provided NE considers this issue to be resolved." "		In order to resolve this issue, Natural England awaits an update to the Outline EMP and OCoCP. The latest revision of the outline CoCP Rev E [REP5-030] has yet to be consistently updated following our advice.		The Applicant reaffirms its comment at Deadline 5.
120	26, 69	The Arboricultural Report [APP-228] is not an Arboricultural Impact Assessment. Natural England advises a full tree survey within the entire DCO boundary is required prior to work on the onshore cables commencing. This should highlight any ancient/veteran trees to avoid and then using micro-siting and HDD to avoid these trees and should inform an arboricultural impact assessment. We advise tree root protection zones are included in the OLEMS and should be secured. Where management of		No change at Deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3.		No Comment at D3		The Applicant has committed to providing The Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plans of the Order Limits, through the Arboricultural Survey Report [APP-228, Section 6.5]. This will provide further detail as to when and where an Arboriculturist will be required on site for briefings. The Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plans will	Please see Natural England's response to item 119 above. Natural England continues to advise the Applicant commits full tree survey of the onshore DCO boundary is required pre-construction.		Although an Arboricultural Impact Assessment has not been completed, the Applicant's Arboricultural Report states, 'full tree survey of the entire DCO boundary prior to construction to highlight any ancient/veteran trees to avoid and then using micro-siting and HDD to avoid these trees.' (6.1.5). Therefore Natural		

Point	Point Number (s) from Appendix I [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP AND DEP Appendix I - Terrestrial Ecology [RR-063]	RAG D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Applicant's comment D3	RAG Status D5	Applicant's comment D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Applicant's comment on D7
		trees is required, we advise this must be completed by a qualified arborist to ensure tree health is not impacted. We would welcome a secured commitment by the Applicant to avoid construction activities within veteran tree buffer zones.								<p>be submitted to the local planning authority for approval prior to construction commencement. This is secured under Requirement 11 of the draft DCO (Revision H) [document reference 3.1], which also requires (within sub-paragraph(e)) 'details of existing tress and hedges to be removed and details of existing trees and hedges to be retained with measures for their protection during the construction period where applicable...'</p> <p>The Applicant also refers Natural England to the Outline Ecological Management Plan (Revision C) [REP3-068, Section 2.2], which provides details on Tree Root Protection Plans and buffer zones for woodland and trees. These requirements are mirrored in the Outline Code of Construction Practice (Revision E) [document reference 9.17, Section 2.5.11].</p> <p>The Applicant considers that the concerns of Natural England have been addressed.</p>		England's concerns are addressed.			
Document Used: [APP-129] 6.2.18 Chapter 18 Water Resources and Flood Risk															
121	38	Natural England advises that further clarity is provided in the documents provided on HDD tolerance monitoring, how quickly bentonite release can be stopped, or an assessment of a worst-case scenario bentonite breakout considering extent, timings, and environmental impacts. Sediment increases as a result of bentonite breakout should be considered with regards to lamprey species which are present in several watercourses including Swannington Beck where its 'high sensitivity would combine with a low magnitude of effect to create an impact of moderate adverse significance' as a result of increased sediment supply. We		Natural England has provided further advice in Appendix 12 advice at Deadline 2. Item remains under discussion.		No change at Deadline 3.		No Comment at D3		<p>The Outline Code of Construction Practice (Revision E) [document reference 9.17] contains mitigation measures for sediment management (Section 7.1.1), pollution prevention (Section 7.1.2) and bentonite breakout (7.1.4). All of which are secured by Requirement 19 of the draft DCO (Revision H) [document reference 3.1].</p> <p>A Bentonite Breakout Plan would be developed prior to construction and would be informed by further detailed design and surveys including hydrofraction</p>	No change at Deadline 5.		<p>We note and welcome the Applicant's clarification in [REP5-065] that the OCoCP contains mitigation measures for sediment management, pollution prevention and bentonite breakout, and that a bentonite breakout plan will be developed post consent.</p> <p>However, we advise that until an outline bentonite mitigation plan is agreed, Natural England is unable to</p>		<p>The Applicant reaffirms its comment at Deadline 5.</p> <p>A Bentonite Breakout Management Plan will be developed prior to construction. This will be informed by further detailed design and surveys including hydrofraction survey at all drill sites. A site-specific risk assessment would then be undertaken as part of the post consent detailed design process.</p> <p>The Applicant refers Natural England to Requirement 19(1) of the draft DCO (Revision K) [document reference 3.1] which states:</p>

Point	Point Number (s) from Appendix I [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP AND DEP Appendix I - Terrestrial Ecology [RR-063]	RAG D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Applicant's comment D3	RAG Status D5	Applicant's comment D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Applicant's comment on D7	
		advise the potential impact of an HDD breakout on features of interest and their supporting habitats should be assessed. See item I2 above.								<p>survey at all drill sites. A site-specific risk assessment would then be undertaken as part of the post consent detailed design process (see paragraph 131 of the Outline Code of Construction Practice (Revision E) [document reference 9.17]. This will include measures to ensure drilling stops once a breakout is reported (there will be a drop in pressure at the drill head).</p> <p>The Applicant confirms the inclusion of the following requirement to the Outline Code of Construction Practice (Revision E) [document reference 9.17], para. 133: All bentonite breakouts within designated sites are to be reported to Natural England as soon as possible and within 24 hours.</p> <p>The Applicant also refers Natural England to the Report to Inform the Appropriate Assessment (RIAA) (onshore) Technical Note [REP2-050] which assesses the potential impact of a bentonite breakout on features of interest (including lamprey species) and supporting habitats. Following the mitigation identified in the document (Sections 2.3.2.1 to 2.3.2.3), there would be no adverse effect on the integrity of the River Wensum SAC in relation to the conservation objectives for brook lamprey.</p> <p>The Applicant considers that the concerns of Natural England have been addressed.</p>				<p>conclude with certainty that the impacts to lamprey species can be appropriately mitigated for. Please see our advice on these measures in Appendix L5. Natural England requests to be a named consultee of these plans once developed.</p>		<p>No phase of the onshore works may commence until a code of construction practice (which must accord with the outline code of construction practice) for that phase has been submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority following consultation with the Environment Agency, Natural England and, if applicable, the MMO.</p> <p>The Applicant has made the following update to the Outline Code of Construction Practice (Revision G) [document reference 9.17, paragraph 143], to be submitted at Deadline 8: To further reduce the risk of AEol to the River Wensum SAC, Natural England will be consulted in addition to seeking the Environment Agency's agreement to the Bentonite Breakout Management Plan when developing mitigation measures for crossing the River Wensum.</p>
Document Used: 6.2.19 Chapter 19 Land Use, Agriculture and Recreation																

Point	Point Number (s) from Appendix I [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP AND DEP Appendix I - Terrestrial Ecology [RR-063]	RAG D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Applicant's comment D3	RAG Status D5	Applicant's comment D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Applicant's comment on D7
I22	39	The study area also crosses two Higher countryside stewardship scheme (CSS) agreements, and ten Middle CSS agreements. We advise the Applicant must consult the landowner and, where required, the Rural Payments Agency at the earliest opportunity to discuss the impacts to schemes. Mitigation should also be provided to ensure that species of conservation note are not unduly impacted by the projects.		No change at Deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3.		No Comment at D3		<p>The Applicant continues to work with Landowners/Occupiers and their respective agents. It would be the responsibility of the named individual on the CSS scheme to contact the Rural Payments Agency and to discuss the potential impacts to their scheme.</p> <p>Mitigation requirements would be determined based on the findings of pre-construction ecological surveys, which are detailed in the Outline Ecological Management Plan (Revision C) [REP3-068, Appendix A].</p> <p>The Applicant considers that the concerns of Natural England have been addressed.</p>	No Change at Deadline 5. Natural England continues to work with the Applicant with the focus that mitigation measures are fit for purpose through the OLEMS. This remains ongoing.		We note and welcome the Applicant's clarification that mitigation requirements would be determined based on the findings of pre-construction ecological surveys, which are detailed in the Outline Ecological Management Plan (Revision C) [REP3-068, Appendix A]. We therefore consider this matter resolved for the purposes of examination.		
I23	40	Open cut techniques will cross several Public Rights of Way (PRoW). Though trenchless crossing methods will be used to cross the Norfolk Coastal Path it is noted that access restrictions may occur during the short term. Natural England queries how assurances can be made to ensure that any diversions of recreational routes do not impact upon protected species or habitats.		As per our Appendix I2 advice at Deadline 2 we advise further information is needed within the OLEMS. Item remains under discussion.		No change at Deadline 3.		No Comment at D3		<p>The Applicant refers Natural England to The Applicant's Comments on Natural England's Deadline 2 Submission [REP3-107].</p> <p>The routing of temporary diversions to Public Rights of Way (PRoW) would be determined prior to commencement of works. Where diversions are required outside the Order Limits, the Applicant would seek to use the existing PRoW network, where possible. Where diversions are within the Order Limits, these would be informed, in part, by the results of further surveys, e.g. Extended UK Habitat classification surveys, where required. Routing would seek to avoid protected species or sensitive habitats, where possible.</p> <p>The Applicant considers that the concerns of Natural England have been addressed.</p>	No change at Deadline 5. Natural England understands this will be incorporated into a schedule of mitigation submitted by the end of examination.		We note and welcome the Applicant's clarification that routing would seek to avoid protected species or sensitive habitats, where possible. We advise this is secured in the DCO or a relevant plan or document in order to resolve this issue.		<p>The Applicant reaffirms its comment at Deadline 5 and in addition refers Natural England to Requirement 24 of the draft DCO (Revision K) [document reference 3.1] which requires that a PRoW strategy is submitted and approved by the relevant LPA.</p> <p>An updated Schedule of mitigation and Mitigation Route map (Revision B) [document reference 6.5] has been submitted at Deadline 8.</p>

Point	Point Number (s) from Appendix I [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP AND DEP Appendix I - Terrestrial Ecology [RR-063]	RAG D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Applicant's comment D3	RAG Status D5	Applicant's comment D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Applicant's comment on D7
I24	41, 44	Mitigation measures include private agreements with landowners regarding any permanent losses of agricultural land. However, it is not clear how these private agreements will mitigate for the permanent loss of the agricultural land. Natural England seeks clarification as to what the opportunities are for additional soil mitigation. Will additional pre-construction surveys be undertaken if additional mitigation measures and agricultural surveys, to determine whether the land associated with the onshore substations is Grade 3a or 3b and if mitigation measures are sufficient to reduce impacts to acceptable levels.		No change at Deadline 2.		No change at Deadline 3.		No Comment at D3		A Construction Practice Addendum has been produced and is included in the Heads of Terms with Landowners/Occupiers. This includes details of the Pre-Construction Soil Survey which would be undertaken. Mitigation in relation to Soil Management is identified in the Outline Code of Construction Practice (Revision E) [document reference 9.17], including pre-construction soil surveys and the production of a Soils Management Plan. This is secured by Requirement 19 (Code of construction practice) of the draft DCO (Revision H) [document reference 3.1]. The Applicant considers that the concerns of Natural England have been addressed.	No Change at Deadline 5		Mitigation in relation to Soil Management is identified in the Outline Code of Construction Practice (Revision E) [document reference 9.17], including pre-construction soil surveys and the production of a Soils Management Plan. This is also secured in the draft DCO. We therefore consider this matter closed.		
I25	43	The cumulative impacts during construction on soil degradation and potential loss of soil due to erosion are given as minor adverse as each project has committed to best practice mitigation. However, we encourage some communication between plans/projects to ensure mitigation covers all potential areas of concern from cumulative impacts.		No change at Deadline 2.											
Document Used: [APP-216] 6.3.20.3 Static Bat Detector and Transect Survey Report and [APP-223] 6.3.20.10 Bat (Roosting) Survey Report															
I26	9, 47	The crossing techniques for the areas closest to Alderford Common (Reepham Road and School Road) have not been confirmed. We advise a commitment to the collection of further preconstruction survey data is required to better understand potential impacts to commuting and foraging routes functionally linked to the Alderford Common SSSI (noted for roosting bats) which may be impacted through open cut trenching. And to ensure that mitigation measures remain fit for purpose.		No change at Deadline 2. We defer our response regarding issues relating to bats to Deadline 3.		No change at Deadline 3. Please see Natural England's advice and comments in Appendix I3 to the 13.10 Bats - Alderford Common SSSI and Swannington Ugate Common SSSI Technical Note [REP1-063] and related comments to the Outline Code of Construction Practice [REP1-24] and Ecological management Plan [REP1-028]. We note the crossing techniques have been indicated in		No Comment at D3		The Applicant confirms that this information is presented in ES Appendix 4.1 - Crossing Schedule (Revision D) [document reference 6.3.4.1]. Trenchless crossing areas are also shown in ES Chapter 4 Project Description (Revision B) Figures [REP3-028, Figure 4.10]. The Applicant refers to the response in ID5 of Table 1-1 above. The Applicant considers that the concerns of Natural England have been addressed.	Natural England notes the Applicant's commitment that these hedgerows will form part of pre-construction surveys to ascertain their importance for bats and therefore any subsequent mitigation measures. Natural England requests review of this data and advise mitigation will be in accordance with measures as agreed. Once this is committed		Further to our advice at Deadline 5. Natural England advises the Crossing Schedule information presented by the Applicant is yet to provide crossing details for the areas closest to Alderford common (Reepham Road and School Road). This issue remains unchanged.		The Applicant reaffirms its comment at Deadline 5. In addition, the Applicant has committed to completing pre-construction ecological surveys as detailed in the Outline Ecological Management Plan (Revision E) [document reference 9.19, Appendix A]. Requirement 13 of the draft DCO (Revision K) [document reference 3.1] requires that the final ecological management plan is approved by the relevant planning authority

Point	Point Number (s) from Appendix I [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP AND DEP Appendix I - Terrestrial Ecology [RR-063]	RAG D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Applicant's comment D3	RAG Status D5	Applicant's comment D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Applicant's comment on D7
						the Applicant's technical note and advise these are included within the EMP. Please also see advice at Point 7 Appendix I3 in relation to areas closest to Alderford Common.					to, this issue is resolved.				in consultation with Natural England and (where works have potential to affect wetland habitat) the Environment Agency. The Applicant refers Natural England to 6.2.4 Environmental Statement - Figures - Chapter 4 - Project Description (Revision B) [REP3-028], specifically Figure 4.10, which show the proposed crossing types within the Order Limits.
127	48, 53	It is unclear why only a 50m buffer has been applied for the Norfolk Biodiversity Information Service (NBIS) data search for bats. Natural England advises given the mobile nature of bats the proposed 50m buffer requires further justification. We query whether Core Sustenance Zones (CSZ) have been considered for other potentially important areas and other bat species (other than barbastelle). Alderford Common SSSI lies within 180m west of the DCO boundary, with good connectivity between the site and the DCO boundary. We advise that connecting and supporting habitats should be considered and advise using CSZ when assessing impacts to bats and their habitats, consulting MAGIC maps to identify the presence of any protected species licence in the boundary, or within the zone of influence of the proposed development. Natural England advises that until this is considered further by the Applicant we are unable to agree with the conclusions they have drawn.		No change at Deadline 2. We defer our response regarding issues relating to bats to Deadline 3.		No change at Deadline 3. Please see Natural England's comment 7 in Appendix I3 to the Ecological management Plan [REP1-028].		No Comment at D3		The Applicant refers Natural England to The Applicant's Response to Natural England's Deadline 3 Submission [REP4-031], detailed below: There will be a high number of sites outside the Order Limits that provide suitable foraging and roosting habitats, functionally linked land and CSZs for bat populations. For example, there are likely thousands of trees and buildings within a few kilometres of the Order Limits which support or are suitable for roosting bats. In some instances, there may be ecological connections between offsite bat habitats and areas which would be impacted by the SEP a DEP onshore construction works, such as for a bat population which roosts outside the Order Limits and flies to a foraging site along a commuting route which would be bisected by the construction works. However, the impact risk to these bats would be captured by bat surveys inside the Order Limits because this is the source of the impact (i.e. in the example given, the impact would be to commuting bats, not to roosting or	Due to unforeseen circumstances, Natural England has been unable to review this. We will provide a response no later than Deadline 7. This may be earlier, but not as early as Deadline 6.		Natural England continues to advise that 50m is an arbitrary small distance. We advise a 2-5km data search would provide a better understanding of the use of the wider landscape by foraging bats. This area is not required for surveys, but should be considered as part of a wider data search. This item remains in discussion.		As detailed in the Outline Ecological Management Plan (Revision E) [document reference 9.17, Appendix A], the Applicant confirms that an updated data search will be completed prior to construction. This data search will be within 2km of the Order Limits. Records of protected and valued species would be used to inform the design of preconstruction surveys which would largely be completed within the year prior to commencement of construction, hence the need to complete the data search beforehand.

Point	Point Number (s) from Appendix I [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP AND DEP Appendix I - Terrestrial Ecology [RR-063]	RAG D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Applicant's comment D3	RAG Status D5	Applicant's comment D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Applicant's comment on D7
										<p>foraging bats). The impact risk to bat activity outside the Order Limits is tenuous and extremely difficult to quantify without identifying the full extent of all populations' roosting, commuting and foraging ranges; without this information the relative value of the Order Limits and the construction works within it would not be assessable. Such an assessment is also thought to be unprecedented for impact assessments, and its scope would be extremely difficult to define. It should be noted that the tree bat roost survey scope (agreed to by Natural England during the ETG meetings (refer to APP-030, Annex 5.2.1.1 for ETG meeting minutes and Annex 5.2.1.2 for ETG Agreement Logs)) comprises surveys only of trees within the Order Limits which are at risk of being impacted (i.e. felled). This means there may be multiple trees with High or Moderate BRP (and indeed with roosting bats) inside the Order Limits that do not need to be surveyed because they are not being impacted. The same principle should apply to offsite habitats which would similarly not be at risk of being impacted. It would be disproportionate to be able to screen out on-site roosting features on the basis that they are not to be impacted, but screen-in off-site potential roost features due to concerns that bats using these roosts could be impacted by off-site works possibly up to a number of kilometres distant. The Applicant is proposing to complete bat surveys focused on the Order Limits where direct impacts would occur and can be assessed and mitigated. Surveys of potential roost sites, CSZs</p>					

Point	Point Number (s) from Appendix I [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP AND DEP Appendix I - Terrestrial Ecology [RR-063]	RAG D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Applicant's comment D3	RAG Status D5	Applicant's comment D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Applicant's comment on D7
										and functional linked land outside the route would not materially change the assessment or mitigation approach because bats would only be at risk of impact if using the Order Limits for some purpose (e.g. foraging). The same approach applies to other mobile species such as wintering birds, where surveys only cover the Order Limits rather than surrounding areas despite the fact birds (possibly including some of the same populations) will also forage there. The Applicant considers that the concerns of Natural England have been addressed.					
128	49	Natural England advises loss of habitat (maternity and hibernation roosts) for barbastelle bats should be minimised, particularly in the area around the River Wensum, Lenwade, Weston Longeville, Swannington, Ringland that have been identified for its significance for important colonies of bats plus important foraging and commuting routes. Please also see new R&I item I38 below in relation to the potential notification of Wensum Woods SSSI. Impacts must be minimised within this area to avoid irreversible damage to habitats and therefore species. Sufficient mitigation should be included in the OLEMS and secured with post-monitoring surveys completed.		No change at Deadline 2. We defer our response regarding issues relating to bats to Deadline 3.		"Please see Natural England's advice in Appendix I3 to the 13.10 Bats - Alderford Common SSSI and Swannington Ugate Common SSSI Technical Note [REP1-063] and related comments to the Outline Code of Construction Practice [REP1-24] and Ecological Management Plan [REP1-028]. Natural England continues to advise the Applicant to minimise impacts within the sensitive areas in and around Alderford Common SSSI, Swannington Ugate Common SSSI, Weston, Morton on the Hill and Scotchwood Hills areas by using trenchless crossing methods. In addition the project should ensure sufficient mitigation measures are included such as a lighting strategy (see new R&I item 38) and sufficient habitat and		No Comment at D3		The Applicant refers Natural England to The Applicant's Response to Natural England's Deadline 3 Submission [REP4-031] . The Applicant considers that the concerns of Natural England have been addressed.	Due to unforeseen circumstances, Natural England has been unable to review this. We will provide a response no later than Deadline 7. This may be earlier, but not as early as Deadline 6.		Natural England continues to advise the Applicant to minimise impacts within these sensitive areas. Natural England advises that providing the appropriate mitigation measures as highlighted by the Applicant's lighting strategy (see comment to R&I item 38) and sufficient habitat and hedgerow planting for areas where hedgerows are removed as informed by pre-construction surveys along with the Applicant's commitment to post-construction surveyed is agreed within the Outline EMP and CoCP then this matter is considered resolved.		The Applicant confirms that mitigation measures have been secured within the OCoCP (Revision G) [document reference 9.19] and the OEMP (Revision E) [document reference 9.17, paragraph 79] to reduce impact on bats e.g. light fixtures will be directed towards working areas and away from adjacent or nearby habitats of value to protected or notable species in accordance with the with Bats and Lighting in the UK guidance (Bat Conservation Trust and Institute of Lighting Engineers, 2018). The Applicant has committed to the reinstatement of habitats following the completion of construction. Habitats will be reinstated in accordance with the agreed specifications, as detailed in the OEMP (Revision E) [document reference 9.17, Section 4.1]. The Applicant has committed to achieving a BNG net gain within Order Limits. Alongside the BNG commitment detailed in the Outline Ecological Management Plan (Revision E) [document

Point	Point Number (s) from Appendix I [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP AND DEP Appendix I - Terrestrial Ecology [RR-063]	RAG D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Applicant's comment D3	RAG Status D5	Applicant's comment D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Applicant's comment on D7
						hedgerow planting for areas where hedgerows are removed."									reference 9.19], the Applicant is committed to ensuring that a minimum 1:1 ratio for tree and hedgerow replanting would also be achieved. This will equate to replanting at least one tree for every individual tree removed, and replanting a length of hedgerow at least equivalent to any lengths of hedgerow removed [REP5-032, para. 29].
129	51	Scotchwood Hills, is an important area for foraging, commuting and roosting bats, in particular barbastelle in combination with the proposed Western Link. We recommend trenchless technique should be considered here to minimise impacts to important colonies of bats.		No change at Deadline 2. We defer our response regarding issues relating to bats to Deadline 3.		No change at Deadline 3. Please see Natural England's advice in Appendix I3 to the 13.10 Bats - Alderford Common SSSI and Swannington Uppgate Common SSSI Technical Note [REP1-063] and related comments to the Outline Code of Construction Practice [REP1-24] and Ecological Management Plan [REP1-028]. We advise that where trenchless crossings are proposed at Scotchwood Hills, Weston, and Morton on the Hill areas, HDD should be considered where there is the potential for significant effects for the foraging and/or commuting bats. Please see RI& item I37 below.		No Comment at D3		The Applicant refers Natural England to The Applicant's Response to Natural England's Deadline 3 Submission [REP4-031], detailed below: The Applicant reaffirms that Natural England's concerns regarding bats Alderford Common/Swannington Uppgate Common SSSIs would be addressed by pre-construction surveys of that area, as confirmed in the earlier technical note [REP1-064]. This would also apply to the Scotchwood Hills area. The barbastelle maternity roost CSZ is thought to relate to 'Wensum Woods' which may be designated as a SSSI in the future but currently CSZs or other aspects of this potential SSSI (such as which woodlands might be included within it) are not defined. Therefore, these two issues are separate as one relates to two existing SSSIs and the other relates to a potential, undefined SSSI. There may be ecological overlaps between the existing and potential SSSIs, but this is not known at this stage because the barbastelle study has not been published and Wensum Woods has not been designated as a SSSI. The Applicant has committed to completing pre-construction bat surveys of all habitats	Due to unforeseen circumstances, Natural England has been unable to review this. We will provide a response no later than Deadline 7. This may be earlier, but not as early as Deadline 6.		Natural England advises as per ID11, that the Applicant's updated commitment within the Outline Code of Construction Practice (OCoCP) Section 2.5.10 Revision C [REP3-065] that crossing locations will be agreed with the relevant planning authority post consent. Natural England wishes to be included as a named consultee. If this can be agreed this matter is resolved.		The Applicant refers Natural England to Requirement 19(1) of the draft DCO (Revision K) [document reference 3.1] which states: No phase of the onshore works may commence until a code of construction practice (which must accord with the outline code of construction practice) for that phase has been submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority following consultation with the Environment Agency, relevant statutory nature conservation bodies and, if applicable, the MMO.

Point	Point Number (s) from Appendix I [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP AND DEP Appendix I - Terrestrial Ecology [RR-063]	RAG D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Applicant's comment D3	RAG Status D5	Applicant's comment D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Applicant's comment on D7
										<p>and features which are considered to be potentially important to bats (in terms of foraging, commuting and roosting) and which are at realistic risk of being impacted by SEP and DEP, such as hedgerows or treelines which would be breached by sections of the cable corridor to be installed using open-cut methods. Consideration of which habitats and features may be important will be scoped into the pre-construction bat surveys and will take account of surrounding habitat contexts, such as nearby woodlands. Areas of woodland and connected habitats within the Wensum corridor will be given particular consideration in this process, given their potential to be included in the future Wensum Woods SSSI. Where pre-construction surveys confirm that features such as hedgerows, treelines or watercourses are important for bats, mitigation will then be designed and provided. This process of using pre-construction surveys to inform mitigation is considered more appropriate than detailing mitigation before pre-construction surveys have taken place, particularly so for mitigation relating to the potential Wensum Woods SSSI on which no bat survey data has yet been made publicly available.</p> <p>The Applicant considers that the concerns of Natural England have been addressed.</p>					

Point	Point Number (s) from Appendix I [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP AND DEP Appendix I - Terrestrial Ecology [RR-063]	RAG D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Applicant's comment D3	RAG Status D5	Applicant's comment D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Applicant's comment on D7
I30	47, 52, 54, 55	It is unclear why the results of the bat static surveys were not used to inform assessments of trees where static detector survey data suggest roosts within close proximity to the DCO boundary. We advise that further clarification whether (and if not why) areas where potential maternity roosts /trees with potential to support roosting bats within close proximity to the DCO boundary and those that may be functional linked e.g. Alderford Common SSSI were surveyed. Also of note are the registration times at Weybourne Woods suggesting there may be roosts located in the vicinity. There will be removal of trees within this area which could impact upon commuting and/or foraging and roosting bats and advised that this further considered by the Applicant to ensure that the necessary mitigations measures can be adopted.		No change at D2. We defer our response regarding issues relating to bats to Deadline 3.		No change at Deadline 3.		No Comment at D3		<p>The static bat detector surveys, along with transect surveys, informed the impact assessment for foraging and commuting bats. Bat roost surveys comprised an appraisal of the roost potential of all possible roost features within the onshore cable corridor, with further targeted surveys (emergence and/or re-entry surveys) completed on any features with High or Moderate bat roost potential (per Bat Conservation Trust guidelines) which were at risk of being adversely impacted (i.e. trees which were at risk of being felled). This approach to bat roost surveys was agreed with Natural England and other stakeholders during ETG meetings.</p> <p>The two different survey methodologies focused on different aspects of bat behaviour/ecology: tree roost surveys for roosting bats, and static detector and transect surveys for bat activity (foraging and commuting bats). The results of the bat roost surveys were not used to inform the scope or location of bat activity surveys, and the results of bat activity surveys were not used to inform the scope of roost surveys because the presence of one type of behaviour does not necessarily mean the other will be impacted. For example, an area of importance for foraging or commuting bats may have no bat roosts. It is because of this distinction between bat behaviours and how they can be impacted that roost surveys were only completed where there was considered to be a risk of an impact to roosting bats (i.e. where a tree with roost potential was at risk of being felled).</p>	As this is reliant on the points above, Natural England will review for Deadline 7.		Natural England welcomes the Applicant's clarification and considers this matter closed.		

Point	Point Number (s) from Appendix I [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP AND DEP Appendix I - Terrestrial Ecology [RR-063]	RAG D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Applicant's comment D3	RAG Status D5	Applicant's comment D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Applicant's comment on D7
										<p>It is considered unnecessary to characterise bat roosting in the surrounding area where bat roosts would not be affected. The risks posed by the onshore cable corridor works to bats which may be roosting in the surrounding area would be to foraging or commuting bats emanating from these roosts; surveys for foraging and commuting bats have been completed and the data from these surveys have informed the impact assessment on this aspect of bat behaviour/ecology.</p> <p>The Applicant also refers to Natural England's agreement (in ETG meetings) [APP-030] for there to be no survey requirement for trees with High or Moderate bat roost potential which are inside the onshore cable corridor if such trees are being retained. It is considered that this survey approach was based on the understanding that such trees required no surveys because there was no risk of impacts to bats which may be roosting in them. By the same principle, there should be no survey requirement for trees outside the onshore cable corridor which are also not being impacted.</p> <p>The Applicant would welcome clarification from Natural England as to the impact pathway/mechanism by which bats roosting in the surrounding area (perhaps many kilometres from the onshore cable corridor) could be directly impacted in a way that would not be captured by the impact assessment on foraging and commuting bats.</p> <p>The Applicant considers that the concerns of Natural</p>					

Point	Point Number (s) from Appendix I [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP AND DEP Appendix I - Terrestrial Ecology [RR-063]	RAG D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Applicant's comment D3	RAG Status D5	Applicant's comment D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Applicant's comment on D7
										England have been addressed.					
I31	56	Natural England advises pre-construction bat roosting surveys should consider potential impacts to existing roosts within habitats as well as trees and structures and should include hibernation roosts. This should be secured in the OLEMS.		No change at Deadline 2. We defer our response regarding issues relating to bats to Deadline 3.		Please see Natural England's advice in Appendix I3 to the 13.10 Bats - Alderford Common SSSI and Swannington Upgate Common SSSI Technical Note [REP1-063] and related comments to the Outline Code of Construction Practice [REP1-24] and Ecological Management Plan [REP1-028]. We welcome the detail within the EMP for the bat roost appraisal surveys. We advise that pre-construction surveys should include any potential new constraints for bats, for example strong winds over winter may create more potential roost features within trees. We advise that if additional roost features are identified further survey should be considered.		No Comment at D3		<p>The Applicant refers Natural England to The Applicant's Response to Natural England's Deadline 3 Submission [REP4-031], detailed below:</p> <p>The pre-construction walkover survey of the whole route (consisting of an Extended UK Habitat classification survey) will appraise the potential for protected species including a ground level appraisal of the Bat Roost Potential (BRP) of all trees. Any trees which are found to have Moderate or High BRP in accordance with Bat Conservation Trust criteria, will be subject to further surveys and, if necessary, mitigation under the terms of a Natural England approved EPS Mitigation Licence.</p> <p>There is also a commitment to brief all tree surgeons (as site personnel) working on tree removal for SEP and DEP to the requirements set out in the EMP and the site-wide ecological requirements, which would include the potential presence of bat roosts [REP3 060, Section 1.2.4].</p> <p>Therefore, in the event that trees previously identified as having no/negligible BRP subsequently develop BRP (in the period between when surveys are completed and when trees are to be removed, which</p>	Natural England notes the Applicant's response. We defer our response on this item to Deadline 6 or 7.		Natural England welcomes the Applicant's clarification on this matter. Providing (as the Applicant states) 'There is also a commitment to brief all tree surgeons (as site personnel) working on tree removal for SEP and DEP to the requirements set out in the EMP and the site-wide ecological requirements, which would include the potential presence of bat roost.' is as secured within the EMP [REP3-068], then we consider this issue is addressed.		Noted. The Applicant refers Natural England to paragraph 40 of the Outline Ecological Management Plan which states: 'all tree surgeons would be briefed prior to commencing works on relevant trees' OEMP (Revision E) [document reference 9.17.

Point	Point Number (s) from Appendix I [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP AND DEP Appendix I - Terrestrial Ecology [RR-063]	RAG D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Applicant's comment D3	RAG Status D5	Applicant's comment D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Applicant's comment on D7
										<p>will be targeted to take place within a few months only), the tree surgeons would be able to respond accordingly (i.e. inform the ecologist who will then determine if tree felling needs to be delayed to allow for surveys and, if necessary, licensed mitigation to be completed).</p> <p>The Applicant considers that the concerns of Natural England have been addressed.</p>					
Document Used: [APP-220] 6.3.20.7 Onshore Ecology Desk Study															
I32	64	It is unclear whether the online resources used to inform the desk study search area includes the use of the Impact Risk Zone layer to inform the decision. Natural England seeks further clarification. Without this information, we are unable to have confidence in the conclusions drawn by the Application		No change at D2		No change at Deadline 3.		No Comment at D3		<p>The approach to the designated sites and biological records search elements of the onshore ecology desk study involved obtaining records of sites and records within 2km of the PEIR boundary. This approach was agreed with Natural England and other stakeholders in the ETG meetings. Impact Risk Zones around individual sites were not specifically reviewed as it was anticipated that Natural England would have raised any particular concerns they had about potential impacts to any designated sites beyond 2km from the PEIR boundary.</p> <p>The information layer associated with IRZs on the MAGIC website specify that the appropriate action/response (if a relevant development proposal overlaps an IRZ) is to consult with Natural England. It is therefore anticipated that Natural England would have provided comments on any site-specific issues or concerns, given there has been ongoing consultation/open dialogue with Natural England since 2019 and throughout the pre-application stage. The IRZ information is a screening tool to help determine when Natural</p>	It is unclear if any documents have been updated to address our original concerns.		Natural England welcomes the Applicant's clarification and considers this matter resolved.		

Point	Point Number (s) from Appendix I [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP AND DEP Appendix I - Terrestrial Ecology [RR-063]	RAG D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Applicant's comment D3	RAG Status D5	Applicant's comment D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Applicant's comment on D7
										<p>England should be consulted over the potential impacts of certain types of development on designated sites. However, Natural England has been consulted (and in extensive detail regarding designated sites such as Alderford Common SSSI, Swannington Uppgate Common SSSI and the potential Wensum Woods SSSI), so the screening tool is not considered a necessary stage of the desk study.</p> <p>The Applicant considers that the concerns of Natural England have been addressed.</p>					
Document Used: [APP-221] 6.3.20.8 Reptile Survey Report															
133	65	<p>Several reptile surveys were subject to suboptimal weather with temperatures outside of the optimal conditions and many surveys carried out in overcast conditions. Several refugia were destroyed and two of the 15 sites surveyed sites were located outside of the DCO boundary. Natural England advises clarity is required regarding the completeness and validity, and therefore the robustness, of the survey data used to inform the Application. We also advise sufficient mitigation must be employed and detailed in the OLEMS.</p>		<p>As per our Appendix I2 advice at Deadline 2 we advise further information is needed within the OLEMS. Item remains under discussion.</p>		<p>No change at Deadline 3.</p>		<p>No Comment at D3</p>		<p>The vast majority of individual reptile surveys were completed in acceptable/optimal conditions, in accordance with survey guidelines. Only a small number of visits at individual sites were completed when air temperatures were marginally outside the optimal range (19 or 20 degrees Celsius rather than between 9 and 18 degrees Celsius). This is considered a very minor constraint and has no implications on the impact assessment; the results tables in the Reptile Survey Technical Appendix [APP-221] show consistent numbers and species of reptiles recorded even during the visits completed when air temperatures were marginally above the optimal level.</p> <p>Reptile surveys can be completed in overcast conditions. This can improve detectability in some circumstances (such as if cloudy weather follows a period of sunny weather) as reptiles are attracted to the survey refuges which</p>	<p>Natural England advises the Applicant demonstrates that the mitigation measures are sufficient given the suboptimal poor weather conditions in which the survey data were acquired.</p>		<p>Natural England welcomes the Applicant's clarification and considers this matter resolved.</p>		

Point	Point Number (s) from Appendix I [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP AND DEP Appendix I - Terrestrial Ecology [RR-063]	RAG D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Applicant's comment D3	RAG Status D5	Applicant's comment D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Applicant's comment on D7
										<p>retain heat during cloudy periods.</p> <p>Sites at which refugia were destroyed included the River Tud and Valley Farm, Swardeston. At both these sites, habitat conditions on these un-grazed pastures were initially considered to be potentially suitable for reptiles and a survey was therefore commenced. However, livestock were then moved into the habitat and partially damaged and destroyed some of the refuges. The livestock simultaneously reduced the suitability of the habitat to a degree which meant reptile surveys were no longer warranted; consequently the sites were screened out of requiring reptile surveys and the surveys were discontinued. This is not considered a constraint because the sites did not warrant surveys once livestock had been moved in.</p> <p>At the Muckleburgh Collection survey site, occasional vegetation cutting is part of the baseline management of the site, to maintain the areas of coastal grassland, scattered scrub and other habitats, and in doing so, maintain the area's suitability for reptiles. This is therefore an unavoidable baseline feature of the site. To have prohibited vegetation management for the duration of the survey may have had a detrimental impact on reptiles given the habitats would have begun to succeed to less optimal and diverse compositions.</p> <p>Two of the 15 sites surveyed for reptiles are now outside the Order Limits, but they were inside the PEIR boundary. The refinement of the route from PEIR boundary to Order Limits was</p>					

Point	Point Number (s) from Appendix I [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP AND DEP Appendix I - Terrestrial Ecology [RR-063]	RAG D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Applicant's comment D3	RAG Status D5	Applicant's comment D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Applicant's comment on D7
										<p>undertaken after the reptile surveys had been completed. The fact that two sites were surveyed for reptiles but are no longer relevant to the impact assessment (given they are outside the Order Limits) is not considered a constraint to the impact assessment; the survey data from these sites has simply been excluded from the impact assessment because it is irrelevant.</p> <p>As outlined in the Reptile Survey Technical Appendix [APP-221], the above constraints are not considered to have had a substantial impact on the reliability of the survey results.</p> <p>The Applicant considers that the concerns of Natural England have been addressed.</p>					
<p>Document Used: 6.3.20.13 Appendix 20.13 - Riparian Mammals (Water Vole and Otter) Survey Report</p>															
I34	68	Water vole presence (water vole feeding sign) is noted near Little Barningham along a stream. The method of crossing at this section is not detailed as open cut or HDD. Natural England seeks clarification of the type of habitat at this area and the crossing method for this location.		No change at D2.		No change at Deadline 3.		No Comment at D3		<p>The habitat at this ditch near Little Barningham is a seasonal ditch bordered by scattered trees and arable field margins.</p> <p>The Applicant advises that the crossing method at this location is listed as open cut. The crossing would be surveyed for signs of riparian mammal presence, during spring and summer in the period up to two years prior to construction works commencing (i.e. surveys would be completed whenever any such watercourses were identified).</p> <p>The Applicant considers that the concerns of Natural England have been addressed.</p>	No change at Deadline 5.		Natural England welcomes the Applicant's clarification. However, we advise that if surveys at this location identify use of water vole, it should be assessed whether a water vole mitigation licence is required and suitable mitigation must be employed to ensure no water vole are harmed/shelters are impacted. This should be secured in the required documents. Please refer to Natural England's standing advice: https://www.gov.uk/guidance/water-voles-advice-for-making-planning-decisions .		The Applicant refers Natural England to Section 2.3.5 of the OEMP (Revision E) [document reference 9.17] in relation to water vole. The OEMP is secured by Requirement 13 of the draft DCO (Revision K) [document reference 3.1].
I35	31	Natural England advises a 10m Construction Exclusion Zone is established/secured within 10m of the watercourses providing suitable habitat for riparian mammals and detailed in the OLEMS [APP-226].		No change at D2.		No change at Deadline 3.		No Comment at D3		<p>Comment noted. The Outline Code of Construction Practice (Revision E) [document reference 9.17, Section 2.5.4] details that:</p>	No change at Deadline 5. Please also see Natural England's response to ExA WQ3.12.2.3 in relation to the PEMP [REP3-060].		Natural England welcomes the Applicant's clarification that the Outline CoCP [REP5-030] details that cable entry and exit pits will be at least 9m from		Noted.

Point	Point Number (s) from Appendix I [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP AND DEP Appendix I - Terrestrial Ecology [RR-063]	RAG D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Applicant's comment D3	RAG Status D5	Applicant's comment D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Applicant's comment on D7
										The cable entry and exit pits will be at least 9m from the banks of the watercourse (in line with the permitting requirement for EA/IDB)...Protective Provisions for drainage authorities are included within Schedule 14 Part 4 (Environment Agency) and Part 5 (Water Management Alliance) of the draft DCO.			the banks of the watercourse. This is not as precautionary as NE advised. Therefore, we continue to advise that the works should be at least 9m but greater if pre-construction evidence demonstrates it is required.		
Document Used: [APP-219] 6.3.20.6 Initial Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment.pdf															
I36	62-63	Natural England welcomes SEP and DEP's voluntary commitment to achieve Biodiversity Net Gain and reminds the Applicant that the mitigation hierarchy should be adhered to in the first instance with BNG additional to this. Natural England considers it is important that a landscape scale approach is applied with a clear strategy of how measures can be delivered across a wider area beyond the compulsory purchase corridor of the route. Measures to create new, restore existing and link severed or isolated habitats across the wider area should be incorporated, with the focus on wetland and woodland habitats. We welcome that BNG details are being considered for hedgerows. Natural England advises there may be opportunities to enhance habitats for reptiles. We recommend restoration of important habitats, such as hedgerows and SSSIs (including the River Wensum and Alderford Common SSSIs) should be focused on for BNG. We emphasise the importance of enhancing and creating new connectivity between habitats.		No change at D2.		No change at Deadline 3.		No Comment at D3		Comment noted.	No change at Deadline 5.		No change at Deadline 7.		Natural England's comments are noted. The Applicant will seek to develop its voluntary Biodiversity Net Gain Strategy and offering post consent.
Additional issues following relevant and Written Reps Submission of 14 November 2022															
I37	New Issue at D1	Natural England (NE) has included an area known as Wensum Woodlands on a list for potential notification as a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) consideration due to the Barbastelle bat colony it contains. There is evidence in the wider area to show that this is a nationally important area for barbastelles (roosts, foraging and commuting) extending east to Drayton Drewary, north to		No change at D2.		No change at Deadline 3. Please see Natural England's advice at Deadline 3 in Appendix I3.		No Comment at D3		The Applicant refers Natural England to The Applicant's Response to Natural England's Deadline 3 Submission [REP4-031] .	As advised above, Natural England defers this response to Deadline 7.		The Applicant's response at Deadline 4 [REP4-031] states that features connected to Wensum Woods will be scoped into pre-construction surveys. Natural England welcomes this commitment but wish to re-iterate our comment relates to potential habitat loss and		Noted. The Applicant has committed to the reinstatement of habitats following the completion of construction. Habitats will be reinstated in accordance with the agreed specifications, as detailed in the OEMP (Revision E) [document reference 9.17, Section 4.1].

Point	Point Number (s) from Appendix I [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP AND DEP Appendix I - Terrestrial Ecology [RR-063]	RAG D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Applicant's comment D3	RAG Status D5	Applicant's comment D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Applicant's comment on D7
		<p>Reepham, west to Swanton Morley, down to North Tuddenham and south to East Tuddenham.</p> <p>The inclusion of the Wensum Woodlands SSSI on the shortlist is not a commitment by NE to notify a SSSI, only to investigate the site further. The spatial extent of the SSSI will be dependent on survey data collected by Natural England. The process in notification decision will take several years to complete.</p> <p>Therefore Natural England advises that in order to future proof the project, there must be no damage due to construction or operation and maintenance activities that may hinder notification of the site. Mitigation as highlighted above should be of gold standard given the importance of the site and the presence of Barbastelles. Also as above we encourage coordination with the Norwich Western Link application by Norfolk County Council, noting their survey information acquired is in the public domain: https://www.norfolk.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/major-projects-and-improvement-plans/norwich/norwich-western-link/timeline.</p>											ensuring that the development does not hinder potential future notification of the SSSI.		The Applicant has committed to achieving a BNG net gain within Order Limits. Alongside the BNG commitment detailed in the Outline Ecological Management Plan (Revision e) [document reference 9.19], the Applicant is committed to ensuring that a minimum 1:1 ratio for tree and hedgerow replanting would also be achieved. This will equate to replanting at least one tree for every individual tree removed, and replanting a length of hedgerow at least equivalent to any lengths of hedgerow removed [REP5-032, para. 29].
I38	New Issue at D3					"Please refer to our advice in Appendix I3. Natural England welcomes that emissions from artificial light during construction will be in accordance with Bats and Lighting in the UK guidance (Bat Conservation Trust and Institute of Lighting Engineers, 2018), and will include the use of directional beams, non-reflective surfaces and barriers and screens, to avoid light nuisance whilst maintaining safety and security obligations. Please also refer to our comment for the OEMP at NE Point 24) [REP2-063].		No Comment at D3		The Applicant refers Natural England to the Outline Code of Construction Practice (Revision E) [document reference 9.17, Section 3.7] which contains mitigation measures to manage emissions from artificial light during construction will be in accordance with Bats and Lighting in the UK guidance (Bat Conservation Trust and Institute of Lighting Engineers, 2018). The Applicant considers that the concerns of Natural England have been addressed.	As advised above, Natural England defers this response to Deadline 7.		Natural England welcomes the mitigation measures within the Outline CoCP [REP5-030] to manage emissions from artificial light during construction in accordance with Bats and Lighting in the UK guidance (Bat Conservation Trust and Institute of Lighting Engineers, 2018). In order to resolve this issue we advise an additional measures are included to ensure lighting is directed away from habitats/linear features. This is included in the guidance, but not		Noted. The Applicant confirms that light fixtures will be directed towards working areas and away from adjacent or nearby habitats of value to protected or notable species in accordance with the with Bats and Lighting in the UK guidance (Bat Conservation Trust and Institute of Lighting Engineers, 2018). Commitments for measures in accordance with this guidance are found in both the OCoCP (Revision G) [document reference 9.19] and the OEMP (Revision E) [document reference 9.17, paragraph 79].

Point	Point Number (s) from Appendix I [RR-063]	Taken from Natural England's Relevant and Written Representations SEP AND DEP Appendix I - Terrestrial Ecology [RR-063]	RAG D1	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG D2	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D3	Applicant's comment D3	RAG Status D5	Applicant's comment D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Consultation, actions, progression	RAG Status D5	Applicant's comment on D7
						We advise that a detailed lighting plan is included in the EMP during the consenting phase to ensure impacts upon sensitive habitats and species, particularly in the area around Alderford Common SSSI/Swannington/Weston/Morton on the Hill, Scotchwood Hills and the wider Wensum Woods areas can be suitably mitigated for. "							stipulated within the Outline CoCP.		

References

Schultze, L. K. P., Merckelbach, L. M., Horstmann, J., Raasch, S., & Carpenter, J. R. (2020). Increased mixing and turbulence in the wake of offshore windfarm foundations. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Oceans*, 125, e2019JC015858. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2019JC015858>

Christiansen N, Daewel U, Djath B and Schrum C (2022) Emergence of Large-Scale Hydrodynamic Structures Due to Atmospheric Offshore Wind Farm Wakes. *Front. Mar. Sci.* 9:818501. doi: 10.3389/fmars.2022.818501