

# Rampion 2 Wind Farm Category 6: Environmental Statement

## Volume 4, Appendix 5.2: Response to the Scoping Opinion

### Date: August 2023 Revision A

Document Reference: 6.4.5.2  
Pursuant to: APFP Regulation 5 (2) (a)  
Ecodoc number: 004866461-01



## Document revisions

---

Revision	Date	Status/reason for issue	Author	Checked by	Approved by
A	04/08/2023	Final for DCO Application	WSP	RED	RED

---

# Contents

---

---

1.1	Responses to the Scoping Opinion	3
1.2	Glossary of terms and abbreviations	145
1.3	References	147

---

## List of tables

Table 1-1	Responses to the Scoping Opinion	5
-----------	----------------------------------	---

---

Page intentionally blank

# 1. Responses to the Scoping Opinion

---

- 1.1.1 This Appendix provides a full list of responses to the Planning Inspectorate's Scoping Opinion (PINS, 2020) in relation to Rampion 2. **Table 1-1** details how each comment has been addressed within this ES.



Page intentionally blank

**Table 1-1 Responses to the Scoping Opinion**

<b>ID</b>	<b>Planning Inspectorate comments</b>	<b>Aspect</b>	<b>How this has been addressed in this ES</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION</b>		
<b>1.1</b>	<b>Background</b>		
<b>1.1.1</b>	On 02 July 2020, the Planning Inspectorate (the Inspectorate) on behalf of the Secretary of State (SoS) received a scoping request from Rampion Extension Development Limited ('RED') (the Applicant) under Regulation 10 of the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (the EIA Regulations) for the proposed Rampion 2 Offshore Wind Farm (the Proposed Development).	General	N/A (no response required).
<b>1.1.2</b>	In accordance with Regulation 10 of the EIA Regulations, an Applicant may ask the SoS to state in writing its opinion 'as to the scope, and level of detail, of the information to be provided in the environmental statement'.	General	N/A (no response required).
<b>1.1.3</b>	This document is the Scoping Opinion (the Opinion) provided by the Inspectorate on behalf of the SoS in respect of the Proposed Development. It is made on the basis of the information provided in the Applicant's report entitled 'Rampion 2 Offshore Wind Farm	General	N/A (no response required).

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
	<p>Environmental Impact Assessment Scoping Report' (the Scoping Report). This Opinion can only reflect the proposals as currently described by the Applicant. The Scoping Opinion should be read in conjunction with the Applicant's Scoping Report.</p>		
1.1.4	<p>The Applicant has notified the SoS under Regulation 8(1)(b) of the EIA Regulations that they propose to provide an Environmental Statement (ES) in respect of the Proposed Development. Therefore, in accordance with Regulation 6(2)(a) of the EIA Regulations, the Proposed Development is EIA development.</p>	General	N/A (no response required).
1.1.5	<p>Regulation 10(9) of the EIA Regulations requires that before adopting a Scoping Opinion the Inspectorate must take into account:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) any information provided about the proposed development;</li> <li>(b) the specific characteristics of the development;</li> <li>(c) the likely significant effects of the development on the environment; and</li> <li>(d) in the case of a subsequent application, the environmental statement submitted with the original application.</li> </ul>	General	N/A (no response required).



ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
1.1.6	This Opinion has taken into account the requirements of the EIA Regulations as well as current best practice towards preparation of an ES.	General	N/A (no response required).
1.1.7	The Inspectorate has consulted on the Applicant's Scoping Report and the responses received from the consultation bodies have been taken into account in adopting this Opinion (see Appendix 2).	General	N/A (no response required).
1.1.8	The points addressed by the Applicant in the Scoping Report have been carefully considered and use has been made of professional judgement and experience in order to adopt this Opinion. It should be noted that when it comes to consider the ES, the Inspectorate will take account of relevant legislation and guidelines. The Inspectorate will not be precluded from requiring additional information if it is considered necessary in connection with the ES submitted with the application for a Development Consent Order (DCO).	General	N/A (no response required).
1.1.9	This Opinion should not be construed as implying that the Inspectorate agrees with the information or comments provided by the Applicant in their request for an opinion from the Inspectorate. In particular, comments from the Inspectorate in this Opinion are without prejudice to any later decisions taken (eg on submission of the application) that any development	General	N/A (no response required).

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
	identified by the Applicant is necessarily to be treated as part of a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP) or Associated Development or development that does not require development consent.		
1.1.10	<p>Regulation 10(3) of the EIA Regulations states that a request for a scoping opinion must include:</p> <p>(a) a plan sufficient to identify the land;</p> <p>(b) a description of the proposed development, including its location and technical capacity</p> <p>(c) an explanation of the likely significant effects of the development on the environment; and</p> <p>(d) such other information or representations as the person making the request may wish to provide or make.</p>	General	N/A (no response required).
1.1.11	The Inspectorate considers that this has been provided in the Applicant's Scoping Report. The Inspectorate is satisfied that the Scoping Report encompasses the relevant aspects identified in the EIA Regulations.	General	This comment is acknowledged.
1.1.12	In accordance with Regulation 14(3)(a), where a scoping opinion has been issued in accordance with Regulation 10 an ES accompanying an application for an order granting development consent should be based on 'the	General	This comment is acknowledged. This Environmental Statement (ES) that has been submitted to accompany the Development Consent Order (DCO) Application has been

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
	most recent scoping opinion adopted (so far as the proposed development remains materially the same as the proposed development which was subject to that opinion)'.  		based on the most recent Scoping Opinion adopted.
1.1.13	The Inspectorate notes the potential need to carry out an assessment under The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 and The Conservation of Offshore Marine Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (the Habitats Regulations). This assessment must be co-ordinated with the EIA in accordance with Regulation 26 of the EIA Regulations. The Applicant's ES should therefore be co-ordinated with any assessment made under the Habitats Regulations.	General	This comment is acknowledged. This ES has been co-ordinated with the Habitats Regulations and a standalone <a href="#">Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment</a> (Document Reference: 5.9) has been submitted to accompany the DCO Application.
1.2	<b>The Planning Inspectorate's Consultation</b>		
1.2.1	In accordance with Regulation 10(6) of the EIA Regulations the Inspectorate has consulted the consultation bodies before adopting this Scoping Opinion. A list of the consultation bodies formally consulted by the Inspectorate is provided at Appendix 1. The consultation bodies have been notified under Regulation 11(1)(a) of the duty imposed on them by Regulation 11(3) of the EIA Regulations to make information available to the Applicant relevant to the preparation of the ES. The Applicant should note that	General	This comment is acknowledged.

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
	whilst the list can inform its consultation, it should not be relied upon for that purpose.		
1.2.2	The list of respondents who replied within the statutory timeframe and whose comments have been taken into account in the preparation of this Opinion is provided, along with copies of their comments, at Appendix 2, to which the Applicant should refer in preparing its ES.	General	N/A (no response required).
1.2.3	The ES submitted by the Applicant should demonstrate consideration of the points raised by the consultation bodies. It is recommended that a table is provided in the ES summarising the scoping responses from the consultation bodies and how they are, or are not, addressed in the ES.	General	This comment is acknowledged. The ES has set out how responses from consultation bodies have been addressed in this Appendix and within tables in each aspect chapter ( <b>Chapters 6: Coastal process to 29: Climate change, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.6 to 6.2.29)).
1.2.4	Any consultation responses received after the statutory deadline for receipt of comments will not be taken into account within this Opinion. Late responses will be forwarded to the Applicant and will be made available on the Inspectorate's website. The Applicant should also give due consideration to those comments in preparing its ES.	General	This comment is acknowledged.
1.3	<b>The European Union (Withdrawal Agreement) Act 2020</b>		

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
1.3.1	The UK left the European Union as a member state on 31 January 2020. The European Union (Withdrawal Agreement) Act 2020 gives effect to transition arrangements that last until the 31 December 2020. This provides for EU law to be retained as UK law and also brings into effect obligations which may come into force during the transition period.	General	N/A (no response required).
1.3.2	This Scoping Opinion has been prepared on the basis of retained law and references within it to European terms have also been retained for consistency with other relevant documents including relevant legislation, guidance and advice notes.	General	This comment is acknowledged.
<b>2</b>	<b>THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT</b>		
<b>2.1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>		
2.1.1	The following is a summary of the information on the Proposed Development and its site and surroundings prepared by the Applicant and included in their Scoping Report. The information has not been verified and it has been assumed that the information provided reflects the existing knowledge of the Proposed Development and the potential receptors/ resources.	General	N/A (no response required).

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
<b>2.2</b>	<b>Description of the Proposed Development</b>		
2.2.1	The Applicant's description of the Proposed Development, its location and technical capacity (where relevant) is provided in sections 1.1 and 2.3 of the Scoping Report.	General	N/A (no response required).
2.2.2	The Proposed Development relates to a new offshore wind farm with an installed capacity of up to 1.2 gigawatts (GW). The Proposed Development is located adjacent to the existing Rampion Offshore Wind Farm ('Rampion 1') in the English Channel, 14km off the coast of Brighton & Hove and approximately 30km east of the Isle of Wight. A location plan is provided in Figure 1.1 of the Scoping Report.	General	N/A (no response required).
2.2.3	<p>The Proposed Development comprises both onshore and offshore infrastructure components as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Offshore wind turbine generators (WTGs) and associated foundations and inter-array cabling</li> <li>• Up to three offshore substations;</li> <li>• Up to four offshore export cables (within a defined cable corridor)</li> <li>• A 'landfall' site using Horizontal Directional drilling (HDD) installation techniques to bring offshore</li> </ul>	General	N/A (no response required).

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
	<p>cables onshore through up to four transition bays near Climping and Littlehampton;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Onshore cabling in a single corridor approximately 36km in length; and</li> <li>A new onshore substation that will connect to the existing substation at Bolney, Mid Sussex.</li> </ul>		
2.2.4	<p>The Scoping Report explains that the number of WTGs to be installed for the Proposed Development would not exceed the number of WTGs installed for the Rampion 1 Offshore Wind Farm. Table 2.2 of the Scoping Report sets out that this will be up to 116 WTGs and also sets out other parameters of the offshore components (eg maximum height to blade tip, foundation types, export cable specifications etc, to the extent that they are known at this stage).</p>	General	N/A (no response required).
2.2.5	<p>The offshore elements of the Proposed Development are situated within an “Area of Search” adjacent to the south east and west of the existing Rampion 1 project. A small area to adjoin / ‘bridge’ the two areas to enable cabling requirements across the full offshore area of the Proposed Development. These areas are shown on Figure 2.8 of the Scoping Report.</p>	General	N/A (no response required).

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
2.2.6	Table 2.3 sets out parameters for the onshore cabling components, for the connection to the National Grid transmission system. As well as the transmission cables, the Proposed Development requires the construction of a new substation and the Applicant is currently considering a number of candidate ‘satellite’ sites (within a radius of 5km of the existing Bolney substation). The anticipated area required for the substation is up to 4.5 hectares (ha). The connection to the existing Bolney substation would require underground cables and minor upgrades.	General	N/A (no response required).
2.2.7	The construction of the Proposed Development is anticipated to take up to five years, as set out in Figure 2.7 of the Scoping Report. During operation, some routine and corrective maintenance activities will be required as set out in paragraphs 2.3.50 – 2.3.56 of the Scoping Report. The operational lifetime of the Proposed Development is assumed to be a minimum of 30 years, followed by a period of decommissioning (likely to be undertaken broadly in reverse to the sequence of construction works and involving similar levels of equipment and activity).	General	N/A (no response required).
<b>2.3 The Planning Inspectorate’s Comments</b>			



ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
2.3.1	<i>Description of the Proposed Development</i> The ES should include the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="365 485 1061 624">• A description of the Proposed Development comprising at least the information on the site, design, size and other relevant features of the development; and</li> <li data-bbox="365 655 1088 831">• A description of the location of the development and description of the physical characteristics of the whole development, including any requisite demolition works and the land-use requirements during construction and operation phases.</li> </ul>	General	An explanation of the Proposed Development is presented in <b>Chapter 4: The Proposed Development, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.4). This includes information on the site design, size, location, physical characteristics, relevant features, and demolition works and the land-use requirements during the construction and operation phases of Rampion 2.
2.3.2	Paragraphs 2.3.50 – 2.3.56 of the Scoping Report provides some detail on operation and maintenance activities. The ES should provide a full description of the nature and scope of these activities, including the types of activity, their frequency, and how works will be carried out for both the onshore and offshore elements of the Proposed Development. This should include consideration for the potential overlapping of activities with those required for the continuing operation of Rampion 1.	General	<b>Chapter 4: The Proposed Development, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.4) provides a description of the nature and scope of operation and maintenance activities, including the types of activity, their frequency, and how works will be carried out for both the onshore and offshore elements of the Proposed Development.
2.3.3	Paragraph 2.3.56 and subsequent aspect sections of the Scoping Report address decommissioning in respect of the Proposed Development. The ES should include the	General	<b>Chapter 4: The Proposed Development, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.4) provides a description of anticipated

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
2.3.4	<p><i>Offshore</i></p> <p>Inter-array cabling and offshore export cables are described as having a “Target depth” for burial of 1m (dependant on cable burial risk assessment). The cable burial risk assessment is recorded as commitment C-45 in appendix A of the Scoping Report, although it is not immediately clear whether this would take place prior to or post any DCO consent. The ES should be clear on the range of burial depths that have been considered as part of the assessment(s). Where reliance is placed on a subsequent risk assessment as mitigation, the ES should also explain the effectiveness and degree of confidence that can be placed on this measure.</p>	General	<p><b>Chapter 4: The Proposed Development, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.4) describes the target burial depth, which will be dependent on the cable burial assessment to be carried out when the cable route is finalised. This will be undertaken post-consent and will be secured through deemed Marine Licence (dML) conditions.</p>

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
2.3.5	<p>The Scoping Report does not explain whether High Voltage Alternating Current (HVAC) or Direct Current (HVDC) technologies are proposed, and the ES should describe the technology proposed or options sought in this regard. The Scoping Report also explains that array cables will be 33kV or 66kV but not the circumstances in which either 33kV or 66kV options would be chosen, or whether it might be a combination of both. The ES should describe these options, any differences in the physical infrastructure requirements and provide an assessment of environmental effects that may result between one or the other (or combined) option</p>	General	<p>High Voltage Alternating Current (HVAC) technologies are proposed as described in <b>Chapter 4: The Proposed Development, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.4).</p> <p><b>Section 3.5 of Chapter 3: Alternatives, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.3) describes the selection process between High Voltage Alternating Current (HVAC) and High Voltage Direct Current (HVDC).</p> <p><b>Chapter 4: The Proposed Development, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.4) describes that the array cables will be up to 132kV, dependent on the latest technology under development.</p>
2.3.6	<p>The Inspectorate understands that preliminary engineering investigations indicate “several” design options for the wind turbine foundations could be considered including monopiles and jackets, and that “other solutions such as suction buckets may be used”. The ES should include a full and detailed description of all the foundation options for which development consent is being sought, including maximum diameter of Piles should they be used. The Inspectorate makes</p>	General	<p><b>Section 4.3 of Chapter 4: The Proposed Development, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.4) describes all options under consideration for the Wind Turbine Generators (WTG) foundations and the maximum assessment assumptions.</p>

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
2.3.7	<p>further comments on flexibility in design in the following paragraphs</p> <p>The Scoping Report identifies the potential need for seabed preparation for foundations and inter array cabling, which may include boulder and/or sandwave clearance. Any requisite seabed preparation for the export cable route should also be described and any resultant likely significant effects assessed within the ES. Should seabed preparation involve dredging, the ES should identify the quantities of dredged material and identify the likely location for disposal. The Applicant's attention is drawn to the scoping consultation response of the Marine Management Organisation (MMO) relating information required as part of the ES in supporting characterisation of new or existing disposal sites if they are to be included as part of the Proposed Development.</p>	General	<p><b>Chapter 4: The Proposed Development, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.4) describes the seabed preparation activities, assessment assumptions for foundations and inter-array cabling. The effects arising from seabed preparation activities for foundations and inter-array cabling are assessed in relevant <b>Chapters 6: Coastal processes to 16: Marine archaeology, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.6 to 6.2.16).</p> <p>Site characterisation of new or existing disposal sites has been undertaken in support of the application for development consent, see <b>Site Characterisation Report</b> (Document Reference: 5.2), and identifies any requirements for a disposal site, in line with the Marine Management Organisation (MMO) scoping consultation response.</p>
2.3.8	<p>The ES should identify the worst-case footprint of seabed disturbance that would arise from all offshore construction activities, for example seabed clearance/preparation, and vessel jack up and</p>	General	<p><b>Section 4.3 of Chapter 4: The Proposed Development, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.4) identifies the worst-case</p>

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
	anchoring. The maximum footprints of all permanent components should also be identified.		footprint of seabed disturbance that will arise from all offshore construction activities.
2.3.9	The Scoping Report states that the construction of the landfall is “anticipated” to be via a trenchless technique “such as” HDD. The Inspectorate notes that commitment C-4 of Scoping Report Appendix A states that a HDD technique “will” be used at the landfall location. No other trenchless or trenched techniques are presented. The ES should describe and assess the options considered in this regard and the assessment of alternatives should explain the reasons for the selected option(s).	General	<p><b>Section 4.4 of Chapter 4: The Proposed Development, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.4) describes the construction of the landfall and techniques to be adopted.</p> <p><b>Chapter 3: Alternatives, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.3) provides a description and assessment of the techniques considered for landfall. The reasons for the selected landfall technique are provided in <b>paragraphs 3.9.14 to 3.9.18 in Chapter 3: Alternatives, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.3).</p>
2.3.10	<p><i>Onshore</i></p> <p>Paragraph 2.3.38 of the Scoping Report explains that, in addition to buried cabling, onshore cable installation methods such as HDD will also be used as required to avoid or minimise potential effects where constraints are identified, including environmentally sensitive water course crossings, major roadways and railways. The ES should identify the locations and type of all such crossings. Where reliance is placed in the ES on the use of a specific method as mitigation, the Applicant should ensure that such commitments are appropriately defined</p>	General	<p><b>Appendix 4.1: Crossings schedule, Volume 4</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.4.1) identifies the locations and types of all trenchless crossings and is cross-referenced in the ES where appropriate. Where reliance is placed in the ES on the use of a specific method as mitigation (such as HDD), the ES ensures that such commitments are appropriately defined and secured.</p> <p><b>Chapter 3: Alternatives, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.3) provides a description and assessment of the techniques</p>

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
	<p>and secured. The Inspectorate notes that commitment C – 18 of the Scoping Report Appendix A refers to a “Crossing Schedule” being produced, and this should be cross-referenced throughout the aspect chapters where special crossing types are relevant.</p>		<p>considered for trenchless crossings in <a href="#">paragraphs 3.9.19 to 3.9.25 in Chapter 3: Alternatives, Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.3).</p> <p><a href="#">Chapter 4: The Proposed Development, Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.4) identifies the locations and types of all trenchless crossings. Where reliance is placed in the ES on the use of a specific method as mitigation, this will be secured through the DCO.</p>
2.3.11	<p>Paragraph 2.3.45 of the Scoping Report explains that onshore cable construction may be phased and there is a possibility that the installation of all onshore cables may not occur in a single operation. It is also explained that haul roads, and any construction compounds will be removed, and reinstatement will take place on completion of the installation. The construction programme should be defined in the ES on the basis of a worst case in respect of phasing periods. The ES should identify where new access routes, either temporary or permanent, are required to access the onshore cable corridor and compounds, as well as the duration for which they will be required in light of phasing (eg how long they will need to be retained for in light of cable installation in multiple operations).</p>	General	<p>The construction programme is defined in <a href="#">Chapter 4: The Proposed Development, Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.4) and is based on a worst case. <a href="#">Chapter 4: The Proposed Development, Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.4) identifies where new access routes, either temporary or permanent, are required to access the onshore cable corridor and construction compounds, as well as the duration for which they will be required in light of phasing (e.g., how long they will need to be retained for in light of cable installation in multiple operations).</p>

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
2.3.12	<p>The Scoping Report identifies the need for joint bays and link boxes “at regular intervals along the route” to enable the cable installation and connection process. Regular intervals are defined as 600 – 1000m in C-19, Appendix A of the Scoping Report, although it does not define whether their locations will be determined by the time the application is made. The Inspectorate anticipates this may not be the case. If uncertainty persists, the ES should identify a worst-case scenario for the number of jointing pits and link boxes that may be required, and their impact during both construction and operation. Where commitments are made at specific locations to mitigate any potential effects, these should be secured through the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) (or equivalent) as referred to at paragraph 4.4.27 of the Scoping Report.</p>	General	<p>Joint Bays (JBs), Fibre Optic Cables (FOC) JBs, and Link Boxes (LBs) are required at regular intervals along the onshore cable route; this is dependent on onshore substation, onshore cable route and length, as described in <b>Chapter 4: The Proposed Development, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.4) (<b>Paragraph 4.5.18</b>). Any impacts associated with JBs, FOC JBs and LBs during construction and, operation and maintenance are identified and assessed in <b>aspects Chapters 17: Socio-economics to 29: Climate change, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.17 to 6.2.29). Where commitments are made at specific locations these are detailed through the <b>Outline CoCP</b> (Document Reference: 7.2).</p>
2.3.13	<p>For the avoidance of doubt, the Inspectorate understands that the connection of the new substation to the existing National Grid Bolney substation would be via underground cabling (as is implied but not expressly stated at paragraphs 2.3.34 – 2.3.48 of the Scoping Report). The Inspectorate expects the ES to provide greater clarity as to the necessary connection works between the new substation and the Bolney substation (up to 5km away). This is particularly important if / where construction and operation of the connection may be of a different form or type (eg overhead line) to the</p>	General	<p>The connection of the new onshore substation to the existing National Grid Bolney substation will be via underground cabling included as part of the Proposed Development. <b>Chapter 4: The Proposed Development, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.4) outlines the necessary extension works to the existing National Grid Bolney substation and works for the cable between the onshore substation and National Grid Bolney substation.</p>



ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
	<p>connection of the new substation to the landfall. In addition, paragraph 2.3.35 states that the existing National Grid Bolney substation would require “underground cables and minor upgrades”, and it is unclear whether these works would be part of the Proposed Development (as associated development) or subject to separate consent by National Grid or another party. These matters should be clearly set out in the ES and likely significant effects should be assessed.</p>		
2.3.14	<p><i>Alternatives</i></p> <p>The EIA Regulations require that the ES include ‘A description of the reasonable alternatives (for example in terms of development design, technology, location, size and scale) studied by the developer, which are relevant to the proposed project and its specific characteristics, and an indication of the main reasons for selecting the chosen option, including a comparison of the environmental effects’.</p>	General	<p><b>Chapter 3: Alternatives, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.3) provides a description of the reasonable alternatives considered by RED throughout the design evolution of the Proposed Development.</p>
2.3.15	<p>The Inspectorate acknowledges section 2.4 of the Applicant’s Scoping Report setting out the consideration of alternatives to date, and ongoing and future activities that are proposed in this regard to inform the ES.</p>	General	<p>This comment is acknowledged.</p>
2.3.16	<p>Paragraph 3.5.21 confirms that the consideration of alternatives will be presented in the ES in line with the</p>	General	<p><b>Chapter 3: Alternatives, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.3) provides a</p>



ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
	<p>requirements of the EIA Regulations 2017. The Inspectorate would expect this to comprise a discrete section in the ES that provides details of the reasonable alternatives studied across all aspects of the Proposed Development and the reasoning for the selection of the chosen option(s), including a comparison of the environmental effects.</p>		<p>description of the reasonable alternatives considered by RED.</p>
2.3.17	<p><i>Flexibility</i></p> <p>The Inspectorate notes the Applicant's desire to incorporate flexibility into their draft DCO (dDCO) and its intention to apply a 'Rochdale Envelope' approach for this purpose. Where the details of the Proposed Development cannot be defined precisely, the Applicant will apply a worst case scenario, as set out in section 2.2 of the Scoping Report. The Inspectorate welcomes the reference to Planning Inspectorate Advice Note nine 'Using the 'Rochdale Envelope' in this regard.</p>	General	<p>The Rochdale Envelope approach has been applied where appropriate. Where applied, a maximum design scenario will be adopted. Assessment assumptions associated with the maximum design scenario are provided throughout <b>Chapter 4: The Proposed Development, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.4), and <b>Chapters 6: Coastal processes to 29: Climate change, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.6 to 6.2.29). The Planning Inspectorate <i>Advice Note Nine 'Using the Rochdale Envelope'</i> (Planning Inspectorate, 2018) has been adhered to.</p>
2.3.18	<p>The Applicant should make every attempt to narrow the range of options and explain clearly in the ES which elements of the Proposed Development have yet to be finalised and provide the reasons. At the time of application, any Proposed Development parameters should not be so wide-ranging as to represent effectively</p>	General	<p><b>Chapter 3: Alternatives, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.3) provides a narrative on how options considered for the Proposed Development have been refined and narrowed during the iterative design process. A summary of the refinement of the design of the Proposed</p>

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
	<p>different developments. The development parameters will need to be clearly defined in the DCO and in the accompanying ES. It is a matter for the Applicant, in preparing an ES, to consider whether it is possible to robustly assess a range of impacts resulting from a large number of undecided parameters. The description of the Proposed Development in the ES must not be so wide that it is insufficiently certain to comply with the requirements of Regulation 14 of the EIA Regulations. In this regard, the Inspectorate expects that the component parameters presented in tables 2.2 and 2.3 of the Scoping Report will be refined and further detailed as part of the ES.</p>		<p>Development between Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) (RED, 2021) and ES is provided in <b>Section 4.1 of Chapter 4: The Proposed Development, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.4). Assessment assumptions are provided throughout <b>Chapter 4: The Proposed Development, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.4).</p>
2.3.19	<p>It should be noted that if the Proposed Development materially changes prior to submission of the DCO application, the Applicant may wish to consider requesting a new scoping opinion.</p>	General	This comment is acknowledged.
<b>3</b>	<b>ES APPROACH</b>		
<b>3.1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>		
3.1.1	<p>This section contains the Inspectorate's specific comments on the scope and level of detail of information to be provided in the Applicant's ES. General advice on the presentation of an ES is provided in the</p>	General	N/A (no response required)

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
3.1.2	<p>Inspectorate's Advice Note Seven 'Environmental Impact Assessment: Process, Preliminary Environmental Information and Environmental Statements'<sup>1</sup> and associated appendices.</p> <p>Aspects/ matters (as defined in Advice Note Seven) are not scoped out unless specifically addressed and justified by the Applicant, and confirmed as being scoped out by the Inspectorate. The ES should be based on the Scoping Opinion in so far as the Proposed Development remains materially the same as the Proposed Development described in the Applicant's Scoping Report.</p>	General	N/A (no response required)
3.1.3	<p>The Inspectorate has set out in this Opinion where it has / has not agreed to scope out certain aspects / matters on the basis of the information available at this time. The Inspectorate is content that the receipt of a Scoping Opinion should not prevent the Applicant from subsequently agreeing with the relevant consultation bodies to scope such aspects / matters out of the ES, where further evidence has been provided to justify this approach. However, in order to demonstrate that the aspects / matters have been appropriately addressed, the ES should explain the reasoning for scoping them out and justify the approach taken.</p>	General	<p><b>Chapter 5: Approach to the EIA, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.5) has set out the aspects/matters considered in this ES. Each aspect chapter (<b>Chapters 6: Coastal processes to 29: Climate change, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.6 to 6.2.29)) sets out activities or impacts scoped out of assessment and the rationale to justify the approach.</p>

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
3.1.4	<p>The Inspectorate has made effort to ensure that this Scoping Opinion is informed through effective consultation with the relevant consultation bodies. Unfortunately, at this time the Inspectorate is unable to receive hard copy consultation responses, and this may affect a consultation body's ability to engage with the scoping process. The Inspectorate also appreciates that strict compliance with COVID-19 advice may affect a consultation body's ability to provide their consultation response. The Inspectorate considers that Applicants should make effort to ensure that they engage effectively with consultation bodies and where necessary further develop the scope of the ES to address their concerns and advice. The ES should include information to demonstrate how such further engagement has been undertaken and how it has influenced the scope of the assessments reported in the ES.</p>	General	<p>Details of the consultation and engagement undertaken is set out in <b>Chapter 5: Approach to the EIA, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.5) and is set out in the <b>Consultation Report</b> (Document Reference: 5.1). <b>Chapters 6: Coastal processes to 29: Climate change, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.6 to 6.2.29) also provide further detail on technical engagement.</p>
3.1.5	<p>Where relevant, the ES should provide reference to how the delivery of measures proposed to prevent / minimise adverse effects is secured through DCO requirements (or other suitably robust methods) and whether relevant consultation bodies agree on the adequacy of the measures proposed.</p>	General	<p><b>Chapter 5: Approach to the EIA, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.5) identifies the overarching approach to environmental measures and <b>Appendix 4.1: Commitments Register, Volume 4</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.4.1) sets out the commitments being made as part of the Rampion 2 design.</p>

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
<b>3.2</b>	<b>Relevant National Policy Statements (NPSs)</b>		
<b>3.2.1</b>	Sector-specific NPSs are produced by the relevant Government Departments and set out national policy for NSIPs. They provide the framework within which the Examining Authority (ExA) will make their recommendation to the SoS and include the Government's objectives for the development of NSIPs. The NPSs may include environmental requirements for NSIPs, which Applicants should address within their ES.	General	The planning policy, legislation, and guidance, including sector-specific National Policy Statements, and how they are considered in this ES are detailed in <b>Chapter 2: Policy and legislative context, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.2). Further detail is also provided in relevant aspect <b>Chapters 6: Coastal processes to 29: Climate change, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.6 to 6.2.29) and the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Document Reference: 5.7).
<b>3.2.2</b>	The designated NPS(s) identified by the Applicant as being relevant to the Proposed Development in section 3.4 of the Scoping Report are as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overarching NPS For Energy (NPS EN-1);</li> <li>• NPS on Renewable Energy Infrastructure (NPS EN-3);</li> <li>• NPS for Electricity Networks Infrastructure (NPS EN-5); and</li> <li>• NPS for Ports.</li> </ul>	General	The planning policy, legislation, and guidance, including sector-specific National Policy Statements, and how they are considered in this ES are detailed in <b>Chapter 2: Policy and legislative context, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.2). Further detail is also provided in relevant aspect <b>Chapters 6: Coastal processes to 29: Climate change, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.6 to 6.2.29) and the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Document Reference: 5.7).  In March 2023 the Department for Energy Security & Net Zero (DESNZ) published revised

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
			<p>draft NPSs including EN-1 (DESNZ, 2023a), EN-3 (DESNZ, 2023b), and EN-5 (DESNZ, 2023c). While this review is undertaken, the current suite of energy NPSs remain relevant UK Government policy and, therefore, the extant 2011 NPSs listed above continue to have effect for the purposes of the Planning Act 2008. On this matter, the transitional arrangements set out in Draft NPS EN-1 (paragraph 1.6.2) confirm that for any application accepted for examination before the designation of the 2023 amendments, the 2011 suite of NPSs should have effect in accordance with the terms of those NPSs.</p> <p>It is considered that the draft NPSs are important and relevant to the determination of Rampion 2 for development consent. Within this Environmental Statement, the draft NPSs are referred to in the policy assessment outline in <b>Chapter 2: Policy and legislative context, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.2) and are considered particularly pertinent to the consideration of the Proposed Development where they provide new or amended policy provisions that differ to the current NPS. Additionally, where applicable, the ES aspect chapters (<b>Chapters 6 to 29, Volume 2</b> (Document References: 6.2.6 to 6.2.29)) provide</p>

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
			a review of draft NPS provisions of relevance to the aspect.
<b>3.3</b>	<b>Scope of Assessment</b>		
<b>3.3.1</b>	The Applicant's overarching approach to the assessment is set out in detail in section 4.4 of the Scoping Report, and graphically summarised in Figure 4.1	General	N/A (no response required)
<b>3.3.2</b>	<p><i>General</i></p> <p>The Inspectorate recommends that in order to assist the decision-making process, the Applicant uses tables:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>to demonstrate how the assessment has taken account of this Opinion;</li> <li>to identify and collate the residual effects after mitigation for each of the aspect chapters, including the relevant interrelationships and cumulative effects;</li> <li>to set out the proposed mitigation and/ or monitoring measures including cross-reference to the means of securing such measures (eg a DCO requirement);</li> </ul>	General	<p>A standard chapter structure, including tables, has been applied throughout this ES to ensure clarity.</p> <p>Each chapter of the ES where relevant includes a table which sets out the Planning Inspectorate Scoping Opinion comments relevant to that chapter and how they have been addressed.</p> <p>Each aspect chapter includes a summary of residual effects table which sets out effects following mitigation (which is all embedded into the Rampion 2 design), a summary of all aspect chapters residual effects is provided in <b>Chapter 31: Summary, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.31). Each aspect chapter includes a cumulative effects assessment which sets out any cumulative effects from the Proposed</p>

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>to describe any remedial measures that are identified as being necessary following monitoring; and</li> <li>to identify where details are contained in the Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA report) (where relevant), such as descriptions of European sites and their locations, together with any mitigation or compensation measures, are to be found in the ES.</li> </ul>		<p>Development in combination with other development. An inter-related effects assessment is provided in <b>Chapter 30: Inter-related effects, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.30).</p> <p>Each aspect chapter includes a table of all relevant embedded environmental measures which are embedded into the design and how they will be secured.</p> <p>The <b>Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment (RIAA)</b> (Document Reference: 5.9) and <b>Habitats Regulations Assessment (Without Prejudice) Derogation Case</b> (Document Reference: 5.10) are provided alongside the ES as separate documents in support of the DCO Application.</p>
3.3.3	<p><i>Baseline Scenario</i></p> <p>The ES should include a description of the baseline scenario with and without implementation of the development as far as natural changes from the baseline scenario can be assessed with reasonable effort on the basis of the availability of environmental information and scientific knowledge.</p>	General	<p>The details of the baseline and future baseline scenarios for each aspect are set out in <b>Chapters 6: Coastal processes to 29: Climate change, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.6 to 6.2.29).</p>



ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
3.3.4	<p>The concept of ‘future baseline’ conditions is introduced in the context of a number of aspect chapters (eg landscape, air quality and ecology). In light of the number of ongoing developments within the vicinity of the Proposed Development application site, and potential evolution of the onshore and offshore environments prior to construction and operation of the Proposed Development, the Applicant should clearly define their overarching approach to the prediction of future baseline conditions against the project programme.</p>	General	<p>The approach to future baseline is discussed in <a href="#">paragraph 5.8.2, Chapter 5: Approach to the EIA, Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.5) and considered as appropriate within relevant aspect <a href="#">Chapters 6: Coastal processes to 29: Climate change, Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.6 to 6.2.29).</p>
3.3.5	<p>Some aspect chapters of the Scoping Report have identified specific receptors, whereas others identify broad categories of receptors only. Specific receptors should be clearly identified within the ES, alongside categorisation of their sensitivity and value. Section 4.4 of the Scoping Report explains the generic approach to defining receptor sensitivity in order to assess the potential impacts upon each receptor. The Inspectorate expects a transparent and reasoned approach to be applied to assigning receptor sensitivity to be defined and applied across the aspect chapters.</p>	General	<p>Specific receptors and aspect approaches to the identification of receptor sensitivity are identified in aspect <a href="#">Chapters 6: Coastal processes to 29: Climate change, Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.6 to 6.2.29).</p>
3.3.6	<p><i>Forecasting Methods or Evidence</i></p> <p>The ES should contain the timescales upon which the surveys which underpin the technical assessments have</p>	General	<p>Timescales upon which the surveys which underpin the technical assessments have been based are provided in each of the aspect <a href="#">Chapters 6: Coastal processes to 29: Climate</a></p>

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
	been based. For clarity, this information should be provided either in the introductory chapters of the ES (with confirmation that these timescales apply to all chapters), or in each aspect chapter.		<b>change, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.6 to 6.2.29).
3.3.7	The Inspectorate expects the ES to include a chapter setting out the overarching methodology for the assessment, which clearly distinguishes effects that are 'significant' from 'non-significant' effects. Any departure from that methodology should be described in individual aspect assessment chapters.	General	<b>Chapter 5: Approach to the EIA, Volume 2</b> (Document Reference: 6.2.5) sets out the overarching methodology for the assessment, with further details and any necessary variations set out in <b>Chapters 6: Coastal processes to 29: Climate change, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.6 to 6.2.29).
3.3.8	The ES should include details of difficulties (for example technical deficiencies or lack of knowledge) encountered compiling the required information and the main uncertainties involved.	General	The details of any technical difficulties or limitations for each aspect are set out in <b>Chapters 6: Coastal processes to 29: Climate change, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.6 to 6.2.29).  <b>Section 5.4 of Chapter 5: Approach to EIA, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.5) sets out some of the challenges and subsequent measures whilst working within the restrictions of the COVID-19 pandemic from 2020 to 2022.

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
3.3.9	<p>The approach to assessing and interpreting significance levels should be consistent across aspect chapters where possible. Where matrices are used in combining magnitude of impact and sensitivity of receptor they too should be consistent in the determining overall significance. The ES should clearly explain where and how professional judgement has been applied in assessing the significance of effects.</p>	General	<p><b>Chapter 5: Approach to the EIA, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.5) sets out the overarching approach to assessing and interpreting significance levels, with further details, use of professional judgement and any necessary variations set out in <b>Chapters 6: Coastal processes to 29: Climate change, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.6 to 6.2.29).</p>
3.3.10	<p>Paragraphs 4.4.10 – 4.4.11 set out that there is a considerable existing evidence base in the form of data from the previous assessment carried out for Rampion 1. This existing evidence base has and will continue to be used “to help inform the scope of the forthcoming environmental assessments and establish the robustness of survey data collected during the COVID-19 period”. The Inspectorate generally welcomes the Applicant’s intention that the evidence base will be regularly discussed with relevant stakeholders to ensure it remains appropriate. Particular consideration should be given to the methods and the spatial and temporal scope of previous surveys given the time that has elapsed since the Rampion 1 application, particularly in justifying the continued validity and relevance of information to the Proposed Development. The Inspectorate also notes the relative geographical separation between the onshore cable routes for</p>	General	<p><b>Section 5.4 of Chapter 5: Approach to the EIA, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.5) sets out some of the challenges and subsequent measures whilst working within the restrictions of the COVID-19 pandemic from 2020 to 2022.</p> <p>The existing evidence base and its application to Rampion 2 has been discussed with stakeholders as part of the Evidence Plan Process (EPP) as described in <b>Section 5.9 of Chapter 5: Approach to the EIA, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.5). The use of existing evidence base is detailed where appropriate within relevant aspect <b>Chapters 6: Coastal processes to 29: Climate</b></p>

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
	Rampion 1 and the Proposed Development which may also affect the applicability.		<b>change, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.6 to 6.2.29).
<b>3.3.11</b>	The Inspectorate understands that the maximum height to blade tip of the Proposed Development's WTGs is 325m, whereas those installed as part of Rampion 1 are 140m to blade tip. This is likely to be a key consideration across the aspect chapters of the ES (particularly landscape and visual, cultural heritage and socio-economics), and the ES should be clear as how the magnitudes of effects of the Proposed Development (within the design envelope) account for the relationship with the Rampion 1 project	General	Details of the maximum assessment assumptions are set out in <b>Chapter 4: The Proposed Development, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.4) and within each aspect <b>Chapters 6: Coastal processes to 29: Climate change, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.6 to 6.2.29). The full assessment of effects of the Wind Turbine Generators (WTGs) in relation to seascape, landscape and visual impact assessment, landscape and visual impact assessment historic environment and socio-economics, is provided in <b>Chapter 15: Seascape, landscape and visual impact assessment, Chapter 17: Socio-economics, Chapter 18: Landscape and visual impact, and Chapter 25: Historic environment, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.15, 6.2.17, 6.2.18 and 6.2.25).
<b>3.3.12</b>	Paragraphs 4.3.10 – 4.3.12 of the Scoping Report explains that an Evidence Plan Process with specialist stakeholders is being progressed in effort to agree the approach and information required to support the assessment of certain environmental aspects relating to HRA matters and “relevant components of the EIA	General	<b>Chapter 5: Approach to the EIA, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.5) sets out the Evidence Plan Process (EPP) for Rampion 2. Agreements achieved through the EPP are documented in the relevant aspect chapters ( <b>Chapters 6: Coastal processes to 29: Climate</b>

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
3.3.13	<p>process". This approach to agreeing the finer details of the assessment is welcomed. The Applicant should ensure that any agreements reached during this process are evidenced within the ES</p> <p>As set out in paragraph 2.3.11 of this Scoping Opinion, the ES should be clear as to the potential construction programme options where the installation of all onshore cables may not occur in a single operation. Paragraph 4.4.26 and Figure 2.7 of the Scoping Report states that the construction of the Proposed Development will have a duration of approximately 5 years although it does not clearly state how this accounts for flexibility in the onshore construction programme and whether this accounts one or more cable installation operations.</p>	General	<p><b>change, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.6 to 6.2.29)).</p> <p>An outline construction programme is provided in <b>Chapter 4: The Proposed Development, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.4).</p>
3.3.14	<p><i>Residues and Emissions</i></p> <p>The EIA Regulations require an estimate, by type and quantity, of expected residues and emissions. Specific reference should be made to water, air, soil and subsoil pollution, noise, vibration, light, heat, radiation and quantities and types of waste produced during the construction and operation phases, where relevant. This information should be provided in a clear and consistent fashion and may be integrated into the relevant aspect assessments.</p>	Multiple	<p>Information on anticipated emissions from the Proposed Development is provided in <b>Chapter 4: The Proposed Development Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.4). and relevant aspect <b>Chapters 6: Coastal processes to 29: Climate change, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.6 to 6.2.29). An <b>Outline Site Waste Management Plan</b> (Document Reference: 7.3) has been prepared and submitted as part of the DCO Application.</p>

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
3.3.15	<p><i>Mitigation and monitoring</i></p> <p>Any mitigation relied upon for the purposes of the assessment should be explained in detail within the ES. The likely efficacy of the mitigation proposed should be explained with reference to residual effects. The ES should also address how any mitigation proposed is secured, with reference to specific DCO requirements or other legally binding agreements.</p>	General	<p>The approach to environmental measures is set out in <b>Section 5.11 of Chapter 5: Approach to the EIA, Volume 2 Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.5). Each aspect <b>Chapter 6: Coastal processes to 29: Climate change Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.6 to 6.2.29) includes a table of all relevant environmental measures which are embedded into the design and how they will be secured and reports any residual effects. The environmental measures are also presented in the <b>Commitments Register</b> (Document Reference: 7.22).</p>
3.3.16	<p>The ES should identify and describe any proposed monitoring of significant adverse effects and how the results of such monitoring would be utilised to inform any necessary remedial actions.</p>	General	<p>Monitoring required of significant adverse effects is detailed in aspect <b>Chapters 6: Coastal process to 29: Climate change Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.6 to 6.2.29) where relevant.</p>
3.3.17	<p>The ES should clearly demonstrate how the Applicant has had regard to the mitigation hierarchy, for example by giving consideration to the avoidance of key receptors. In this regard, Paragraphs 4.4.19 – 4.4.20 set out the Applicant’s proposed approach to setting out avoidance, best practice and design commitments and classifying them against the IEMA ‘Guide to Shaping Quality Development’ (2015) definitions.</p>	General	<p><b>Chapter 5: Approach to the EIA Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.5) sets out the overarching consideration of environmental measures and how they will be used for Rampion 2, with specific measures and requirements set out in <b>Chapters 6: Coastal processes to 29: Climate change Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.6 to 6.2.29).</p>

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
3.3.18	<p>The Inspectorate also notes that Appendix A of the Scoping Report provides a list of certain “commitments” that have already been identified by the project team for the purpose of mitigating potential effects of the Proposed Development. Many of those measures are in the form of management or mitigation plans or other documents. Whilst this approach is generally welcomed and the principles of how the measures listed would likely be beneficial in terms of environmental effects understood, limited detail is provided as to the content of the management and mitigation plans that are listed, and many of the matters included are suffixed by statements such as “where possible” or “as far as practicable”. It is therefore difficult for the Inspectorate to gain confidence as to the likely efficacy of such plans at this stage. The ES should therefore set out these plans (or the reliance placed on them) in sufficient detail so as to understand the significance of residual effects. This should also include identification of any monitoring and remedial actions (if relevant) in the event that predicted residual effects differ to actual monitored outcomes. Further comments on these are made in sections 4 and 5 of this Scoping Opinion as appropriate.</p>	General	<p>The <b>Commitments Register</b> (Document Reference: 7.22) has been updated through the iterative design evolution process and is supported by additional information where appropriate. Where relevant, aspect <b>Chapters 6: Coastal processes to 29: Climate change Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.6 to 6.2.29) set out plans and reliance in order to understand the significance of residual effects.</p>
3.3.19	<p>The ES should also identify and describe any proposed monitoring of significant adverse effects and how the results of such monitoring would be utilised to inform any necessary remedial actions within the framework of</p>	General	<p>Monitoring required of significant adverse effects will be detailed in aspect <b>Chapters 6: Coastal processes to 29: Climate change Volume 2</b> of</p>



ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
	the commitments register and other mitigation measures.		the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.6 to 6.2.29) where relevant.
<b>3.3.20</b>	<p><i>Risks of Major Accidents and/or Disasters</i></p> <p>The ES should include a description and assessment (where relevant) of the likely significant effects resulting from accidents and disasters applicable to the Proposed Development. The Applicant should make use of appropriate guidance (e.g. that referenced in the Health and Safety Executives (HSE) Annex to Advice Note 11) to better understand the likelihood of an occurrence and the Proposed Development's susceptibility to potential major accidents and hazards. The description and assessment should consider the vulnerability of the Proposed Development to a potential accident or disaster and also the Proposed Development's potential to cause an accident or disaster. The assessment should specifically assess significant effects resulting from the risks to human health, cultural heritage or the environment. Any measures that will be employed to prevent and control significant effects should be presented in the ES.</p>	General	<p>Risk of major accidents and/or disasters has been included in this ES and is set out in <b>Chapter 27: Major accidents and disasters Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.27).</p>
<b>3.3.21</b>	<p>Relevant information available and obtained through risk assessments pursuant to European Union legislation such as Directive 2012/18/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council or Council Directive</p>	General	<p>Risk of major accidents and/or disasters has been included in this ES and is set out in <b>Chapter 27: Major accidents and disasters</b></p>



ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
	<p>2009/71/Euratom or relevant assessments carried out pursuant to national legislation may be used for this purpose provided that the requirements of this Directive are met. where appropriate, this description should include measures envisaged to prevent or mitigate the significant adverse effects of such events on the environment and details of the preparedness for and proposed response to such emergencies.</p>		<p><b>Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.27).</p>
3.3.22	<p><i>Climate and Climate Change</i></p> <p>The ES should include a description and assessment (where relevant) of the likely significant effects the Proposed Development has on climate (for example having regard to the nature and magnitude of greenhouse gas emissions) and the vulnerability of the project to climate change. Where relevant, the ES should describe and assess the adaptive capacity that has been incorporated into the design of the Proposed Development. This may include, for example, alternative measures such as changes in the use of materials or construction and design techniques that will be more resilient to risks from climate change</p>	General	<p><b>Chapter 29: Climate change, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.29) provides an assessment of greenhouse gases from the construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases of the Proposed Development. It compares emissions from a scenario where the Proposed Development is not built; and the scenario where the Proposed Development with embedded environmental measures is built.</p> <p>Consideration of vulnerability to climate change has been included within relevant chapters of this ES and in further documentation supplied for planning purposes. <b>Chapter 29: Climate change, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.29) provides a summary of the policy and climatic baseline relevant to the Proposed Development. Where climate change</p>

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
3.3.23	<p><i>Transboundary Effects</i></p> <p>Schedule 4 Part 5 of the EIA Regulations requires a description of the likely significant transboundary effects to be provided in an ES. The Scoping Report states that the Proposed Development is likely to have significant effects on another European Economic Area (EEA) State.</p>	General	<p>may exacerbate any potential environmental effects, it is incorporated into all relevant chapters within this ES, as described in <b>Chapter 29: Climate change, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.29). Where environmental measures for climate change resilience have been incorporated into the design of the Proposed Development, these are described in the <b>Design and Access Statement</b> (Document Reference: 5.8).</p>
3.3.24	<p>Regulation 32 of the EIA Regulations inter alia requires the Inspectorate to publicise a DCO application on behalf of the SoS if it is of the view that the proposal is likely to have significant effects on the environment of another EEA state, and where relevant, to consult with the EEA state affected. The Inspectorate considers that</p>	General	N/A (no response required)

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
	where Regulation 32 applies, this is likely to have implications for the examination of a DCO application.		
3.3.25	<p>Appendix B of the Scoping Report explains the Applicant's consideration of transboundary impacts, and concludes that the following aspects could give rise to significant effects on other EEA states and therefore screened in to the Applicant's ES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fish and shellfish ecology;</li> <li>• Marine mammals;</li> <li>• Ornithology;</li> <li>• Commercial fisheries;</li> <li>• Shipping and navigation; and</li> <li>• Other marine users.</li> </ul>	General	N/A (no response required)
3.3.26	<p>On the basis of current information, the Applicant is of the view that the Proposed Development could affect the environment in Belgium, France, the Netherlands and Spain.</p>	General	N/A (no response required)
3.3.27	<p>The Inspectorate expects that the ES will therefore provide further detail as to the Proposed Development's</p>	General	<p>The transboundary assessment approach was established at the scoping stage see the Scoping Report, Appendix B (RED, 2020). The approach</p>

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
	potential for significant transboundary effects and to confirm which EEA States could be affected		to the assessment of transboundary effects is set out in <b>Section 5.14 of Chapter 5: Approach to the EIA, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.5), and where relevant, is discussed in aspect <b>Chapters 6: Coastal processes to 29: Climate change, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.6 to 6.2.29).
<b>3.3.28</b>	<i>A Reference List</i> A reference list detailing the sources used for the descriptions and assessments must be included in the ES.	General	A reference list is provided with each chapter of this ES ( <b>Chapter 1: Introduction to Chapter 31: Summary, Volume 2</b> of this ES (Document Reference: 6.2.1 to 6.2.31).
<b>3.4</b>	<b>Coronavirus (COVID-19) Environmental Information and Data Collection</b>		
<b>3.4.1</b>	The Inspectorate understands government enforced measures in response to COVID-19 may have consequences for an Applicant's ability to obtain relevant environmental information for the purposes of their ES. The Inspectorate understands that conducting specific surveys and obtaining representative data may be difficult in the current circumstance.	General	N/A (no response required)
<b>3.4.2</b>	The Inspectorate has a duty to ensure that the environmental assessments necessary to inform a robust DCO application are supported by relevant and up to date information. Working closely with consultation	General	N/A (no response required)

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
	<p>bodies, the Inspectorate will seek to adopt a flexible approach, balancing the requirement for suitable rigour and scientific certainty in assessments with pragmatism in order to support the preparation and determination of applications in a timely fashion.</p>		
3.4.3	<p>Applicants should make effort to agree their approach to the collection and presentation of information with relevant consultation bodies. In turn the Inspectorate expects that consultation bodies will work with Applicants to find suitable approaches and points of reference to allow preparation of applications at this time. The Inspectorate is required to take into account the advice it receives from the consultation bodies and will continue to do so in this regard.</p>	General	N/A (no response required)
3.5	<b>Confidential and Sensitive Information</b>		
3.5.1	<p>In some circumstances it will be appropriate for information to be kept confidential. In particular, this may relate to personal information specifying the names and qualifications of those undertaking the assessments and / or the presence and locations of rare or sensitive species such as badgers, rare birds and plants where disturbance, damage, persecution or commercial exploitation may result from publication of the information.</p>	General	N/A (no response required)

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
3.5.2	Where documents are intended to remain confidential the Applicant should provide these as separate electronic documents with their confidential nature clearly indicated in the title and watermarked as such on each page. The information should not be incorporated within other documents that are intended for publication or which the Inspectorate would be required to disclose under the Environmental Information Regulations 2004.	General	Information within the ES which is required to be confidential will be clearly marked and produced as separate documents.
3.5.3	The Inspectorate adheres to the data protection protocols set down by the Information Commissioners Office <sup>1</sup> Please refer to the Inspectorate's National Infrastructure privacy notice <sup>2</sup> for further information on how personal data is managed during the Planning Act 2008 process.	General	N/A (no response required)
<b>4</b>	<b>ASPECT BASED SCOPING TABLES - OFFSHORE</b>		
<b>4.1</b>	<b>Coastal processes</b>		
4.1.1	No matters are proposed to be scoped out of the assessment	Coastal processes	This comment is acknowledged.

<sup>1</sup> <https://ico.org.uk> [footnote taken from Planning Inspectorate Scoping Opinion (RED, 2020)]

<sup>2</sup> <https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/help/privacy-notice/> [footnote taken from Planning Inspectorate Scoping Opinion (RED, 2020)]

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
4.1.2	The Scoping Report states that the potential impact of the design of the Proposed Development will be assessed “both alone and in conjunction with the built design of the existing Rampion project”. It is unclear why the Proposed Development would be assessed alone given that Rampion 1 is now entirely completed. The ES should assess the impacts of the Proposed Development in the context of the relevant baseline environment.	Coastal processes	Potential changes to waves and currents caused by maximum design scenario (MDS) foundations in Rampion 2 are assessed in <a href="#">paragraphs 6.10.11 to 6.10.17</a> of <a href="#">Chapter 6: Coastal processes, Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.6) against a baseline environmental condition that includes the number, type, dimensions and locations of foundations built in Rampion 1.
4.1.3	The Scoping Report states that the assessment for Rampion 1 was overly conservative and overestimated the number of structures built, yet it asserts that the results of the previous modelling remain valid and can reliably support the ES for the Proposed Development. The ES should ensure that potential changes to the wave and hydrodynamic regime are assessed against an accurately described baseline so as not to underestimate the scale and significance of effects.	Coastal processes	<p>Potential changes to waves caused by MDS foundations in Rampion 2 are assessed in <a href="#">paragraphs 6.10.11 to 6.10.17</a> of <a href="#">Chapter 6: Coastal processes, Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.6) using a new numerical model which includes Rampion 1 in the baseline.</p> <p>Potential changes to currents caused by MDS foundations in Rampion 2 are assessed in <a href="#">paragraphs 6.10.1 to 6.10.10</a> of <a href="#">Chapter 6: Coastal processes, Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.6) using a desktop assessment that uses previous conservative modelling results (based on a greater total number of larger foundations) to realistically account for the maximum likely effect of the</p>

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
4.1.4	<p>The Scoping Report does not address impacts on tidal, wave and sediment transport regime or seabed scour during construction and decommissioning of the Proposed Development. The ES should include an assessment of the impacts associated with changes to tidal, wave and sediment transport regime and seabed scour where significant effects are likely to occur. The Applicant should make effort to agree the approach with relevant consultation bodies including NE and the MMO.</p>	Coastal processes	<p>smaller number, type, dimensions and locations of foundations subsequently built in Rampion 1.</p> <p>Potential changes to waves, currents and sediment transport, and scour caused by all MDS infrastructure (foundations and cable protection) in Rampion 2 during the O&amp;M phase are assessed in <a href="#">paragraphs 6.10.38 to 6.10.44</a> of <a href="#">Chapter 6: Coastal processes, Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.6).</p> <p>Potential changes of similar or lesser magnitude and extent caused by any less than all MDS infrastructure during the construction and decommissioning phases are separately assessed in <a href="#">paragraphs 6.9.75 to 6.9.79</a> and <a href="#">paragraphs 6.11.17 to 6.11.22</a> of <a href="#">Chapter 6: Coastal processes, Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.6) respectively (using the same MDS as for all infrastructure present).</p> <p>A number of ETG meetings, described in <a href="#">Section 6.3</a> of <a href="#">Chapter 6: Coastal processes, Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.6) were held to discuss and agree the approach with relevant consultation bodies including Natural England, Cefas and the MMO.</p>



ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
4.1.5	<p>SSSIs along the coastline (as shown in Figure 5.11.3) have not been listed as sensitive receptors in this regard.</p> <p>The ES should present a full list of designated sites that have the potential to be impacted in terms of coastal processes, including any effects on Climping Beach SSSI (in relation to changes to landfall morphology) and Beachy Head East MCZ and the Bembridge MCZ.</p>	Coastal processes	<p>Potential changes to waves, currents and sediment transport, and scour caused by all MDS infrastructure (foundations and cable protection) in Rampion 2 during the O&amp;M phase are assessed in <a href="#">paragraphs 6.10.38 to 6.10.44</a>, <a href="#">Chapter 6: Coastal processes, Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.6).</p> <p>Potential changes of similar or lesser magnitude and extent caused by any less than all MDS infrastructure during the construction and decommissioning phases are separately assessed in <a href="#">paragraphs 6.9.75 to 6.9.79</a> and <a href="#">paragraphs 6.11.7 to 6.11.22</a>, <a href="#">Chapter 6: Coastal processes, Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.6), respectively (using the same MDS as for all infrastructure present). A number of ETG meetings, described in <a href="#">Section 6.3 of Chapter 6: Coastal processes, Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.6) were held to discuss and agree the approach with relevant consultation bodies including Natural England, Cefas and the MMO.</p>
4.1.6	<p>The Scoping Report does not address the likelihood of the potential impacts to the sediment transport regime to act cumulatively with other developments and/or infrastructure (including the Aquind interconnector). The ES should include an assessment of the cumulative</p>	Coastal processes	<p>Potential changes to waves, currents and sediment transport, and scour caused by all MDS infrastructure (foundations and cable protection) in Rampion 2 during the operation and maintenance phase are assessed in <a href="#">paragraphs</a></p>

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
	impacts on the sediment transport regime where significant effects are likely to occur.		<p><b>6.10.38 to 6.10.44</b> of <b>Chapter 6: Coastal processes, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.6).</p> <p>Potential changes of similar or lesser magnitude and extent caused by any less than all MDS infrastructure during the construction and decommissioning phases are separately assessed in <b>paragraphs 6.9.75 to 6.9.79</b>, and in <b>paragraphs 6.11.17 to 6.11.22, Chapter 6: Coastal processes, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.6) respectively (using the same MDS as for all infrastructure present).</p> <p>A number of ETG meetings, described in <b>Section 6.3, Chapter 6: Coastal processes, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference 6.2.6), were held to discuss and agree the approach with relevant consultation bodies including Natural England, Cefas and the MMO.</p>
<b>4.2</b>	<b>Other marine users</b>		
<b>4.2.1</b>	The Scoping Report demonstrates no spatial overlap between the study area and existing oil and gas infrastructure. The Inspectorate is content for these receptors to be scoped out of the assessment.	Other marine users	This has been noted by RED and on this basis effects on oil and gas infrastructure have been scoped out from this assessment.

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
4.2.2	<p>The Scoping Report demonstrates no spatial overlap between the study area and munitions disposal areas or MoD practice or exercise areas (PEXAs). The Inspectorate is content for these receptors to be scoped out of the assessment (with the exception of MoD Danger Area D037, see the following paragraph). The Inspectorate notes the comments of the MoD around the potential overlap between the Proposed Development would and Danger Area boundary for D037 which could impact on Military training and the Navy's freedom to exercise within the Area. This matter should be considered as part of the ES where significant effects are likely to occur.</p>	Other marine users	<p>This has been included within the ES baseline (<a href="#">Section 7.6, Chapter 7: Other marine users, Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.7)) and assessed in <a href="#">Section 7.9, Chapter 7: Other marine users Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.7) onwards. It is also important to note that the overlap with DCO Order limits and D037 has now been removed. The potential exists for a temporary safety zone to overlap with D037 during construction or major maintenance but as described in <a href="#">paragraph 7.9.58, Chapter 7: Other marine users Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.7) this will only affect a very small portion of D037 and is of temporary and intermittent duration. RED will ensure ongoing engagement and consultation with the MoD (as set out in <a href="#">Table 7-5, Chapter 7: Other marine users Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.7)) in order to establish and agree management measures to limit the potential for construction activities to impinge on any military exercises to avoid impacts to the use of the PEXA.</p>
4.2.3	<p>The Scoping Report demonstrates no spatial overlap between the study area and other offshore energy</p>	Other marine users	<p>This has been noted by RED and on this basis effects on other offshore energy infrastructure have been scoped out from this assessment.</p>

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
4.2.4	<p>infrastructure. The Inspectorate is content for these receptors to be scoped out of the assessment.</p> <p>The Scoping Report seeks to scope out recreational fishing and seaweed farming from the assessments of temporary increases in suspended sediments and deposition, and alteration in wave energy direction. The Scoping Report provides no information regarding the local seaweed farming industry, and no justification for scoping out effects on recreational fishing. The Inspectorate does not agree to scope this aspect out of the ES based on current information.</p>	Other marine users	<p>Local seaweed farming and recreational fishing information has been included within the ES baseline presented in <a href="#">Section 7.6, Chapter 7: Other marine users Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.7), with relevant receptors taken through to assessment (<a href="#">Section 7.9, Chapter 7: Other marine users Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.7) onwards).</p>
4.2.5	<p>No justification is given to scope out this matter, however the Inspectorate considers that given their nature significant effects are unlikely to occur to these receptors and they can be scoped out of the assessment. The ES should set out any measures intended to control impacts of this sort through provisions in the relevant embedded measures through DCO requirements and other relevant commitments.</p>	Other marine users	<p>This has been noted by RED and on this basis effects from the temporary increase in suspended sediments and deposition on recreational boating have been scoped out from this assessment. The proposed methods for construction and installation of infrastructure are considered throughout the ES where relevant and appropriate embedded environmental measures are detailed to address significant effects, where relevant.</p>
4.2.6	<p>No justification is given to scope out these impacts however the Inspectorate agrees that significant effects</p>	Other marine users	<p>This has been noted by RED and on this basis the impact of increased subsea noise on aggregates, disposal sites, offshore wind, subsea</p>

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
	are unlikely to occur due to the nature of the receptors and agrees they can be scoped out of the assessment.		cables and pipelines and recreational boating and sailing have been scoped out from this assessment.
4.2.7	No justification is given to scope out these impacts. The Inspectorate considers that insufficient justification has been provided to scope out the effects on recreational boating and sailing. However, for receptors others than recreational boating and sailing, the Inspectorate agrees that significant effects are unlikely to occur due to the nature and sensitivity of the receptors and they can be scoped out of the assessment.	Other marine users	This has been noted by RED and on this basis the effects from the alteration in wave energy direction and period on aggregates, disposal sites, offshore wind and subsea cables and pipelines have been scoped out from this assessment. Effects from alteration in wave energy direction and period on recreational boating and sailing diving and water sports are considered further in <a href="#">Section 7.6, Chapter 7: Other marine users Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.7).
4.2.8	The Scoping Report makes no mention of the aquaculture industry as a potential receptor. This is not addressed in Chapter 5.6 for Commercial Fisheries either. The ES should assess the impacts from the Proposed Development to the aquaculture sector where significant effects are likely to occur.	Other marine users	Aquaculture has been included within this assessment's current and future baseline ( <a href="#">Section 7.6, Chapter 7: Other marine users Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.7)), however there is currently no spatial overlap with the Zone of Influence (Zoi) and any proposed aquaculture and therefore no further consideration for assessment has been presented in this ES (as explained in <a href="#">Table 7-8, Chapter 7: Other marine users Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.7)).

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
<b>4.3</b>	<b>Fish and shellfish ecology</b>		
<b>4.3.1</b>	Although the Inspectorate notes the basis of the evidence provided to support the Applicant's proposed approach (Orpwood et al. (2015) and Armstrong et al. (2015)), the MMO and its technical advisors do not support these findings. In their view, significant uncertainties concerning electromagnetic effects remain. The Inspectorate therefore does not agree that likely significant effects upon fish receptors from operational EMF can be excluded at this stage and this matter should remain scoped into the ES.	Fish and shellfish ecology	The impacts of EMF on sensitive fish and shellfish species have been addressed in <a href="#">Section 8.10, Chapter 8: Fish and shellfish ecology, Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.8) using available literature to undertake a precautionary assessment.
<b>4.3.2</b>	The Inspectorate agrees that, with the implementation of measures to limit any potential pollution incidents, any potential impacts on fish and shellfish are unlikely to result in significant effects and therefore further assessment is not required. However, the Inspectorate seeks assurances as to the detail of such measures that would be employed and how they would be secured and therefore considers that this detail should be presented within the ES.	Fish and shellfish ecology	This comment is acknowledged. Proposed environmental measures and how they will be secured are set out in <a href="#">Section 8.7, Chapter 8: Fish and shellfish ecology, Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.8).
<b>4.3.3</b>	The Inspectorate agrees on the basis of the evidence provided and the nature of the Proposed Development that direct and indirect impacts to the seabed resulting in the release of sediment contaminants during	Fish and shellfish ecology	This comment is acknowledged.

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
	construction and decommissioning on fish and shellfish receptors can be scoped out of the ES.		
4.3.4	Para 5.4.29 states that the proposed development may impact on less mobile species such as whelk, lobster and scallop. This stands at odds with para 5.4.44 which states “Species present that will be subject to disturbance are likely to be mobile and can therefore move away from the construction activities.” In the absence of information such as evidence demonstrating clear agreement with relevant consultation bodies, the Inspectorate does not agree to scope this matter out. Accordingly, the ES should include an assessment of this matter where significant effects are likely.	Fish and shellfish ecology	The potential impact on these species is considered in <a href="#">Section 8.9 to 8.12, Chapter 8: Fish and shellfish ecology, Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.8).
4.3.5	The Inspectorate is content that there is unlikely to be significant effects from underwater noise during operation and therefore agrees that this matter can be scoped out of the fish and shellfish assessment.	Fish and shellfish ecology	This comment is acknowledged.
4.3.6	The Inspectorate does not consider there is sufficient information in the Scoping Report to support scoping out direct disturbance resulting from maintenance within the array area and the offshore cable corridor during operation (for example frequency, duration and nature of such activities). Depending on the nature of the maintenance works and the species present in the area	Fish and shellfish ecology	Potential impacts from direct disturbance resulting from maintenance within the array area and the offshore export cable corridor have been considered in <a href="#">Section 8.10, Chapter 8: Fish and shellfish ecology, Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.8).

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
4.3.7	there could be a likely significant effect which should be assessed as part of the ES on the basis of the anticipated maintenance programme.	Fish and shellfish ecology	This comment is acknowledged.
4.3.8	The Inspectorate agrees that this matter can be scoped out of the ES on the basis that displacement is only expected to be short term in duration (construction phase) and of limited spatial extent as part of the wider study area. Relevant matters are considered as part of scope of the commercial fisheries section.	Fish and shellfish ecology	This comment is acknowledged.
4.3.9	It is noted that baseline section of the Scoping Report does not clearly identify the conservation status of the fish and shellfish species discussed. The ES should identify, value, and assess impacts on protected species and species of conservation concern, where significant effects are likely.	Fish and shellfish ecology	Species of conservation importance are identified in <b>Section 8.6, Chapter 8: Fish and shellfish ecology, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.8). Potential impacts on these species are considered in <b>Section 8.9 to 8.12, Chapter 8: Fish and shellfish ecology, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.8).



ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
4.3.10	There are locally important populations of undulate ray in the vicinity of the Proposed Development, and as such, impacts to undulate ray nursery grounds should be assessed within the ES.	Fish and shellfish ecology	The potential impacts on elasmobranchs, including undulate ray is considered in, <a href="#">Section 8.9 to 2.12 of Chapter 8: Fish and shellfish ecology, Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.8)
4.3.11	The Scoping Report does not propose any updated fish or shellfish surveys as there is intent to rely upon data collected for Rampion 1. As Rampion 1 was completed in 2018, it is considered that the fish and shellfish numbers or species may have changed during this time, and potentially as a direct result of the operation of Rampion 1. The Inspectorate does not specifically agree it is appropriate that no additional data collection is required based on the information presented in the Scoping Report. The Inspectorate considers the need for fish and shellfish surveys to be updated should be specifically considered as part of the Evidence Plan Process and reported in the ES. The ES should then justify the validity of the evidence base in informing a robust assessment of significant effects.	Fish and shellfish ecology	<p>Datasets used to inform the fish and shellfish ecology chapter are provided in <a href="#">Section 8.5, Chapter 8: Fish and shellfish ecology, Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.8).</p> <p>As part of the EPP, it was agreed with the fish and shellfish ETG that adequate information had been provided for the baseline characterisation, and with the exception of black seabream, further fish and shellfish surveys were not considered necessary for the assessment.</p> <p>Site specific geophysical surveys were conducted across the entire proposed DCO Order Limits, which allows the consideration of likely distribution of black seabream nests, and nesting habitat potential outside the Kingmere MCZ based on seabed characteristics (<a href="#">paragraphs 8.6.82 to 8.6.84 of Chapter 8: Fish and shellfish ecology, Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.8)).</p> <p>The site-specific surveys complement long term black seabream nest distribution data collected</p>

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
<p>within the export cable corridor, Kingmere MCZ and the nearfield Zone of Influence (ZOI) to inform licensing decisions for the aggregate industry, black seabream catch and release data, and regional geological data, the composite of which is described <b>Chapter 8: Fish and shellfish ecology, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.8), and completes a comprehensive baseline characterisation fit for the purposes of EIA.</p>			
<p><b>4.4 Benthic subtidal and intertidal ecology</b></p>			
4.4.1	<p>The Inspectorate agrees that, with the implementation of measures to limit any potential pollution incidents, any potential impacts on benthic subtidal and intertidal ecology are unlikely to result in significant effects and therefore further assessment is not required. However, the Inspectorate seeks assurances as to the detail of such measures that would be employed and how they would be secured and therefore considers that this detail should be described within the ES.</p>	<p>Benthic, subtidal and intertidal ecology</p>	<p>The likelihood of an incident will be reduced by implementation of an <b>Outline Project Environmental Management Plan (PEMP)</b> (Document Reference: 7.11) details of which are presented in <b>Section 9.7</b> and <b>Table 9-16 of Chapter 9: Benthic, subtidal and intertidal ecology, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.8). The impacts of accidental pollution events have also been addressed within the assessment <b>Section 9.9 to 9.12, Chapter 9: Benthic, subtidal and intertidal ecology, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.8) using available literature to undertake a precautionary assessment.</p>

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
4.4.2	<p>Although the Inspectorate notes the basis of the evidence provided to support the Applicant's proposed approach (Orpwood et al. (2015) and Armstrong et al. (2015)), the MMO and its technical advisors do not support these findings. The Inspectorate is of the view that uncertainties concerning operation effects of electromagnetic effects remain. The Inspectorate therefore does not agree that likely significant effects upon fish receptors from operational EMF can be excluded at this stage and this matter should remain scoped in to the ES.</p>	<p>Benthic, subtidal and intertidal ecology</p>	<p>The impacts of EMF on sensitive benthic subtidal ecology receptors have been addressed in <b>Section 9.10, Chapter 9: Benthic, subtidal and intertidal ecology, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.9) using available literature to undertake a precautionary assessment.</p> <p>Specific EMF impacts on elasmobranch, fish and shellfish are considered in <b>Section 8.10 of Chapter 8: Fish and shellfish ecology, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference 6.2.8).</p>
4.4.3	<p>The Scoping Report provides limited evidence to support the request and nothing to demonstrate agreement with relevant consultation bodies. The Inspectorate is not in a position to agree to scope these matters from the assessment. Accordingly, the ES should include an assessment of these matters where significant effects are likely to occur.</p>	<p>Benthic, subtidal and intertidal ecology</p>	<p>The impacts of noise pollution during construction related activities have been addressed within the assessment in <b>Section 9.9, Chapter 9: Benthic, subtidal and intertidal ecology, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.9) using available literature to undertake a precautionary assessment.</p>
4.4.4	<p>Table 5.5.2 identifies designated sites and their features which have been screened in for assessment and these include European and nationally designated sites. The ES should ensure that impacts on protected habitats and species (including, but not limited to, those protected under the Habitats Directive, Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, NERC Act s41 habitats and</p>	<p>Benthic, subtidal and intertidal ecology</p>	<p>Impacts on protected habitats and species, together with local BAP habitats and species and other habitats/species of conservation concern have been assessed within <b>Section 9.9, Chapter 9: Benthic, subtidal and intertidal ecology, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference:</p>

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
4.4.5	<p>species of principal importance), together with local Biodiversity Action Plan (LBAP) habitats and species and other habitats/species of conservation concern are assessed where significant effects are likely.</p> <p>It is not yet confirmed which method of cable protection will be adopted for the proposed development, though it is noted that cable burial is the preferred option. The ES should explain the types of cable protection which could be used, and the associated impacts upon benthic subtidal and intertidal ecology.</p>	Benthic, subtidal and intertidal ecology	<p>6.2.9) using available literature to undertake a precautionary assessment.</p> <p>The exact form of cable protection to be used will depend upon local ground conditions, hydrodynamic regime/processes, and the selected cable protection contractor. However, the final choice will include one or more of the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) concrete ‘mattresses’;</li> <li>2) rock placement;</li> <li>3) geotextile bags filled with stone, rock or gravel;</li> <li>4) polyethylene or steel pipe half shells, or sheathes; and/or</li> <li>5) bags of grout, concrete, or another substance that cures hard over time.</li> </ol> <p>The impacts of introduced artificial substrates have been addressed in <b>Section 9.10, Chapter 9: Benthic, subtidal and intertidal ecology, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.9) using available literature and a worst-case</p>

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
4.4.6	It is understood that of the eleven sites sampled, four supported levels of contaminants in excess of Action Level 1 for Arsenic and Chromium. The ES should explain the significance of this finding, and the risk posed from any other contaminants found in the context of characterising the whole survey area.	Benthic, subtidal and intertidal ecology	scenario to undertake a precautionary assessment.  The impacts of sediment contamination have been addressed within the assessment <a href="#">Section 9.9 to 9.12, Chapter 9: Benthic, subtidal and intertidal ecology, Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.9), using available literature to undertake a precautionary assessment.
4.4.7	The ES should include an assessment of the potential for the spread of non-indigenous species via the colonisation of hard substrates and for the Proposed Development to be used to reach the designated hard habitats in the adjacent Kingmere MCZ.	Benthic, subtidal and intertidal ecology	The impacts of Marine Invasive Not Native Species (INNS) have been addressed within the assessment <a href="#">Section 9.9 to Section 9.12, Chapter 9: Benthic, subtidal and intertidal ecology, Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.9), using available literature to undertake a precautionary assessment.
4.5	<b>Commercial fisheries</b>		
4.5.1	The Scoping Report proposes to scope this matter out of the ES on the basis that the impact will be localised and not significant due to the implementation of the mitigation measure to give adequate notification. The Inspectorate agrees that this matter can be scoped out of the impact assessment having regard to the likely	Commercial fisheries	Whilst the Scoping Opinion agreed with the proposed scoping out of the potential impact, subsequent consultation has indicated that some stakeholders are concerned about the effects of Rampion 2 on steaming times to alternate fishing grounds. RED acknowledge that this potential

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
	magnitude and on the basis that significant effects are unlikely to occur.		impact merits more detailed assessment for all project phases; impact assessment outcomes are therefore presented in <a href="#">Sections 10.9 and 10.11, Chapter 10: Commercial fisheries, Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.10).
<b>4.6</b>	<b>Marine mammals</b>		
<b>4.6.1</b>	The Inspectorate agrees with the rationale and technical comments of the MMO in paragraphs 3.9.5 - 3.9.12 of their response the scoping consultation regarding the need for assessment of TTS (also supported by Natural England). The Inspectorate is of the view that were TTS to be excluded from underwater noise assessments, the risk of cognitive impairment (TTS) will not be reflected in the overall assessment of risk to marine mammals, despite evidence in literature to suggest the potential for significant harm to individuals. The ES should therefore assess impacts to TTS from the Proposed Development across all marine mammal species scoped into the assessment where significant effects are likely to occur.	Marine mammals	Consideration of the potential for Temporary Threshold Shift (TTS) effects on marine mammals has been included within <a href="#">Sections 11.9 to 11.12, Chapter 11: Marine mammals, Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.11) as appropriate.
<b>4.6.2</b>	The Scoping Report seeks to scope out noise from these activities on the basis that noise impacts will be “low in terms of intensity and duration, with a very localised risk”, and that that risk is effectively contained within the assessment of ‘vessel disturbance’ activity	Marine mammals	The potential effects arising from underwater noise from these other, non-piling, sound sources have been assessed within <a href="#">Sections 11.9 to 11.12, Chapter 11: Marine mammals, Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.11).

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
	<p>(and ZOI defined in that respect). Without further reference to durations and methodologies of such activities in relation to vessel disturbance, and empirical evidence of the magnitudes of noise impacts from these activities when compared to vessel noise, the Inspectorate does not agree that they can be scoped out on the basis of the information provided. The Inspectorate also considers that there is the potential that noise generated from these activities could combine with vessel noise resulting in an overall larger impact and potentially more significant effect on marine mammals.</p>		
4.6.3	<p>The Inspectorate is content that the potential for reduction in prey availability to result in a significant effect on marine mammals during operation can be scoped out of further assessment. The Inspectorate does not agree that such a conclusion is supported by the information available at this stage in respect of construction phase impacts. The Scoping Report states that there would be no significant direct effects on marine mammal prey species during construction (see the Benthic Ecology (5.5) and Fish and Shellfish Ecology (5.4) sections of the Scoping Report). The Inspectorate does not agree that significant indirect effects on marine mammals from loss of prey can be excluded at this stage.</p>	Marine mammals	<p>The potential for indirect effects to marine mammals due to potential changes in prey availability during construction has been considered within <a href="#">Section 11.9, Chapter 11: Marine mammals, Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.11).</p>

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
4.6.4	<p>The Applicant seeks to scope out the risks to marine mammals of accidental pollution occurring during construction, operation &amp; maintenance or decommissioning of the Proposed Development on the basis that a Marine Pollution Contingency Plan (MPCP) and emergency response plans will be implemented in the unlikely event that any such incident occurs. The Inspectorate agrees that, with the implementation of such measures, any potential impacts on marine mammals are unlikely to result in significant effects and therefore further assessment is not required. However, the Inspectorate considers that the detail of such measures, including how they would be employed and be secured should be presented within the ES. The ES should include draft versions (with sufficient detail) of any plans containing such measures.</p>	Marine mammals	<p>The implementation of a MPCP and emergency response plans has been included as embedded environmental measures for the Proposed Development and have been detailed in <a href="#">Table 11-14, Chapter 11: Marine mammals, Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.11). The MPCP has also been detailed in the Environmental Statement as requested by the Inspectorate and therefore accidental pollution remains scoped out at this stage of assessment.</p>
4.6.5	<p>The Scoping Report seeks to scope impacts of the construction phase resulting in disturbance at a seal haul out sites. The baseline information shows that there is approximately 25-30km between the Proposed Development and the harbour haul out sites. The Inspectorate does not consider that sufficient evidence has been provided to support the contention that significant effects on haul out sites can be ruled out due to the separation distance. As set out in item 4.6.13 below, the spatial extent of the study areas for marine mammals are yet to be fully defined by the Applicant</p>	Marine mammals	<p>Consideration of the potential for impacts to seal haul out sites during the construction phase is presented within <a href="#">Section 11.9, Chapter 11: Marine mammals, Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.11).</p>



ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
4.6.6	<p>therefore the Inspectorate considers it is premature to agree to scope out such effects from further assessment at this stage. The ES should include this assessment where significant effects are likely to occur.</p> <p>The Inspectorate agrees that significant effects on marine mammals due to direct effects of EMF are unlikely during operation of the Proposed Development and agrees that this matter can be scoped out of further assessment. However, the Inspectorate notes that indirect effects from changes to prey availability from EMF (in terms of fish and benthic ecology) during operation will be considered.</p>	Marine mammals	<p>The potential for indirect effects to marine mammals from changes in prey availability due to EMF during operation is presented in <a href="#">Section 11.10, Chapter 11: Marine mammals, Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.11).</p>
4.6.7	<p>The Zol for assessment of effects on marine mammals are stated as to be defined “once project specific underwater noise modelling has been completed”. The Inspectorate considers that different cetacean species may require different Zol’s and study areas to be defined and notes that species have different Management Units. The ES should describe the approach to defining Zol and study area across all species with reference to the outcomes of the evidence plan process. The relevant species for consideration in the context of the Proposed Development are harbour porpoise, bottlenose dolphin, white-beaked dolphin, common dolphin and minke whale, as informed by previous studies and experience from Rampion 1. As per the</p>	Marine mammals	<p>A baseline characterisation has been presented in <a href="#">Section 11.6, Chapter 11: Marine mammals, Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.11), with full details presented in <a href="#">Appendix 11.1: Marine mammal baseline technical report, Volume 4</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.11.1). These characterisations present detail on the management units and the data sources and populations used for assessment purposes. A combination of both historic data sources (i.e. Rampion 1) plus contemporary data sources, including site specific surveys, has been used to enable a robust assessment. Due to the close proximity to</p>

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
	<p>comments raised in sections 2 and 3 of the Scoping Report, reliance on an evidence base from Rampion 1 will need to be explained and evidenced as to how it remains temporally and spatially applicable.</p>		<p>Rampion 2, the Rampion 1 dataset is considered to be spatially relevant and more recent data sources, such as Rampion 2 site specific surveys and SCANS III (Hamond <i>et al.</i>, 2017) have been used to validate the information presented.</p> <p>A discussion is presented in <b>Appendix 11.1: Marine mammal baseline technical report, Volume 4</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.11.1) regarding the densities of the various species as recorded from numerous extensive data sources and includes a justification for the exclusion of white-beaked dolphin from the assessment.</p>
4.6.8	<p>Where the “constantly expanding” marine mammal evidence base is used to provide new or updated baseline data than is referred to in the Applicant’s Scoping Report and this Opinion, these should be set out clearly in the ES including reference to agreement as part of the evidence plan process.</p>	Marine mammals	<p>A baseline characterisation has been presented in <b>Section 11.6, Chapter 11: Marine mammals, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.11) with full details presented in <b>Appendix 11.1: Marine mammal baseline technical report, Volume 4</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.11.1), including details of discussions through the EPP.</p>
4.6.9	<p>Paragraph 5.7.22 omits any reference to seabed preparation works that may be required as set out in section 2 of the Scoping Report. The ES should</p>	Marine mammals	<p>Potential effects arising from seabed preparation works have been assessed as regards underwater noise and impacts to prey availability within <b>Section 11.9, Chapter 11: Marine</b></p>

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
	consider the potential effects of such works on marine mammals.		<a href="#">mammals Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.11).
<b>4.6.10</b>	The Applicant's proposed assessment of cumulative effects on marine mammals does not make specific reference to the study area(s) (which is still to be defined) for each species. Paragraphs 5.7.36 – 5.7.38 explain that the study area for cumulative effects remains "to be defined through evidence of potential connectivity". There is no specific reference to spatial and temporal overlap between construction of the Proposed Development and the Aquind interconnector and the operation and maintenance activities associated with Rampion 1. These matters should be assessed in the ES where significant effects are likely.	Marine mammals	Consideration of cumulative effects is presented within <a href="#">Section 11.12, Chapter 11: Marine mammals Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.11), with inclusion of all relevant projects informed based on the study areas (as detailed in <a href="#">Section 11.6, Chapter 11: Marine mammals, Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.11)).
<b>4.7</b>	<b>Offshore ornithology</b>		
<b>4.7.1</b>	The Inspectorate is content that there is unlikely to be significant effects from maintenance of the offshore export cable during operation and therefore agrees that this matter can be scoped out of the assessment.	Offshore ornithology	This comment is acknowledged.
<b>4.7.2</b>	The Inspectorate is content that there is unlikely to be significant effects from maintenance of the intertidal	Offshore ornithology	This comment is acknowledged.

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
	export cable during operation and therefore agrees that this matter can be scoped out of the assessment.		
4.7.3	The Scoping Report provides limited information and no evidence of agreement with relevant consultation bodies to scope this matter out of the ES. The Inspectorate does not agree to scope these matters from the assessment. Accordingly, the ES should include an assessment of these matters where significant effects are likely to occur.	Offshore ornithology	Barrier effect: Array – The presence of the array area could create a barrier to movements of breeding seabirds during foraging trips or to migratory movements during operation. An assessment of the potential impact from barrier effects during operation is included in <a href="#">paragraph 12.13.147, Chapter 12: Offshore ornithology, Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.12).
4.7.4	The study area for offshore ornithology is described as being the Proposed Development array survey area with a 4km buffer, the export cable corridor and the cable landfall area. The Inspectorate considers that the study area should be extended to take into consideration potential impacts on birds species which may use the area for foraging and not just on migration as suggested in para 5.8.7. It is recommended that effort should be made to agree the scope of the study area with relevant consultation bodies.	Offshore ornithology	The study area is defined in <a href="#">paragraph 12.4.3, Chapter 12: Offshore ornithology, Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.12). This assessment includes all bird species which may use the study area at any point, including using the study area for foraging, moulting, loafing (periods of sitting or resting between feeding and flight), or whilst migrating. The study area has been agreed with stakeholders through the evidence plan process.
4.7.5	The Inspectorate notes that aerial digital surveys are being undertaken to provide information regarding ornithological species in the study area. Details should	Offshore ornithology	As a result of changes to the Proposed Development between Scoping and PEIR, and then between PEIR and this ES, the offshore

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
	<p>be provided of the methodology used to undertake the surveys. This information should be clearly presented in the ES. The Applicant should make effort to agree the scope and adequacy of these surveys with relevant consultation bodies. Paragraph 5.8.5 and figures 5.8.3 – 5.8.6 show that a small part of the eastern area of the offshore study area has not been covered by digital survey. The ES should justify the extent of survey areas in supporting a robust assessment of significant effects on displacement of bird populations.</p>		<p>array area plus a 4km buffer are fully within the area covered by the digital aerial surveys. Justification that the Study Area is suitable to support a robust assessment of significant effects of displacement is presented in <b>Sections 12.12 and 12.13, Chapter 12: Offshore ornithology Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.12).</p>
4.7.6	<p>The exact method for CRM has not yet been defined. The ES and/or accompanying technical appendices should provide detailed information regarding the methodology undertaken for the CRM and analysis of the data used to inform the impact assessment, together with figures where appropriate.</p>	Offshore ornithology	<p>Detailed information regarding the CRM methodology and additional supporting information is provided in <b>Appendix 12.3: Offshore ornithology collision risk modelling, Volume 4</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.12.3). RED has agreed with the relevant stakeholders through discussion at the ETGs and following responses to the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) with the relevant stakeholders that the approach to CRM is suitable.</p>
4.7.7	<p>The ES should contain details of other developments assessed in the cumulative effects assessment. Given the far ranging nature of breeding and migratory birds,</p>	Offshore ornithology	<p>Cumulative effects are assessed in <b>Section 12.5, Chapter 12: Offshore ornithology, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.12). Full</p>

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
	justification should be provided as to the spatial and temporal extent of the other projects considered.		justification is given for the spatial and temporal extent of the other developments considered.
<b>4.8</b>	<b>Underwater noise</b>		
<b>4.8.1</b>	n/a	Underwater noise	N/A
<b>4.8.2</b>	The Inspectorate welcomes the consideration of underwater noise and vibration during the construction, operation and decommissioning phases of the Proposed Development. Effort should be made to agree the methodology with the relevant consultation bodies and agreements should be clearly outlined within the ES. Early engagement with the MMO is encouraged to ensure that any noise modelling utilising site-specific physical parameters and project specific detail is appropriate and fit for purpose.	Underwater noise	A description of the early engagement undertaken with various stakeholders can be found throughout <b>Section 11.3, Chapter 11: Marine mammals, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.11). While ‘Early Engagement’ was not undertaken, the MMO were present during the “Offshore Ornithology, Marine Mammals and HRA (offshore only)” ETG on the 18 September 2020 (see EPP section below). Alongside the MMO, Cefas, Natural England, The Sussex Wildlife Trust (TSWT), The Wildlife Trusts (TWT), and Whale and Dolphin Conservation (WDC) were also invited to participate in the EPP as described below.
<b>4.8.3</b>	The baseline environment should be established beyond simply referring to the relevant aspect chapters where this information is presented. Potential noise and vibration impacts should be assessed against that	Underwater noise	The underwater noise technical modelling report ( <b>Appendix 11.3: Underwater noise assessment technical report, Volume 4 Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference:

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
	baseline, noting that the underwater noise assessment draws entirely upon baseline data in other aspect chapters. The methods and noise propagation modelling software should be detailed within the ES; along with the project specific detail that it utilises with reference to spatial, temporal and physical design envelopes.		6.4.11.3)) presents full details of the modelling methodology including establishment of the worst-case assumptions. The results of the modelling have been incorporated within the relevant aspect chapters to inform the assessments of impacts from underwater noise on the relevant aspects with due consideration of the baseline environment.
4.8.4	The Inspectorate welcomes the collaboration with the other relevant aspects as set out in paragraph 5.9.1 of the Scoping Report. The ES should include appropriate cross-references between aspect chapters and avoid duplication and contradictory information.	Underwater noise	Cross-referencing has been undertaken to relevant documents where appropriate to minimise duplication of information between chapters.
4.8.5	The possible modelling of noise from UXO is not referenced in this section. Elsewhere in the Scoping Report there is reference to UXO surveys yet to be conducted and that UXO removal may be required. The ES should therefore consider the potential for UXO underwater noise impacts of the Proposed Development where significant effects are likely to occur (including cumulative effects with other underwater noise producing activities).	Underwater noise	The predicted impact ranges from UXO clearance for a range of sizes has been modelled and is presented within ( <b>Appendix 11.3: Underwater noise assessment technical report, Volume 4 Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.11.3). The potential effects arising from underwater noise from a range of sources including UXO have been assessed within <b>Sections 11.9 to 11.12, Chapter 11: Marine mammals Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.11).



ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
<b>4.9 Shipping and navigation</b>			
n/a	No matters are proposed to be scoped out of the assessment	Shipping and navigation	This comment is acknowledged.
4.9.1	The Applicant explains that the study area “will be reviewed and potentially amended in response to such matters as refinement of the offshore components, the identification of additional impact pathways and in response where appropriate to feedback from consultation”. The Inspectorate is unclear as to what refinement of offshore components or identification of additional impact pathways could occur that would lead to amendment of the study area. The ES should clearly set out the study area with reference to the “standard” 10nm buffer that is stated (and it’s basis within relevant legislation and guidance).	Shipping and navigation	<p>The shipping and navigation study area used for the Scoping Report (RED, 2020) has been maintained despite a reduction in the size of the DCO Limits in order to ensure consistency.</p> <p>Consequently, the study area considered in the ES is a minimum 10nm buffer of the proposed DCO Limits. The Study Area is presented and justified in <b>Section 13.4, Chapter 13: Shipping and navigation Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.13).</p>
4.9.2	There is a high degree of overlap in the assessment of effects on offshore recreational users as set out in sections 5.3 (other marine users) section 5.10 (shipping and navigation) and section 5.15 (socioeconomics). The Inspectorate expects that these matters will be considered as part of the assessment(s) of inter-related effects as set out in paragraph 4.4.40 of the Scoping Report.	Shipping and navigation	<p>The effect on recreational users has been considered as an inter-related effect. The assessment of inter-related effects is provided in <b>Section 13.14, Chapter 13: Shipping and navigation Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.13).</p> <p>The socio-economic effect of Rampion 2 has been considered in <b>Chapter 17: Socio-</b></p>



ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
4.9.3	The International Maritime Organization (IMO) Formal Safety Assessment (FSA) guidance will be followed when assessing impacts to shipping and navigation receptors, assessing each impact in terms of frequency and consequence (Table 5.10.1). The ES should clearly set out how the risk assessment approach leads to an assessment of significance of effect consistent / compatible with the terminology as set out in Figure 4.1 of the Scoping Report.	Shipping and navigation	<p><b>economics, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Application Reference Number 6.2.17).</p> <p>The <i>Revised Guidelines for FSA for Use in the Rule-Making Process</i> (IMO, 2018) have been applied to the impact assessment, noting that this differs from the standard assessment methodology being applied for other aspects. The methodology used for the preliminary assessment is outlined in <b>Section 13.1, Chapter 13: Shipping and navigation, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.13) with further detail provided in <b>Section 3 of Appendix 13.1: Navigational risk assessment, Volume 4</b> (Application Reference Number 6.4.13.1).</p>
4.9.4	The Inspectorate notes the apparent importance of the “hazard workshop[s]” subsequent to the Scoping Opinion in refining the approach to the assessment. The scope, outcomes and agreements reached during this meeting should be specifically set out in the ES and NRA (eg in the form of technical appendices or other standalone reports).	Shipping and navigation	Points raised at the Hazard Workshops are outlined in <b>Section 13.3, Chapter 13: Shipping and navigation, Volume 4</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.13.1) and the Hazard Log – the main output of the Hazard Workshops – is provided in full in <b>Annex B of Appendix 13.1: Navigational risk assessment, Volume 4</b> (Document Reference 6.4.13.1).
4.9.5	The ES should explain how the assessment has factored in shipping and navigation effects on the nine	Shipping and navigation	Consultation with marine aggregate dredging stakeholders has been undertaken and marine

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
4.10	<b>Nature conservation</b>	Nature conservation	The approach to scoping nature conservation designations was developed through further consultation with stakeholders following issue of the Scoping Opinion.
4.10.1	<p>marine aggregate dredging areas intersecting the study area. It is unclear if such effects are to be considered part of the ‘baseline’ conditions or whether a future baseline is required accounting for changes in dredging activity,. Such effects may also need to be considered as part of the cumulative effects assessment of combined effects of the Proposed Development and aggregate activity on other receptors. The Inspectorate notes the Applicant’s identification of a “significant marine aggregate dredging route...within the north-west of the study area” in this regard.</p> <p>Direct impacts to nature conservation features of designated sites are scoped out of further assessment on the basis that there is no physical overlap of between the Proposed Development and designated site (other than Climping Beach SSSI, direct effects to which are scoped in to the assessment). The Inspectorate agrees with the Applicant that direct effects can be excluded on this basis and considers that indirect effects will be assessed appropriately as set out in table 5.11.5 of the Scoping Report (subject to relevant comments in this Opinion).</p>	<p>aggregate dredgers have been considered as a receptor in the impact assessment, both for the assessment of Rampion 2 in isolation and as part of the Cumulative Effect Assessment (CEA). The preliminary assessment (which includes consideration of marine aggregate dredgers) is provided in <a href="#">Section 13.9, 13.10 and 13.11</a> of <a href="#">Chapter 13: Shipping and navigation, Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.13).</p>	

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
4.10.2	<p>The Inspectorate recognises that there will be a high degree of overlap between the proposed assessment of 'Nature conservation' as a standalone aspect chapter and several other aspects as listed in paragraph 5.11.2. This is also demonstrated by Table 5.11.5 of the Scoping Report (likely significant nature conservation effects) where it is explained that all baseline requirements will be covered by the individual aspect assessments (ie no additional data is required for the nature conservation aspect chapter).</p> <p>The Inspectorate also notes the interface with the assessment of terrestrial ecology (section 6.6 of the Scoping Report, which is not listed in paragraph 5.11.2) as well as standalone HRA and WFD assessments that are proposed.</p> <p>The Applicant should ensure the scope and content of the assessment is clearly framed with this in mind in order to avoid an overly complex assessment across a number of aspect chapters. Cross referencing should be used in order to avoid duplication and ease presentation of material for stakeholders.</p>	Nature conservation	<p>Comment acknowledged and the nature conservation (offshore) chapter proposed in the Scoping Opinion has been subsumed into relevant chapter to avoid potential for overlap of the nature conservation assessment. The scope of the Rampion 2 Scoping Report nature conservation has been provided within: <b>Chapter 8: Fish and shellfish ecology, Chapter 9: Benthic, subtidal and intertidal ecology, Chapter 11: Marine mammals, Chapter 12: Offshore ornithology, and Chapter 22: Terrestrial ecology and nature conservation, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document References: 6.2.8, 6.2.9, 6.2.11, 6.2.12 and 6.2.22) as required.</p>
4.10.3	<p>The Scoping Report identifies the spatial relationship of the Proposed Development to Marine Conservations Zones (MCZs) in Table 5.11.3 and Figure 5.11.3. Although that the requirements for standalone MCZ assessment(s) under the Marine and Coastal Access</p>	Nature conservation	<p>The scope of the Rampion 2 Scoping Report nature conservation has been provided within: <b>Chapter 8: Fish and shellfish ecology, Chapter 9: Benthic, subtidal and intertidal ecology, Chapter 11: Marine mammals,</b></p>

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
	Act (MCAA) are sperate to the EIA process, the Inspectorate expects a coordinated approach to the assessment of effects on MCZs in the ES and any separate assessment under the MCAA.		<p><b>Chapter 12: Offshore ornithology, and Chapter 22: Terrestrial ecology and nature conservation, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document References: 6.2.8, 6.2.9, 6.2.11, 6.2.12 and 6.2.22) as required. The assessment therefore considers the qualifying features of relevant MCZ within the context of the EIA. The <b>Marine Conservation Zone assessment</b> (Document Reference: 5.11) presents an assessment of MCZs in the context of the Marine and Coastal Access Act (MCAA).</p>
4.10.4	Potential effects Marine Local Wildlife Sites (LWS) should be considered and assessed as part of this aspect chapter where significant effects could occur. This should include the Waldrons Marine LWS, Shelley Rocks Marine LWS, and HMS Northcoates Marine LWS.	Nature conservation	Local wildlife sites have been considered within this assessment. As noted above, this has been presented within <b>Chapter 8: Fish and shellfish ecology, Chapter 9: Benthic, subtidal and intertidal ecology, Chapter 11: Marine mammals, Chapter 12: Offshore ornithology, and Chapter 22: Terrestrial ecology and nature conservation, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document References: 6.2.8, 6.2.9, 6.2.11, 6.2.12 and 6.2.22) as required.
4.10.5	Reference is made to the WFD coastal water body and designated bathing waters, but no further reference is made to the assessment of effects to be reported within the scope of the Nature Conservation ES chapter. The potential for significant effects on this designation should	Nature conservation	Changes to water quality were scoped out of the assessment in agreement with stakeholders during consultation on the Nature Conservation Method Statement. <b>Appendix 26.3: Water Framework Directive compliance assessment,</b>

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
	be presented as part of the ES chapter, with appropriate cross reference to other aspect chapters (and standalone WFD reports) as required.		<b>Volume 4</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.26.3) presents an assessment on water quality.
<b>4.10.6</b>	The marine mammal “management unit scale” study area described in the section 5.7 of the Scoping Report identifies the Southern North Sea SAC as being relevant to the Proposed Development. On this basis, the Inspectorate would expect to see the SAC included in the assessment of potential significant effects in the nature conservation assessment chapter of the ES.	Nature conservation	The marine mammal nature conservation study area is presented in <b>Chapter 11: Marine mammals, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.11). The Southern North Sea (SNS) Special Area of Conservation (SAC) has been scoped into the assessment and has been considered.
<b>4.11</b>	<b>Civil and military aviation</b>		
<b>4.11.1</b>	The Inspectorate agrees that significant aviation effects from construction and operation of the offshore cabling are unlikely and can be scoped out of further assessment.	Civil and military aviation	Aviation effects from construction and operation of the offshore cabling have been scoped out of the assessment (see also <b>Table 14-7, Chapter 14: Civil and military aviation Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.14)).
<b>4.11.2</b>	On the basis that WTG rotors will be static during construction and would not interfere with radar systems, the Scoping Report suggests that there is no impact pathway during construction. The Inspectorate agrees that this can be scoped out on this basis and on the basis that the operational assessment effectively	Civil and military aviation	Acknowledged. Impact of static WTG rotors on radar systems during construction and decommissioning scoped out of the assessment (see also <b>Table 14-7, Chapter 14: Civil and military aviation, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.14)).

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
	encompasses consideration of any significant effects during construction.		
4.11.3	On the basis that there are no licensed airfields with a surveillance radar within 30km of any part of the WTG array area, the Applicant seeks to scope this matter out of further assessment. Whilst the Applicant is proposing additional consultation with stakeholders as to the scope of the assessment, the Inspectorate does not consider it appropriate to agree to scoping this matter out on the basis of an arbitrary 30km distance at this stage. The Inspectorate does not consider that sufficient justification has been provided to exclude effects beyond 30km (for example with reference to defined consultation zones). The ES should assess this matter where significant effects are likely to occur.	Civil and military aviation	Although CAP 764 recommends a 30km consultation distance for airfields with surveillance radar facilities, Farnborough Airport, Gatwick Airport and Southampton Airport are included in the Radar Line of Sight (RLoS) modelling assessment detailed in <a href="#">Appendix 14.1: Airspace analysis and radar modelling, Volume 4</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.14.1). RLoS modelling assessment shows that there is no possibility of their radars being affected by Rampion 2 (see also <a href="#">Table 14-7 of Chapter 14: Civil and military aviation, Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.14)) and therefore no consultation is deemed to be necessary with these airfields.
4.11.4	On the basis that there are no no-radar licensed aerodromes within or close to the relevant 12 and 17km consultation distances set out, the Inspectorate agrees that this matter can be scoped out of further assessment.	Civil and military aviation	Physical presence and operation of the WTGs leading to impacts on no-radar licensed aerodromes has been scoped out of the assessment (see also <a href="#">Table 14-7 of Chapter 14: Civil and military aviation Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.14)).

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
4.11.5	Given the location of the WTGs at least 12km offshore, the Scoping Report identifies that there will be no effects on light aircraft landing strips, gliding sites, microlight sites or parachute sites. The Inspectorate agrees that significant effects during operation are unlikely and can be scoped out of further assessment on this basis.	Civil and military aviation	Physical presence and operation of the WTGs leading to impacts on other civil aviation activities (excluding Search and Rescue (SAR)) has been scoped out of the assessment (see also <a href="#">Table 14-7</a> of <a href="#">Chapter 14: Civil and military aviation, Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.14)).
4.11.6	The Scoping Report seeks to rely on an Emergency Response and Cooperation Plan (ERCOP) and appropriate lighting, marking and notification, in line with CAA regulations (to be applied and secured for the Proposed Development) to exclude significant effects. In absence of the detail of an ERCOP and the other measures proposed, the Inspectorate cannot rely on their content as justification for scoping this matter out of the ES. The Inspectorate also notes the potential combined effect on SAR of the construction and operation of the Proposed Development and Rampion 1 and this should be assessed within the ES.	Civil and military aviation	Impact on SAR considered as part of the assessment of the various phases of the Proposed Development (see <a href="#">Sections 14.9 to 14.11, Chapter 14: Civil and military aviation, Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.14)). The combined effect with Rampion 1 is also considered in these sections.
4.11.7	Based on the information provided in paragraphs 5.12.31 – 5.12.34, the Scoping Report suggests that it is “evident” that there is sufficient distance from the Proposed Development to rule out significant effects on MoD facilities. Paragraph 5.12.55 also states that there are no air defence radars within a “relevant distance of Rampion 2” although such a distance is not defined. The	Civil and military aviation	The nearest air defence radars are at Trimmingham, 267 km to the north-east, and at Portreath, 329 km to the west. Neither of these radars will have RLoS of Rampion 2 turbines. In their Scoping response, the MoD stated that the



ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
4.11.8	<p>Inspectorate does not consider sufficient technical and evidence based information has been provided to agree that effects on MoD facilities entirely, not least because the Applicant refers to further consultation with the MoD as part of the scoping process (and potentially beyond). The ES should assess these matters where significant effects are likely to occur.</p> <p>On the basis that the nearest Met Office radar systems are located at c. 85km from the Proposed Development (in excess of the 20km safeguarded zone around each), the Inspectorate agrees that significant effects are not likely to occur and that this matter can be scoped out of the ES.</p>	Civil and military aviation	<p>Proposed Development will have no impact on military Air Traffic Control or Air Defence Radars.</p> <p>Effects on Met Office radar systems have been scoped out of the assessment (see also <a href="#">Table 14-7</a> of <a href="#">Chapter 14: Civil and military aviation Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.14)).</p>
4.11.9	<p>The Scoping Report relies on the requirement for aviation lighting (with differentiation between aviation and maritime lighting) to be put in place and secured as part of the design of the Proposed Development to justify scoping out this matter. In absence of the detail of these measures (and the need for further consultation in this regard), the Inspectorate cannot rely on their content as justification for scoping this matter out of the ES at this stage. The Inspectorate also notes the potential combined effect of the construction and operation of the Proposed Development and Rampion 1 and this should be assessed as part of the ES.</p>	Civil and military aviation	<p>Noting the comment, construction, operation and decommissioning effects on civil and military flight operations have all been scoped into the assessment; see <a href="#">Sections 14.9 to 14.12, Chapter 14: Civil and military aviation, Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.14).</p> <p>The adjacent Rampion 1 offshore wind farm is an existing operational project and is therefore considered as part of the existing baseline. Possible cumulative effects arising from the presence of Rampion 1 are considered in <a href="#">Sections 14.6, 14.10 and 14.11 of Chapter 14:</a></p>



ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
4.11.10	Figure 5.12.1 does not actually depict the proposed study area, and does not provide a key making it difficult to depict and identify the features set out on the complex basemap (and which are then described listed in the baseline conditions section). The ES should provide a clear definition of the study area (including if / how it varies across the various matters considered in the assessment (ie civil and military aviation receptors). Supporting figures should more clearly identify the location(s) of these receptors.	Civil and military aviation	<p data-bbox="1368 363 2056 432"><b>Civil and military aviation, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.14).</p> <p data-bbox="1368 491 2056 742">The updated study area figure (<b>Figure 14.1, Volume 3</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.14)) clearly identifies the locations of civil and military aviation receptors as detailed in <b>Section 14.4, Chapter 14: Civil and military aviation, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.14).</p>
4.11.11	The Applicant explains that “significance criteria for aviation impacts are typically difficult to establish”, and that further details of the assessment of significance will be provided in the PEIR and ES. The Inspectorate is therefore not able to make any comments on the proposed approach, but expects that the Applicant would define such criteria so that they are compatible with the approach and terminology as set out in section 4 and figure 4.1 of the Scoping Report.	Civil and military aviation	The significance criteria used for the assessment are discussed in <b>paragraph 14.8.11</b> and defined in <b>Table 14-11 of Chapter 14: Civil and military aviation Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.14).
4.11.12	The Inspectorate refers the Applicant to the comments of NATS Enroute PLC and the potential effects identified by them on radar infrastructure at Pease Pottage and	Civil and military aviation	The impact on Pease Pottage has been confirmed by RLoS modelling, see <b>Appendix 14.1: Airspace analysis and radar modelling,</b>

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
	<p>both the “London Area Control Centre” and “London Terminal Control Centre” Air Traffic Control Centres (ATC). The Inspectorate notes that further consultation will be required in order to enable suitable mitigation (paragraph 5.12.37). The ES should set out how the design and / or other measures secured as part of the Proposed Development propose to mitigate assess these effects.</p>		<p><b>Volume 4</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.14). and mitigation options have been explored in <b>Appendix 14.1: Airspace analysis and radar modelling, Volume 4</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.14) and consultation with NATS is ongoing to determine the most appropriate mitigation solution for the effects on radar infrastructure and ATC.</p>
<b>4.12</b>	<b>Seascape, landscape and visual impact assessment</b>		
<b>4.12.1</b>	<p>The Inspectorate agrees that this matter can be scoped out of the seascape, landscape and visual assessment on the basis that these MCA’s are likely to experience low levels of change, with limited visibility of offshore elements of the Proposed Development. Significance of effects on MCA08, MCA13 and MCA06 will be assessed (as shown on Figure 5.13.4).</p>	<p>Seascape, landscape and visual impact assessment</p>	<p>Significance of effects on MCA05, MCA06, MCA07 and MCA08, are assessed in <b>Section 15.10, Chapter 15: Seascape, landscape and visual impact assessment, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.15). MCA13 ‘Central English Channel’ has also been scoped out of the assessment due to its distance offshore, position at the most distant part of the wind farm array area and baseline influence as a busy shipping channel.</p>
<b>4.12.2</b>	<p>The Inspectorate agrees that this matter can be scoped out of the seascape, landscape and visual assessment on the basis of the justification in paragraphs 5.13.112 – 5.13.116 (there is limited/no visibility of the offshore elements of the Proposed Development)</p>	<p>Seascape, landscape and visual impact assessment</p>	<p>Effects on these landscape receptors have been scoped out.</p>

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
4.12.3	<p>The Inspectorate agrees that this matter can be scoped out of the SLVIA in relation to special qualities 2 (A rich variety of wildlife and habitats including rare and internationally important species) and 4 (An environment shaped by centuries of farming and embracing new enterprise).</p> <p>However, in respect of special qualities 5 (Great opportunities for recreational activities and learning experiences) and 6 (Wellconserved historical features and a rich cultural heritage), the Inspectorate does not consider it is appropriate to scope these out of the SLVIA and these matters should be assessed in the ES</p>	Seascape, landscape and visual impact assessment	<p>Effects on Special Quality 2 and 4 have been scoped out.</p> <p>Effects on Special Quality 5 are assessed in <a href="#">Section 15.10, Chapter 15: Seascape, landscape and visual impact assessment, Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.15). Effects on Special Quality 6 are assessed in <a href="#">Chapter 25: Historic environment Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.25).</p>
4.12.4	<p>The Inspectorate is content that there is unlikely to be a significant cumulative seascape, landscape and visual effects of the Proposed Development with other windfarm projects; with the exception of Rampion 1 and therefore agrees that this matter can be scoped out of the seascape, landscape and visual assessment</p>	Seascape, landscape and visual impact assessment	<p>Cumulative seascape, landscape and visual effects of Rampion 2 with other wind farm projects have been scoped out. Rampion 1 is considered as part of the baseline conditions in <a href="#">Section 15.10 and 15.6 of Chapter 15: Seascape, landscape and visual impact assessment, Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.15) and impact assessments.</p>
4.12.5	<p>The Inspectorate is content that there is unlikely to be significant effects outside of the 50km radius SLVIA study area and therefore agrees that this matter can be</p>	Seascape, landscape and visual	<p>Seascape, landscape and visual effects outside the 50km radius SLVIA Study Area have been scoped out.</p>

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
	scoped out of the seascape, landscape and visual assessment	impact assessment	
4.12.6	The ES should contain assessment of the impact which the Proposed Development may have on dark skies. It would be helpful if a Figure were included to show the study area which is considered for this. Agreement with relevant consultation bodies should be evidenced in the ES.	Seascape, landscape and visual impact assessment	An assessment of the impact which the Proposed Development may have on dark skies is provided in <a href="#">Appendix 15.5: Assessment of aviation and navigation night-time lighting, Volume 4</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.15.5) and summarised in <a href="#">Section 15.10, Chapter 15: Seascape, landscape and visual impact assessment, Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.15).
4.12.7	The Scoping Report acknowledges that the Proposed Development would be visible from the Isle of Wight, particularly at those locations which are at higher elevations. Only one viewpoint has been selected for the Isle of Wight. The south east of the Isle of Wight has areas of high ground which overlook the Channel and where views of the Proposed Development could be afforded. Effort should be made to agree the locations of the viewpoints with relevant local planning authorities and other consultation bodies that might be affected to ensure impacts from long reaching views have been assessed at relevant representative viewpoints.	Seascape, landscape and visual impact assessment	Three viewpoints have been selected on the Isle of Wight in agreement with relevant consultation bodies – Viewpoint 24, 34 and 35 and have been included in <a href="#">Chapter 15: Seascape, landscape and visual impact assessment, Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.15).

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
4.12.8	The ES should also include effects of views from the Isle of Wight Coastal path as a sensitive receptor. This coastal path encircles the island and allows for views across the Proposed Development site.	Seascape, landscape and visual impact assessment	An assessment of the impact which the Proposed Development may have on the Isle of Wight Coastal path is provided in <a href="#">Table 15-41, Chapter 15: Seascape, landscape and visual impact assessment, Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.15).
<b>4.13 Marine archaeology</b>			
4.13.1	The impacts proposed to be scoped out in Table 5.14.8 are on the basis of “embedded environmental measures to be adopted for the Proposed Development, forming commitments by RWE to avoid all identified archaeological receptors of a medium or high archaeological potential”.	Marine archaeology	Following stakeholder feedback during the PEIR stage, RED has decided to scope in all impacts on marine heritage receptors as demonstrated <a href="#">Table 16-9 of Chapter 16: Marine archaeology, Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.16).  1) An Outline Marine WSI ( <a href="#">Outline Marine Written Scheme of Investigation</a> (Application Reference Number 7.13)), as per embedded environmental measure C-57 ( <a href="#">Table 16-16, Chapter 16: Marine archaeology, Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.16)) has been produced.  2) All future geophysical and geotechnical surveys conducted throughout the lifetime of the project will be undertaken in line with C-58 and C-59 ( <a href="#">Table 16-16, Chapter 16: Marine</a>
4.13.2	to be adopted for the Proposed Development, forming commitments by RWE to avoid all identified archaeological receptors of a medium or high archaeological potential”.		
4.13.3	This will be through the establishment of archaeological exclusion zones (AEZs) of an “appropriate size and extent” and ‘tertiary’ mitigation in the form of archaeological written schemes of investigation (WSI) and project specific reporting protocol for unexpected discoveries. The embedded measures are listed in table 5.14.7 and summarised as follows:		
4.13.4	1) A marine WSI (in accordance with an Outline Marine WSI), including a protocol for archaeological discoveries)		
4.13.5	2) Offshore geophysical surveys (including unexploded ordnance (UXO) survey) will be undertaken		
4.13.6			
4.13.7			

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
	<p>prior to construction covering 100% of the development area.</p> <p>3) Offshore geotechnical surveys will be undertaken prior to construction, including geoarchaeological assessment and analysis of data (inclusive of publication),</p> <p>4) Offshore export cable corridor and the array cabling will be routed to avoid any identified archaeological receptors (with buffer zones as to be detailed in the WSI). The Scoping Report does not provide specific detail in respect to these measures, but they are acknowledged to constitute recognised methods of control for the impacts described (with reference to relevant guidance in paragraphs 5.14.11 - 5.14.12).</p> <p>The Inspectorate is content that if the above measures are adequately secured (with reference to implementation) and presented in sufficient detail then they may be relied upon as means to demonstrate an absence of significant effect in the ES. In this regard, the Inspectorate expects that the “outline” WSI would form part of the DCO application documents and that this document and the ES would provide additional detail to what “appropriate size and extent” of AEZs would comprise and where they would be located. The Applicant should make efforts to agree the detail in relation to these measures with relevant consultation</p>		<p><b>archaeology, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.16)).</p> <p>The results of the archaeological assessments of geophysical data to date are summarised in <b>Section 16.6, Chapter 16: Marine archaeology, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.16) and detailed in <b>Appendix 16.1: Marine archaeology technical report, Volume 4</b> (Document Reference 6.4.16.1).</p> <p>Early archaeological engagement during the geotechnical survey planning process is set out in embedded environmental measures C-57 and C-59 (<b>Table 16-16, Chapter 16: Marine archaeology, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.16) and <b>Outline Marine Written Scheme of Investigation</b> (Document Reference: 7.13) and will be detailed in the forthcoming geoarchaeology Method Statement.</p> <p>4) Embedded environmental measure C-57 (<b>Table 16-16, Chapter 16: Marine archaeology Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.16)) and <b>Outline Marine Written Scheme of Investigation</b> (Document Reference: 7.13) details the AEZs which have been recommended following desk-based studies combined with the</p>

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
	bodies, and the Inspectorate welcomes the Applicants intent in this regard, for example through the evidence plan process.		<p>assessment of geophysical data to ensure correct location as well as appropriate size and extent of protective area. This is further discussed in Section 5 of <a href="#">Appendix 16.1: Marine archaeology technical report, Volume 4</a>, (Document Reference: 6.4.16.1).</p> <p>Regular Expert Topic Group (ETG) meetings will present progress on these commitments on which Historic England will have the opportunity to comment and inform the further direction. See details further below in this section.</p> <p>The embedded environmental measures are reflected in the DCO (Requirement 13 (1), (2)).</p>
4.13.8	Based on the baseline information presented in tables 5.14.5 and 5.14.6 and the receptor sensitivity criteria, the Inspectorate understands that unmitigated impacts of the Proposed Development could be of high significance. In setting out the proposed mitigation measures as considered above, the Applicant should acknowledge worst case assumptions in respect receptor sensitivity of potentially unidentified archaeological assets including those identified through geophysical survey.	Marine archaeology	The maximum design scenario has been updated and is detailed in <a href="#">Section 16.7, Chapter 16: Marine archaeology, Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.16)), it includes the assessment of maximum design scenario for each receptor and establishes the maximum potential adverse impact on potential known and unknown receptors ( <a href="#">Table 16-15, Chapter 16: Marine archaeology, Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.16)).



ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
			<p><b>Table 16-17, Chapter 16: Marine archaeology, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.16) outlines the criteria for establishing the level of receptors sensitivity (value). The criteria for establishing the magnitude of impact on marine heritage receptors are outlined in <b>Table 16-18</b> and the significant assessment matrix is included as <b>Table 16-19, Chapter 16: Marine archaeology, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.16)</p> <p>Potential impacts on Archaeological receptors are detailed in <b>Sections 16.9 to 16</b> of <b>Chapter 16: Marine archaeology, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.16)</p> <p>All embedded environmental measures, mitigating identified impacts are presented in <b>Table 16-16, Chapter 16: Marine archaeology, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.16) and are included in <b>Outline Marine Written Scheme of Investigation</b> (Document Reference: 7.13).</p> <p>Impact on unidentified and unexpected receptors are mitigated through commitment C-57 (<b>Table 16-16 Chapter 16: Marine archaeology, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.16)) which includes a reporting protocol for</p>



ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
4.13.9	The Inspectorate notes an important distinction between geophysical survey and geotechnical survey coverage. Paragraph 5.14.45 states “geophysical survey data	Marine archaeology	<p>instances where a site or find may be located during offshore works.</p> <p>Impacts on unknown receptors are also mitigated through C-58 (<b>Table 16-16 Chapter 16: Marine archaeology, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.16)) the assessment of geophysical data and C-59 (<b>Table 16-16 Chapter 16: Marine archaeology, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.16)), the assessment of geotechnical data ensuring that unknown receptors are identified and assessed for archaeological significance followed by mitigation secured in C-57 (<b>Table 16-16 Chapter 16: Marine archaeology, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.16)), the <b>Outline Marine Written Scheme of Investigation</b> (Document Reference: 7.13). and C-60 (<b>Table 16-16 Chapter 16: Marine archaeology Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.16)), the avoidance of known receptors.</p> <p>The embedded environmental measures are reflected in the DCO (Requirement 13 (1), (2)).</p> <p>The extent of geophysical data coverage and data used to develop the marine archaeology baseline (<b>Section 16.6 Chapter 16: Marine</b></p>

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
	<p>covering 100 percent of the seabed within the development area, currently expected to be undertaken June / July 2020". However, paragraph 5.14.46 implies the only a "limited coverage survey" will be undertaken in support of the Application and that 100 percent coverage of the final design plan will be completed and reviewed prior to construction. The "limited coverage" geophysical survey to support the DCO application is not specifically quantified as a percentage of the development area. This should be presented as part of the ES. The basis for, and point at which, the "comprehensive programme of geotechnical survey data" would commence in terms of informing considering archaeological potential (and coverage of geotechnical survey) is not specifically stated. The Inspectorate understands that detailed geotechnical surveys will be undertaken prior to construction and that the outline WSI will set out it's specification so as the reliance placed on it at as mitigation in addressing potentially significant effects can be understood. The marine archaeological assessment chapter of the ES should clearly set out the geoarchaeological considerations in the design and specification of the geotechnical survey.</p>		<p><b>archaeology, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.16)), as well as the marine archaeology study area, is clarified in this ES Chapter and shown on <b>Figure 16.1, Volume 3</b> of the ES (Document Reference 6.3.16).</p> <p>Early archaeological engagement during the Rampion 2 geotechnical survey planning process is a requirement of embedded environmental measures C-57 and C-59 (<b>Table 16-16, Chapter 16: Marine archaeology, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.16) as well as <b>Outline Marine Written Scheme of Investigation</b> (Document Reference: 7.13) and will be detailed in geoarchaeology Method Statements. Close contact with the Historic Environment team is being facilitated through regular meetings.</p> <p>The embedded environmental measures are reflected in the DCO (Requirement 13 (1), (2)).</p> <p>The assessment of sub-bottom data and an outline deposit model based on the results and desk-based studies is summarised in <b>Section 16.6, Chapter 16: Marine archaeology, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.16) and detailed in <b>Appendix 16.1: Marine archaeology</b></p>

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
<p data-bbox="1368 363 1944 432"><b>technical report, Volume 4</b> (Application Reference Number 6.4.16.1).</p> <p data-bbox="1368 475 2063 655">This ES Marine Archaeology chapter has been updated following further studies, as per commitments detailed in <b>Outline Marine Written Scheme of Investigation</b> (Document Reference: 7.13).</p>			
<b>4.14</b>	<b>Socio-economics</b>		
<b>4.14.1</b>	<p data-bbox="315 802 1099 1129">The Inspectorate considers that the impacts of construction, O&amp;M and decommissioning activity on changes to population structure as a result of increased demand for labour and the subsequent demand for housing accommodation are likely to be negligible and any effects will be spread further wider than the immediate area. The Inspectorate agrees that these matters can be scope scoped out from the ES as significant effects are unlikely to occur.</p>	Socio-economics	<p data-bbox="1368 802 2051 978">Given the scoping opinion comments made by the Planning Inspectorate the impacts related to changes to population structure as a result of increased demand for labour have been scoped out of the assessment.</p>
<b>4.14.2</b>	<p data-bbox="315 1185 1088 1401">The Inspectorate agrees that significant effects on inshore recreation activity during operation are unlikely and that the ES will assess operational effects in terms of offshore recreation. However, reference to Zols and study areas are made in paragraph 5.15.13 and table 5.15.1, without reference to spatial extent of “inshore”</p>	Socio-economics	<p data-bbox="1368 1185 2051 1401"><b>Figures 15.13, 17.1 and 17.2, Volume 3</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.15 and 6.3.17) provide an overview of the spatial extent of the various Zols used in the assessment. Under the maximum parameters scenario, the cable will pass through the inshore area (defined as the</p>

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
	and “offshore” areas (see comments under 4.14.3below). Without fully understanding the extent of the inshore area as defined in the context of the socio-economic assessment (and the noted need for an assessment of offshore operational effects on recreation), the Inspectorate cannot agree to scope this matter out of the ES.		area extending 250m out to sea from landfall) in a duct installed by HDD and there will be no requirement to carry out maintenance in this area. The assessment of the Proposed Development’s impact on inshore recreation during the operation and maintenance phase is considered alongside the impact on offshore recreation.
4.14.3	Whilst Table 5.15.1 summaries the ZOIs to be considered for the various receptor groups as part of the socio-economic assessment, figures would assist in understanding their spatial extent and the entirety of the study area (onshore and offshore).	Socio-economics	<b>Figures 17.1 and 17.2, Volume 3</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.17) provide an overview of the spatial extent of the various ZOIs used in the assessment.
4.14.4	Any key assumptions made in developing estimates on the anticipated construction programme and phasing should be clearly set out and consideration given to a ‘worst case’ scenario in the duration and definition of ‘temporary’ effects and in considering the overall significance of effect (eg around the amounts of goods and services to be sourced locally / regionally / nationally). This includes assumptions on the use of local ports for construction. Reference is made to the development of “two scenarios based on varying assumptions in the amounts of goods and services sourced from within Sussex and the UK, in addition to the use of local ports”. It is not clear whether the “two	Socio-economics	More detail on the approach to socio-economic impact assessment is presented in <b>Section 17.8, Chapter 17: Socio-economics, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.17) Additional detail on the approach to the economic impact of Rampion 2 is presented in <b>Appendix 17.2: Socio-economics cost and sourcing report, Volume 4</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.17.2). A single realistic worst-case scenario is now considered. That said, when considering jobs and the economy, the overall impact is anticipated to be positive.

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
	scenarios based on varying assumptions” are intended to represent alternative “realistic” scenarios, or whether they are “best case” / “worst case” in terms of local, regional or national impacts. This should be set out clearly in the ES.		Overall, there is potential for local expenditure to be higher than that identified in the assessment, generating additional benefits.
4.14.5	A number of sources set out in table 5.15.3 are stated as “TBD” , including Recreational activity and Ports and harbour infrastructure for which the coverage of the study area is also stated as “TBD”. It is unclear whether these datasets would be obtained in the course of data collection from other aspect chapters. The ES should clearly set out these data sources and their spatial coverage and how all of these have been derived from and the effort made to agree with relevant consultation bodies.	Socio-economics	A detailed list of data and information sources used in the assessment is set out in <b>Appendix 17.3: Socio-economics technical baseline, Volume 4</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.17.3). Furthermore, a list of the stakeholders approached as part of the socio-economics assessment is presented in <b>Section 17.5, Chapter 17: Socio-economics, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.17). This includes references to discussions about and approach to collating key data sources (where relevant).
4.14.6	The ES should take account of the current West Sussex County Council Economic Growth Plan 2018-2023 in considering baseline conditions and assessing significance of socio-economic effects.	Socio-economics	Local Policy (including the West Sussex County Council Economic Growth Plan 2018-2023) is considered in detail in <b>Appendix 17.3: Socio-economics technical baseline, Volume 4</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.17.3) and summarised in <b>Section 17.3, Chapter 17: Socio-economics, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.17) and taken into account in the assessment of effects in <b>Sections 17.9 to 17.12</b>

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
5	<b>ASPECT BASED SCOPING TABLES - ONSHORE</b>		
5.1	<b>Landscape and visual amenity</b>		
5.1.1	<p>The Scoping Report states that the cable corridor will be reinstated and restored post construction. There are insufficient details in the Scoping Report to understand the type of landscape features which may be lost during the construction phase and also no details of the types of planting which may not be allowed during reinstatement (for example, lack of tree planting on and near to the cable corridor). The cable corridor may look very different during operation as it did preconstruction. On this basis, the Inspectorate does not agree to scope this matter out.</p>	<p>Landscape and visual amenity</p>	<p>The effects of the onshore cable corridor on landscape and visual receptors during the operation and maintenance phase have been summarised in <b>Section 18.12, Chapter 18: Landscape and visual impact, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.18) and <b>Appendix 18.3: Landscape assessment, Volume 4</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.18.3) and <b>Appendix 18.4: Visual assessment, Volume 4</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.18.4).</p> <p>Strategic principles to the landscape design and approach to embedded environmental measures are presented in <b>Section 18.7, Chapter 18: Landscape and visual impact, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.18). The <b>Appendix C National Grid Bolney Substation Extension Indicative Landscape Plan</b> and <b>Appendix D Oakendene onshore substation Indicative Landscape Design</b> within the <b>Design</b></p>

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
			<p><b>and Access Statement</b> (Document Reference: 5.8) for the onshore substation has been developed together with the <b>Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan</b> (Document Reference: 7.10).</p> <p>Landscape features or elements (principally hedgerows / trees woodland) that may be lost or retained during the construction phase are documented in <b>Chapter 22: Terrestrial ecology and nature conservation, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.22) and indicated in <b>Appendix B: Vegetation Retention Plans</b> of the <b>Outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP)</b> (Document Reference: 7.2).</p> <p>The <b>Appendix D Oakendene onshore substation Indicative Landscape Plan</b> within the <b>Design and Access Statement</b> (Document Reference: 5.8) for the onshore substation and the reinstatement of landscape features or elements has been developed together with the <b>Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan</b> (Document Reference: 7.10).</p>

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
5.1.2	<p>The Scoping Report states that any receptors beyond the Zone of Theoretical Visibility will not have a view of the onshore elements and impacts are therefore scoped out. The information provided in the Scoping Report lacks detailed information from which to be able to fully understand what the ZTV applied is. The ES must include a clear figure of an appropriate scale and size to present the ZTV as well as justification for definition of study areas and sensitive receptors within the ZTV.</p>	Landscape and visual amenity	<p>Zones of Theoretical Visibility (ZTVs) for the onshore substation site at Oakendene and the onshore cable corridor are illustrated in <b>Figures 18.2a – 18.4a-c, Volume 3</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.18).</p> <p>For the avoidance of doubt, if an area on these maps is shown to be outwith the ZTV then there will be <i>no view</i> of the onshore elements of the Proposed Development from these locations and are therefore scoped out. The technical basis for the ZTV is described in <b>Section 18.4, Chapter 18: Landscape and visual impact, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.18).</p>
5.1.3	<p>A 2km study area is proposed on the basis that the same study area was used for Rampion 1. The study area for the Proposed Development should be applied taking into account specifics for the area around the proposed cable route.</p>	Landscape and visual amenity	<p>A 2km Study Area has been selected for the LVIAA. Detail and justification for the Study Area is provided in <b>Section 18.4, Chapter 18: Landscape and visual impact, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.18).</p>
5.1.4	<p>The scale of the figures provided in the Scoping Report show the route of the cable corridor in its entirety and it is therefore difficult to understand which landscape receptors may be affected. The ES should contain figures at a scale which would ensure that the content is more easily understood.</p>	Landscape and visual amenity	<p>Detailed figures illustrating the landscape and visual receptors within the onshore cable corridor and the LVIA Study Area are illustrated in <b>Figures 18.2-4a-c, Volume 3</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.18).</p>



ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
5.1.5	The Inspectorate expects the assessment to have regard to the Strategy for the West Sussex Landscape; Local Distinctiveness Study of West Sussex as well as the High Weald AONB Management Plan 2019-2024	Landscape and visual amenity	Acknowledged. These documents have been taken into consideration in the assessment in <b>Sections 18.9 to 18.13, Chapter 18: Landscape and visual impact, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.18) and in <b>Appendix 18.3: Landscape assessment, Volume 4</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.18.3).
5.1.6	High Weald AONB is shown in Figure 6.2.3 to be in the study area for LVIA, however paragraph 6.2.39 state that this is beyond the study area. On the basis that the nature, scale and location of the works at the proposed and existing substations (including connection between them) are not fully defined at this stage, an assessment of significant effects on the AONB should be provided as part of the ES (including cross reference to the SLVIA and socio-economic assessments).	Landscape and visual amenity	Indirect landscape effects on the High Weald AONB and its Special Landscape Qualities are assessed in <b>Appendix 18.3: Landscape assessment, Volume 4</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.18.3) and summarised in <b>Sections 18.9 to 18.13, Chapter 18: Landscape and visual impact, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.18).
5.1.7	There are no details provided in the Scoping Report regarding landscape effects on community amenities, or schools. The ES should assess impacts on all receptors groups and the location of those receptors which have been assessed should be included in clear figures at an appropriate scale.	Landscape and visual amenity	Visual effects on community amenities or schools are included within the assessment of settlements, where relevant in <b>Sections 18.9 to 18.13, Chapter 18: Landscape and visual impact, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.18) and <b>Appendix 18.4: Visual assessment, Volume 4</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.18.4).

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
5.1.8	The Scoping Report refers to impacts beyond and in the ZTV, however it is not currently clear what the ZTV for onshore works and the substation are as no ZTV has been prepared. The ES should provide details of the ZTV for all onshore workings and assessments should be made for impacts during construction, operation and decommissioning.	Landscape and visual amenity	<p>ZTVs for the onshore elements of the Proposed Development (onshore substation site at Oakendene and the onshore cable corridor) are illustrated in <b>Figures 18.2 – 18.4a-c, Volume 3</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.18).</p> <p>The LVIA includes an assessment of the onshore elements of the Proposed Development during the construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases.</p>
5.1.9	The proposed substation location is identified as being ‘near to’ the existing Bolney substation. With approximate dimensions of 300m x 150m x 15m, the effects on landscape and visual amenity of this new structure by itself and any cumulative impacts with the existing substation and other existing or proposed structures, should be assessed in the ES.	Landscape and visual amenity	<p>The LVIA includes the assessment (<b>Sections 18.9 to 18.10, Chapter 18: Landscape and visual impact, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.18) of the onshore Oakendene substation at Oakendene and the existing National Grid Bolney substation extension, taking into account other cumulative developments within the LVIA Study Area. This includes the nearby existing National Grid Bolney substation and Rampion 1 onshore substation.</p>
5.1.10	The Scoping Report states that loss of landscape features such as trees, hedgerows, Ancient Woodlands will be avoided “where possible”. A tree survey and hedgerow survey should be completed to inform the ES. The ES should assess the impacts if such features are	Landscape and visual amenity	<p>Arboricultural surveys were carried out between May 2021 and January 2023 has been carried out in the summer of 2021 and the assessment is reported in <b>Appendix 22.16: Arboricultural Impact Assessment, Volume 4</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.22.16) which has</p>

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
	to be removed and explain any mitigation measures to reduce impacts.		informed the landscape effects in <b>Chapter 18: Landscape and visual impact, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.18).
5.1.11	The Scoping Report states that up to 4 trenches will be required for the installation of the onshore corridor. The ES should report the number of trenches to be used and also dimensions of each and how long they would remain open for. The intention is to use trenchless techniques where possible; the ES should assess the landscape effects which may be created by open trenches.	Landscape and visual amenity	<p><b>Table 18-24, Chapter 18: Landscape and visual impact, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.18). provides a summary of the assessment assumptions of the onshore elements of the Proposed Development with a full description provided in <b>Section 4.4 within Chapter 4: The Proposed Development, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.4).</p> <p>Effects on landscape character/ elements as a result of the installation of the onshore cable corridor are assessed in <b>Appendix 18.3: Landscape assessment, Volume 4</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.18.3) and summarised in <b>Section 18.11, Chapter 18: Landscape and visual impact, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.18).</p>
5.1.12	The ES should include all different types of development which may lead to a cumulative impact, not just those which are similar in nature to the Proposed Development. Details of agreements with relevant	Landscape and visual amenity	The approach to the Cumulative Effects Assessment (CEA) and cumulative developments included in the ES are reported in <b>Chapter 5: Approach to the EIA, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.5) and <b>Appendix 5.5:</b>

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
	consultation bodies as to the scope of projects to be included should be presented as part of the ES.		<b>Cumulative effects assessment shortlisted developments, Volume 4</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.5.4).
5.1.13	Efforts should be made to agree the location of viewpoints to assess impacts from the onshore cable corridor during construction and operation with relevant consultation bodies. Details of the agreement should be included in the ES.	Landscape and visual amenity	Viewpoints have been agreed with a number of stakeholders including SDNPA, Natural England, West Sussex County Council, High Weald AONB and Horsham District Council as described in <b>Section 18.4, Chapter 18: Landscape and visual impact, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.18).
5.1.14	It is noted that computer models will be used to inform the LVIA assessment, and the ES should contain details of these various methods used to inform the landscape and visual assessment	Landscape and visual amenity	The methodology used to illustrate the ZTVs and visualisations is reported in <b>Appendix 18.1: Landscape and visual impact assessment methodology, Volume 4</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.18.1).
5.1.15	The night time lighting assessment should be appended to the ES together with evidence of consultation with relevant bodies. Visual representations should also be included.	Landscape and visual amenity	Where required, construction lighting will be limited to directional task lighting positioned to minimise glare and nuisance to residents and recreational receptors as noted in <b>Section 18.7, Chapter 18: Landscape and visual impact, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.18).

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
			<p>The effects of artificial lighting have been assessed in <b>Appendix 18.2: Viewpoint analysis, Volume 4</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.18.2), <b>Appendix 18.3: Landscape assessment, Volume 4</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.18.3) and <b>Appendix 18.4: Visual assessment, Volume 4</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.18.4).</p> <p>A lighting assessment in relation to the offshore elements of the Proposed Development (wind generator turbines) is reported in <b>Chapter 15: Seascape, landscape and visual impact assessment, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.15).</p>
<b>5.2</b>	<b>Air quality</b>		
<b>5.2.1</b>	<p>The Scoping Report proposes to scope out an assessment of air quality impacts from the on-site construction and decommissioning equipment. This conclusion is not justified through the provision of mobile plant and construction equipment numbers and details. The Applicant should provide specific details of the equipment required on site with justification for scoping them out of the assessment against relevant guidance and criteria. The Inspectorate also notes that there is further work to be done in terms of refinement of the</p>	Air quality	<p>The assessment now considers air quality impacts from on-site construction equipment with detailed information on the mobile plant and construction equipment required presented in <b>Appendix 21.2: Construction plant list, Volume 4</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.21.2). A quantitative assessment of effects from temporary construction activities associated with Trenchless Crossings (TCs) construction compounds, landfall and substations is presented</p>

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
	<p>route, locations of construction compounds and the location of the substation. Whilst these (and thus proximity to air quality sensitive receptors) are uncertain, the Inspectorate considers it premature to rule out likely significant effects during construction and decommissioning.</p>		<p>along with an assessment of likely effects on receptors in <a href="#">Section 19.9 and 19.10, Chapter 19: Air quality, Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.19) and <a href="#">Appendix 19.2: Full results of construction plant modelling, Volume 4</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.19.2). These are the sources that are associated with emissions to air.</p> <p>The assessment has been updated to reflect the proposed DCO Order Limits and receptors have been selected to ensure that the most sensitive receptors across the TCs, landfall and substations works are considered. The proposed batching plant at the Oakendene substation is mainly associated with dust emissions and these have been considered in the qualitative dust assessment (see <a href="#">Table 19-24, Chapter 19: Air quality, Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.19)). Potential impacts from decommissioning on-site equipment have been scoped out as the number of equipment is a fraction of the anticipated construction equipment.</p>
5.2.2	<p>The Inspectorate is content that there is unlikely to be significant emissions of odour during construction and therefore agrees that this matter can be scoped out of the air quality assessment. The Inspectorate notes the</p>	Air quality	<p>Acknowledged. Further refinement of the Proposed Development since receipt of the Scoping Opinion resulted in the potential for temporary construction activity to take place</p>

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
	Applicant's intention at commitment C-6 to avoid areas of historic landfill through the design and DCO order limits and the agreement that this can be scoped out is on this basis.		<p>in/close to areas of historical landfill, and therefore an odour assessment has been carried out where appropriate (see <a href="#">Section 19.9, Chapter 19: Air quality, Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.19)).</p> <p>Effects from odour during the operation and maintenance and decommissioning phases remain scoped out.</p>
5.2.3	The Inspectorate is content that there will be no significant emissions associated with the onshore cable or substation during operation and maintenance and this matter to be scoped out of the air quality assessment. However specific details should be provided on the amount of road traffic associated with the operational Proposed Development and how these relate to the IAQM/EPUK screening values set out in paragraph 6.3.3. With reference to the description of the Proposed Development, any potential sources of emissions from the proposed substation should also be set out in demonstrating significant effects on receptors sensitive to air quality can be ruled out.	Air quality	A screening of operational traffic using the IAQM/EPUK criteria (2017) is presented in <a href="#">Section 19.8, Chapter 19: Air quality, Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.19). This confirmed that operational traffic is below the IAQM screening criteria and it can therefore be scoped out of the assessment.
5.2.4	The Inspectorate is content that there is unlikely to be significant emissions of dust during operation and	Air quality	No sources of emissions to air from the operation of the onshore substation have been identified, therefore significant effects on receptors sensitive to air quality can be ruled out. Therefore, air

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
	therefore agrees that this matter can be scoped out of the air quality assessment.		quality effects from the onshore substation during the operation and maintenance phase have been scoped out.
5.2.5	The ES should set out the relevant Zols within which ecological effects from the construction works will be considered (both in terms of the cable route and substation works).	Air quality, Terrestrial ecology and nature conservation	<p>Acknowledged. Emissions of dust during the operation and maintenance phase have been scoped out.</p> <p>Zones of Influence (Zols) for all potential effects, including those related to dust are provided in <a href="#">Section 22.6, Chapter 22: Terrestrial ecology and nature conservation, Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.22).</p> <p>Emissions associated with construction traffic and plant on all statutorily designated sites have been scoped out, in agreement with Planning Inspectorate (Planning Inspectorate, 2020a), and are not considered further within <a href="#">Chapter 22: Terrestrial ecology and nature conservation, Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.22).</p>
5.2.6	The Inspectorate agrees with the methodology for designating the proposed study area set out in paragraph 6.3.3. The study area for the assessment should be sufficiently broad to ensure that all receptors which could experience a significant effect are captured	Air quality	<p>Acknowledged. The Study Area is detailed in <a href="#">Section 19.4, Chapter 19: Air quality, Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.19). Locations likely to be affected by air quality effects have been discussed with relevant</p>



ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
	<p>within the assessment. The ES should consider how traffic and transport due to construction of the Proposed Development would contribute to air quality levels in the relevant AQMAs. Effort should be made to agree the extent of the study area with relevant consultation bodies and justified within the ES.</p>		<p>stakeholders to ensure they are included in the assessment (see <a href="#">Section 19.8, Chapter 19: Air quality, Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.19)).</p>
5.2.7	<p>The Scoping Report provides limited information regarding the need for surveys in order to characterise the baseline environment or otherwise inform the Air Quality Assessment. Paragraph 6.3.15 claims that existing data sources are sufficient to characterise the baseline air quality, without the need for further monitoring. Effort should be made to agree the requirement for additional baseline survey data with the relevant consultation bodies. The Applicant should set out in the ES any proposals for air quality monitoring of emissions from the Proposed Development during construction.</p>	Air quality	<p>Acknowledged. There are several publicly available air quality datasets from Defra and the relevant local authorities. Therefore, there was sufficient information to characterise baseline concentrations and no site-specific air monitoring surveys was required. Details on the existing baseline are provided in <a href="#">Section 19.6, Chapter 19: Air quality, Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.19). <a href="#">Table 19-36, Chapter 19: Air quality, Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.19) includes proposed mitigation measures to address dust emissions during construction. Measure 12 references monitoring of PM<sub>10</sub> and dust, if required depending on the size of the construction site and after consultation with the local authority.</p>
5.2.8	<p>The Inspectorate would expect an Air Quality Management Plan to form part of the CoCP. The Applicant should ensure that drafts of these documents, demonstrating the minimum measures relied upon as</p>	Air quality	<p>The relevant dust mitigation measures form part of the <a href="#">Outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP)</a> (Document Reference: 7.2) (see <a href="#">Table 19-20, Chapter 19: Air quality, Volume 2</a> of the</p>

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
	mitigation, are submitted with the ES and appropriately secured.		ES (Document Reference: 6.2.19)), secured through embedded environmental measure C-24. The <b>Outline CoCP</b> (Document Reference: 7.2) includes an embedded environmental measure to produce Dust Management Plans for the areas within the proposed DCO Order limits that are associated with medium dust risk.
5.2.9	The Inspectorate is satisfied with the methodology proposed, which is based on the Institute of Air Quality Management's (IAQM) (2014) Guidance on the assessment of dust from decommissioning and construction. The assessment should include an examination of effects on both human and ecological receptors.	Air quality, Terrestrial ecology and nature conservation	<p>Acknowledged. The assessment of emissions of dust from construction / decommissioning is presented in <b>Section 19.9, Chapter 19: Air quality, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.19) in line with IAQM guidance (2016).</p> <p>The assessment presented in <b>Section 22.6, Chapter 22: Ecology and nature conservation, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.22) follows the criteria of the IAQM (2016) regarding dust emissions.</p>
5.2.10	The Inspectorate is satisfied with the methodology proposed, which is based on industry standard guidance (IAQM and Environmental Protection UK (EPUK)) and includes the assessment of effects on both human and ecological receptors. Paragraph 6.3.46 states that 'It is likely that the construction and decommissioning road traffic will be below IAQM thresholds for scoping out.' If	Air quality	An assessment of the air quality effects of road traffic associated with the construction phase is provided in <b>Section 19.9, Chapter 19: Air quality, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.19) in line with IAQM and EPUK guidance (2017). Traffic associated with the decommissioning phase is assumed to be half of

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
	this is the case the ES should include justification for its exclusion from the ES.		the construction traffic and below the IAQM and EPUK guidance (2017) screening criteria. Therefore, potential impacts from decommissioning traffic have been scoped out.
5.2.11	The air quality assessment should be informed by the TA and the projects transport consultants particularly with regards to defining the study area and the potential impact from vehicle movements during both construction and operation.	Air quality	The Proposed Development does not require a full Transport Assessment. The relevant traffic characteristics are assessed in <b>Chapter 23: Transport, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.23). The air quality assessment is informed by this traffic modelling, with traffic information referenced in <b>Section 19.8</b> and <b>Section 19.9, Chapter 19: Air quality, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.19).
5.3	<b>Soils and agriculture</b>		
5.3.1	The Inspectorate is content that there is unlikely to be a significant loss of agricultural land due to operational and maintenance or decommissioning activities and therefore agrees that this matter can be scoped out of the soils and agriculture assessment.	Soils and agriculture	This comment is acknowledged. Loss of agricultural land due to operation and maintenance or decommissioning activities has been scoped out of <b>Chapter 20: Soils and agriculture, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.20). It is anticipated that during decommissioning, the onshore electrical cables will be left in-situ with ends cut, sealed and buried as outlined in <b>Section 4.8 of Chapter 4: The Proposed Development, Volume 2</b> of the ES

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
5.3.2	The Inspectorate is content that there is unlikely to be a significant loss of soil due to operational and maintenance activities and therefore agrees that this matter can be scoped out of the soils and agriculture assessment.	Soils and agriculture	(Document Reference: 6.2.4) to minimise environmental effects associated with removal.  This comment is acknowledged. Loss of or damage to soil resources during operation and maintenance phase has been scoped out of <b>Chapter 20: Soils and agriculture, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.20) as soil resources will be protected by the site-specific <b>Outline Soils Management Plan (SMP)</b> (Document Reference 7.4) produced using information gathered in the baseline surveys conducted in 2021 ( <b>Section 20.6, Chapter 20: Soils and agriculture, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.20)).
5.3.3	The Inspectorate welcomes the use of the Government's policy for the protection of the best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land as set out in paragraph 112 of the National Policy Planning Framework (NPPF). The Inspectorate also expects that 'soils' should be considered under a more general heading of sustainable use of land and the ecosystem services they provide as a natural resource in line with paragraph 109 of the NPPF.	Soils and agriculture	<b>Chapter 20: Soils and agriculture, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.20) considers the many ecosystem services that soils provide (flood mitigation, food production, supporting biodiversity etc.), these will be protected by embedded environmental measures ( <b>Table 20-17, Chapter 20: Soils and agriculture, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.20)).

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
5.3.4	<p>It is considered that the handling, storage and reinstatement of soil should be conducted in accordance with a Soil Management Plan (SMP) which sets out good practice mitigation to minimise adverse effects on the soil resource. The Applicant should refer to guidance set out in the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) 'Construction Code of Practice for the Sustainable Use of Soils on Construction Sites'. The Scoping Report identifies that a SMP is planned in Chapter 6.2, however, there was no references to this in Chapter 6.4. The Inspectorate welcomes and encourages consistent cross references between the aspect chapters. The ES should address how soils and agriculture will be managed and describe any assumptions made. Any mitigation required should be explained in the ES and appropriately secured.</p>	Soils and agriculture	<p>An <b>Outline SMP</b> (Document Reference 7.4) has been developed and is provided alongside this ES as part of the DCO Application. The <b>Outline SMP</b> (Document Reference 7.4) will be implemented to protect soil resources from damage during the construction phase. This is an embedded environmental measure (C-183), as presented in <b>Table 20-17, Chapter 20: Soils and agriculture, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.20). The <b>Outline SMP</b> (Document Reference 7.4) makes references to relevant guidance from the Defra <i>Construction Code of Practice for the Sustainable use of Soils on Construction Sites</i> (Defra, 2009) and guidance on soil handling from the Institute of Quarrying's <i>Good Practice for Handling soils in Mineral Workings</i> (Institute of Quarrying, 2021).</p> <p>The <b>Outline SMP</b> (Document Reference 7.4) forms part of the <b>Outline CoCP</b> (Document Reference 7.2) which will be issued to contractors and must be complied with during construction of Rampion 2. The <b>Outline SMP</b> (Document Reference: 7.4) and environmental measure C-183 also commit Rampion 2 to full Soil and ALC Survey coverage within the proposed DCO Order Limits during pre-construction so that measures to be included in</p>

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
5.3.5	The consideration of the potential impacts on agricultural land should also be assessed in the context of socio-economics, namely those financial effects on productive farmland and small holdings during construction, operation and decommissioning. With this in mind, the Inspectorate welcomes the acknowledgement of the inter-relationship between the socio-economic and soils/agriculture.	Soils and agriculture	<p>the Final SMP can be defined during pre-construction for all soil types and all agricultural land grades present.</p> <p>This ES addresses how soils and agricultural land will be managed during the construction phase of the Proposed Development and relevant mitigation will be described and secured in the <b>Commitments Register</b> (Document Reference 7.22). Commitments relevant to soils and agriculture are detailed in <b>Table 20-17, Chapter 20: Soils and agriculture, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.20).</p> <p>The assessment of effects of Rampion 2 on farming including financial effects is provided in <b>Section 20.9 in Chapter 20: Soils and agriculture, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document reference: 6.2.20).</p>
5.3.6	The Scoping Report commits to onsite soil survey/sampling. The Inspectorate welcomes this survey and recommends that effort should be made to agree the survey locations with relevant consultation bodies	Soils and agriculture	The survey approach was agreed with Natural England (the statutory consultee) to confirm the proposed investigative method and survey locations. Partial Soil and ALC Survey was conducted in 2021 (reported in <b>Appendix 20.1:</b>

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
5.3.7	Careful consideration should be given to the siting of the onshore infrastructure in relation to grade 1 and grade 2 agricultural land; the potential temporary and permanent loss of Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) land	Soils and agriculture	<p><b>Detailed Agricultural Land Classification Report, Volume 4</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.20.1) and it was planned that the survey would cover the entire proposed DCO Order Limits. However, surveys during this phase of work were limited due to the identification of a moderate or higher risk of unexploded ordnance (UXO) in all potential route options through the former South Downs Training Area (SDTA), much of which is within the South Downs National Park (SDNP). The methodology for the collection of soil and ALC data for Rampion 2 remains in accordance with Natural England's requirements, and the remaining surveys to cover all areas of the proposed DCO Order Limits will be completed during pre-construction. This is an embedded measure in <b>Table 20-17, Chapter 20: Soils and agriculture, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.20). The available survey data which informs the assessment is presented in <b>Section 20.6, Chapter 20: Soils and agriculture, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.20).</p> <p>BMV land has been considered throughout the design of Rampion 2 as an environmental constraint in the design of the Proposed Development (refer to <b>Chapter 3: Alternatives,</b></p>

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
	<p>should be assessed within the ES. The potential effects on soil quality should be considered and relevant mitigation measures proposed where significant effects are likely to occur.</p>		<p><b>Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.3). BMV agricultural land has been further defined to confirm the ALC grades within the onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits through the field surveys undertaken in 2021 (<b>Section 20.6, Chapter 20: Soils and agriculture, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.20)).</p> <p>The onshore substation footprint at Oakendene has been surveyed to confirm its ALC grade and has been found to be mainly Subgrade 3b (77 percent), some Subgrade 3a was also identified (19 percent) and a small amount of Grade 2 (4 percent). This means that 77 percent is not best and most versatile land, and 23 percent does meet the criteria of best and most versatile land.</p> <p>The existing National Grid Bolney substation extension works will use existing accesses and an existing compound, limiting temporary land take. The area of permanent development is limited to 0.63ha of land east of the existing National Grid Bolney substation, some of which has been used previously as a construction compound. This land has not been surveyed to date and is shown as provisional ALC Grade 3 (provisional ALC mapping does not subdivide</p>



ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
<p>Grade 3 into Subgrades 3a and 3b). However, the Predictive BMV Land Assessment map (Natural England, 2010), shows the land as having a low likelihood of BMV land (<math>\leq 20</math> percent area BMV).</p> <p>The cables and joint bays between landfall and the onshore substation will run through some BMV land, however, other than where small ground level infrastructure is needed (e.g., access covers, each approximately <math>1\text{m}^3</math>, at joint bays) the agricultural land use can be reinstated during the construction phase. The embedded measures to protect soils during handling and storage are in <a href="#">Table 20-17, Chapter 20: Soils and agriculture, Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.20).</p> <p>The assessment of effects is outlined in <a href="#">Section 20.9 to 20.11 of Chapter 20: Soils and agriculture, Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.20).</p>			
<b>5.4</b>	<b>Noise and vibration</b>		
<b>5.4.1</b>	Based on the anticipated low levels of site traffic during operation and maintenance, the Inspectorate is content that there will be no significant noise emissions	Noise and vibration	Acknowledged. Noise emissions associated with site traffic during operation and maintenance is scoped out of the assessment due to the very low

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
5.4.2	<p>associated with the onshore cable or substation maintenance in terms of additional site traffic during operation.</p> <p>The Inspectorate agrees that noise effects of the offshore substation would not have significant effects for any onshore receptors. The Inspectorate is satisfied that the scope of the underwater noise assessment is sufficient to consider offshore substation noise effects on offshore and marine receptors where significant effects are likely to occur.</p>	Noise and vibration	<p>numbers of vehicles expected for operation and maintenance.</p> <p>Acknowledged. The noise effects from the operation of the offshore substations on onshore receptors are therefore scoped out of the noise assessment in <b>Chapter 21: Noise and vibration, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.21) due to the large distances between noise source and receptor. The underwater noise assessment is included in <b>Chapter 11: Marine mammals, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.11) and <b>Appendix 11.3: Underwater noise assessment, Volume 4</b> (Document Reference: 6.4.11.3).</p>
5.4.3	<p>The Inspectorate agrees that vibration effects to onshore receptors as a result of the offshore substations and WTGs can be scoped out of further assessment. The Inspectorate does not agree that vibration effects from the onshore substation scoped out as insufficient justification has been provided at this time to support this approach (including operational design parameters of the proposed substation). The ES should assess these matters where significant effects are likely to occur.</p>	Noise and vibration	<p>Acknowledged. The vibration effects to onshore receptors as a result of offshore substations and WTGs are scoped out of the assessment in <b>Chapter 21: Noise and vibration, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.21) due to the large distances between vibration source and receptor.</p>

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
5.4.4	<p>The Scoping Report has scoped out Noise and vibration disturbance during decommissioning works on the basis that the effects of decommissioning will be lower than those experienced during construction. The Inspectorate does not agree that this can be scoped out at this stage as the noise and vibration effects and subsequent mitigation have not been quantified for the construction phase. Although the noise and vibration disturbance during decommissioning works are likely to be similar or potentially lower than during construction, the ES should assess these matters where significant effects are likely to occur.</p>	Noise and vibration	<p>It is not possible to provide a quantitative assessment of vibration from the onshore substation as vibration will be negligible even very close to the equipment. There is no rotating or reciprocating machinery to give rise to vibration associated with out-of-balance forces. In addition, it is necessary to minimise vibration to maintain equipment integrity. Therefore, significant effects are unlikely to occur as outlined in <b>Table 21-13 of Chapter 21: Noise and vibration, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.21).</p>
5.4.5	<p>Paragraph 6.5.31 of the Scoping report states that ‘Once the locations of the Proposed Development have been decided upon, the existing data will be reviewed to ascertain its potential use in the assessment’. The Inspectorate expects a project specific baseline survey, with the assessment methodology and choice of noise receptors should be agreed with the relevant local planning authorities. The Applicant’s attention is directed to the Joint Guidance produced by the Association of Noise Consultants (ANC) and the Institute of Acoustics (IoA) “Joint Guidance on the Impact of COVID-19 on the Practicality and Reliability of Baseline Sound Level Surveying and the Provision of Sound &amp; Noise Impact Assessments during the current COVID-19 pandemic”.</p>	Noise and vibration	<p>A decommissioning assessment is included in <b>Section 21.12 of Chapter 21: Noise and vibration, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.21).</p>

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
5.4.6	Paragraph 6.5.4 of the Scoping Report states that the spatial scope of the construction noise assessment would be “a 1 km buffer zone around the cable route potential centreline and substation boundary”. The Inspectorate expects further explanation and justification be provided in the ES to support the study area used for the assessment with reference to specific receptors or groups of receptors.	Noise and vibration	A baseline noise survey has been developed with the methodology and noise receptors agreed with the relevant local planning authorities beforehand. The baseline noise survey was carried out in 2023 after restrictions associated with the COVID-19 pandemic had been removed. The results of the baseline noise survey have been incorporated into <a href="#">Section 21.6 of Chapter 21: Noise and vibration, Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.21). It is noted that the guidance referred to in the scoping opinion is not considered relevant and so has not been included into the guidance section.
5.4.7	Information should be provided on the types of vehicles and plant to be used during the construction phase. The assessment should consider a ‘worst case’ for receptors, i.e. that within the application site the vehicles and plant are located at the closest possible point to a receptor.	Noise and vibration	Further explanation and justification for the Study Area has been provided in <a href="#">Section 21.4 of Chapter 21: Noise and vibration, Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.21).
5.4.8	The Inspectorate notes that there is little reference to other receptor types that may be sensitive to noise and vibration, such as ecological receptors. The Inspectorate welcomes consideration of noise impacts on nature conservation areas and other ecological receptors (e.g. protected species). The noise assessment should cross-refer to the findings of other relevant aspect chapters,	Noise and vibration	Information on the types of vehicles and plant to be used in the construction phase, along with percentage on times are provided in <a href="#">Appendix 21.4: Construction plant list, Volume 4</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.21.4)

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
	such as terrestrial ecology and offshore ornithology. The ES should clearly explain any assumptions made regarding the assessment of likely significant effects arising from noise and vibration on sensitive ecological receptors		
5.4.9	The scoping report sets out that a CoCP and decommissioning plan will be developed as part of the DCO application. No mention is made however of a noise mitigation plan. The Inspectorate expects that such a plan or specific noise mitigation measures would be set out and secured through the CoCP or otherwise where they are relied upon in the assessment of significance of residual effects.	Noise and vibration	The assessments of noise and vibration on marine mammals, offshore ornithology, terrestrial ecology and heritage receptors are provided in <b>Chapter 11: Marine mammals, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.11), <b>Chapter 12: Offshore and intertidal ornithology, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.12), <b>Chapter 22: Terrestrial ecology and nature conservation, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.22) and <b>Chapter 25: Historic environment, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.25) respectively.
5.5	<b>Terrestrial ecology and nature conservation</b>		
5.5.1	The Inspectorate agrees that this impact can be scoped out on the basis that no land within a European site(s) will be lost as a result of the Proposed Development. No European sites are within the redline boundary as shown on Figure 6.6.4.	Terrestrial ecology and nature conservation	The location of constituents of the national site network within the context of the onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits is provided in <b>Section 22.6 of Chapter 22: Terrestrial ecology and nature conservation, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.22). No land-take or

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
5.5.2	Pagham Harbour SPA is located over 10km from the proposed landfall point. States that due to distance, it suggests that black bellied Brent geese are not linked to the SPA. The Inspectorate agrees that this matter can be based on the distance between the designated sites and the proposed landfall point. Natural England also agree that this matter can be scoped out on the basis of the distance of 10km being an established upper foraging distance for Brent geese.	Terrestrial ecology and nature conservation	land cover change within a SAC or SPA is proposed, maintaining the position presented in the Scoping Report (RED, 2020).  Pagham Harbour Ramsar site and SPA is scoped out and is not considered further within <b>Chapter 22: Terrestrial ecology and nature conservation, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.22). This is on the basis that the onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits is further from Pagham Harbour (11.5km) than that displayed within the Scoping Report (RED, 2020), with no change in potential effects being identified between that report and the assessment within <b>Chapter 22: Terrestrial ecology and nature conservation, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.22).
5.5.3	The paragraph numbers to which the reader is referred (6.6.56 – 6.6.59) appears to be incorrect. Although literature is cited in support of the Applicant's position, the Inspectorate does not agree to scope out habitat fragmentation effects on these features of the SPA. The Inspectorate does not consider that sufficient evidence has been provided to demonstrate that the cable route would not affect or cause deterioration to land that could support these species and be functionally linked to the SPA and as such its loss or deterioration resulting from	Terrestrial ecology and nature conservation	Wintering bird surveys have been completed within the relevant areas of the Arun Valley and Adur Valley. One element of this survey is the recording of species listed as designated features on the Arun Valley SPA and Ramsar site.  An assessment of the potential effects of fragmentation on features of the Arun Valley SPA and Ramsar site is provided within <b>Section 22.9</b> of <b>Chapter 22: Terrestrial ecology and nature</b>

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
	the Proposed Development's cable route could have an impact on the SPA and should be assessed in the ES.		<p><b>conservation, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.22).</p> <p>A summary of the baseline position is provided within <b>Section 22.5</b> of <b>Chapter 22: Terrestrial ecology and nature conservation, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.22).</p>
5.5.4	The only European site within 2.5km of the scoping boundary is the Solent and Dorset Coast SPA (designated for tern species). On the basis of the embedded measure C-76, the Inspectorate agrees that this matter can be scoped out.	Terrestrial ecology and nature conservation	<p>Pollution events associated with works above Mean High Water Springs (MHWS) have been considered in <b>Section 22.6</b> of <b>Chapter 22: Terrestrial ecology and nature conservation, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.22) within which they are scoped out on the basis of the embedded environmental measures described in <b>Section 22.7</b> of <b>Chapter 22: Terrestrial ecology and nature conservation, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.22).</p>
5.5.5	The Inspectorate agrees that this matter can be scoped out based on the temporary and transient nature of the effect, the location of the nearest European sites and SSSI's and the limited amount of traffic likely serving construction at any single location. The Inspectorate also notes that this approach in line with advice from Natural England as cited in paragraph 6.6.68, and Natural England have not expressed concern in their	Terrestrial ecology and nature conservation	<p>Emissions associated with construction traffic and plant on all statutorily designated sites were scoped out following the issue of the Scoping Opinion (Planning Inspectorate, 2020a) and are not considered further within <b>Chapter 22: Terrestrial ecology and nature conservation, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.22).</p>

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
scoping consultation response relating to the Proposed Development.			
5.5.6	The Scoping Boundary does not overlap with any European sites, so it is agreed that these matters can be scoped out. However the possibility for the spread of non-native invasive species via watercourses to designated sites which are hydraulically linked should be assessed within the ES where significant effects are likely to occur	Terrestrial ecology and nature conservation	The potential for the spread of invasive non-native species is assessed in <a href="#">Section 22.6 of Chapter 22: Terrestrial ecology and nature conservation, Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.22), in light of embedded environmental measures detailed in <a href="#">Section 22.7 of Chapter 22: Terrestrial ecology and nature conservation, Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.22).
5.5.7	The Inspectorate agrees that this matter can be scoped out on the basis that there would be no land take or land cover changes outside of the scoping boundary.	Terrestrial ecology and nature conservation	Land take / land cover change is considered with regard to one SSSI immediately adjacent to the onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits and four LWS within it. The baseline situation is described in <a href="#">Section 22.5 of Chapter 22: Terrestrial ecology and nature conservation, Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.22).and the assessment of likely significant effects provided in <a href="#">Section 22.9 of Chapter 22: Terrestrial ecology and nature conservation, Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.22).



ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
5.5.8	<p>The Scoping Report is seeking to scope out all SSSIs which are not located within the Scoping Boundary, features would not be expected to move regularly between the designated sites and the construction area. The Inspectorate does not agree that this matter can be scoped out as insufficient justification has been provided. The ES should assess this matter where significant effects are likely to occur.</p>	<p>Terrestrial ecology and nature conservation</p>	<p><b>Section 22.5 of Chapter 22: Terrestrial ecology and nature conservation, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.22) identifies all SSSIs within 5km of the onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits (or 12km for SSSIs that cite one or more bat species).</p> <p><b>Sections 22.6 and 22.9 of Chapter 22: Terrestrial ecology and nature conservation, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.22) assess the likely significant effects on the mobile features of the SSSIs identified from the fragmentation of habitats.</p>
5.5.9	<p>The Inspectorate does not agree that impacts as a result of noise and vibration should be scoped out for all SSSIs outside of the red line boundary. Some of the SSSIs scoped in by the Applicant have interest features which could be impacted by vibration and noise generated by the proposal some of which have the potential to be transient between areas and SSSI's outside of the redline boundary. The ES should assess this matter where significant effects are likely to occur</p>	<p>Terrestrial ecology and nature conservation</p>	<p><b>Section 22.5 of Chapter 22: Terrestrial ecology and nature conservation, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.22) identifies all SSSIs within 5km of the onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits (or 12km for SSSIs that cite one or more bat species).</p> <p><b>Sections 22.6 and 22.9 of Chapter 22: Terrestrial ecology and nature conservation, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.22) assess the likely significant effects on the mobile features of the SSSIs identified due to noise and vibration.</p>

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
5.5.10	No SSSIs within 5km of the Scoping Boundary have been found to support bat species as designated features. The foraging distance of some bats species extends further than 5km and as such the Inspectorate does not agree to scope this out as insufficient justification has been provided. The ES should assess this matter where significant effects are likely to occur	Terrestrial ecology and nature conservation	<p>A search for SSSIs within 12km of the onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits supporting bats has been undertaken (<a href="#">Section 22.5 of Chapter 22: Terrestrial ecology and nature conservation, Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.22)). No SSSIs within this search distance support bats as a designated feature.</p> <p>The potential effects of light on bat species as features of SSSIs is thus discounted and not considered further within <a href="#">Chapter 22: Terrestrial ecology and nature conservation, Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.22).</p> <p>The effects of light on bats not associated with SSSIs is provided in <a href="#">Section 22.9 of Chapter 22: Terrestrial ecology and nature conservation, Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.22).</p>
5.5.11	Impacts on changes to hydrology to SSSIs and LWS outside of the Zol (deemed as 1km for this matter) are proposed to be scoped out. The Inspectorate does not agree that this matter can be scoped out as insufficient justification has been provided at this time to support this approach. The ES should ensure that hydrological impacts are assessed where significant effects are likely	Terrestrial ecology and nature conservation	The Zol used within <a href="#">Chapter 22: Terrestrial ecology and nature conservation, Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.22) is that established within <a href="#">Chapter 26: Water environment, Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.26) to assess the potential for changes in hydrology. This is based on the water

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
	with further justification around the appropriateness and extent of the 1km Zol.		<p>environment in the area (for example, catchments) and not on a simple measure of distance.</p> <p><b>Section 22.6 of Chapter 22: Terrestrial ecology and nature conservation, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.22) uses information in <b>Chapter 26: Water environment, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.26) to identify the SSSIs and LWSs that may be at risk of a likely significant effect associated with potential hydrological changes due to the onshore elements of the Proposed Development. Assessment of those effects resulting on designated sites is provided in <b>Section 22.9, Chapter 22: Terrestrial ecology and nature conservation, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.22).</p>
5.5.12	There are no SSSIs within 500m of the scoping boundary. On the basis of the embedded measure C-76, the Inspectorate agrees that this matter can be scoped out of the ES as significant effects are unlikely to occur.	Terrestrial ecology and nature conservation	Two SSSIs are located within 500m of the onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits (see <b>Section 22.5 of Chapter 22: Terrestrial ecology and nature conservation, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.22)) and likely significant effects on these have been subject to assessment in this document (see <b>Sections 22.6 and 22.9 of Chapter 22: Terrestrial ecology and nature conservation, Volume 2</b> of the ES

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
5.5.13	The possibility for the spread of non-native invasive species via watercourses to designated sites which are hydraulically linked should be assessed within the ES.	Terrestrial ecology and nature conservation	(Document Reference: 6.2.22). Embedded environmental measures are described within <b>Section 22.7 of Chapter 22: Terrestrial ecology and nature conservation, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.22).
5.5.14	The Inspectorate agrees that this matter can be scoped out on the basis that there would be no land take or direct effects to habitat outside of the scoping boundary.	Terrestrial ecology and nature conservation	The potential for the spread of invasive non-native species, including those by hydrological means, is assessed in <b>Section 22.6 of Chapter 22: Terrestrial ecology and nature conservation, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.22), in light of embedded environmental measure C-107 detailed in <b>Section 22.7 of Chapter 22: Ecology and nature conservation, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.22).  Four LWSs are located within the onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits (see <b>Section 22.5 of Chapter 22: Terrestrial ecology and nature conservation, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.22)). An assessment of the likely significant effects of fragmentation of habitats resulting on these designations is provided in <b>Section 22.9 of Chapter 22: Terrestrial ecology and nature conservation, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.22), and embedded environmental measures

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
5.5.15	The Inspectorate does not agree that this aspect can be scoped out as insufficient justification has been provided at this time to support this approach.	Terrestrial ecology and nature conservation	detailed in <a href="#">Section 22.7</a> of <a href="#">Chapter 22: Terrestrial ecology and nature conservation, Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.22). LWSs outside of the proposed DCO Order Limits are not considered with regards fragmentation of habitats as per the Scoping Opinion (Planning Inspectorate, 2020).
5.5.16	On the basis of the embedded measure C-76, the Inspectorate agrees that this matter can be scoped out	Terrestrial ecology and nature conservation	The likely significant effects resulting on LWSs from lighting are considered in <a href="#">Section 22.6</a> of <a href="#">Chapter 22: Terrestrial ecology and nature conservation, Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.22) and embedded environmental measures detailed in <a href="#">Section 22.7</a> of <a href="#">Chapter 22: Terrestrial ecology and nature conservation, Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.22).
			Pollution events and resulting effects associated with works above MHWS have been considered in <a href="#">Section 22.6</a> of <a href="#">Chapter 22: Terrestrial ecology and nature conservation, Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.22) within which they are scoped out on the basis of the embedded environmental measures detailed in <a href="#">Section 22.7</a> of <a href="#">Chapter 22: Terrestrial ecology</a>

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
5.5.17	<p>The Inspectorate considers that insufficient information is provided to support the scoping out of breeding birds from assessment entirely at this stage. The Inspectorate understands the embedded environmental measures in place to maintain legal compliance in this regard. However, the proposed working corridor for onshore cable installation (of up to 50m, and wider in respect of special crossings) as well as construction and operation of the onshore substation could require considerable destruction of habitat suitable for breeding birds. The Inspectorate therefore expects the ES to the detail such measures that would be employed and how they would be secured. The ES should assess this matter where significant effects are likely to occur</p>	Terrestrial ecology and nature conservation	<p>and nature conservation, Volume 2 of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.22).</p> <p>A breeding bird survey has been completed and is detailed in <b>Appendix 22.13: Breeding bird survey, Volume 4</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.22.13).</p> <p><b>Section 22.5 of Chapter 22: Terrestrial ecology and nature conservation, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.22) summarises the baseline with assessment provided in <b>Section 22.9 of Chapter 22: Terrestrial ecology and nature conservation, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.22). Embedded environmental measures are described within <b>Section 22.7 of Chapter 22: Terrestrial ecology and nature conservation, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.22).</p>
5.5.18	<p>The onshore cable corridor will pass near to or through existing watercourses, where trenched and / or special crossings may be required. The impacts of the Proposed Development upon fish species should be assessed in the ES. This should include impacts on migratory species such as eel, sea lamprey and sea trout. Cross</p>	Terrestrial ecology and nature conservation	<p>The watercourses that will be crossed using an “open cut” methodology have been surveyed, with the results provided in <b>Appendix 22.6: Fisheries habitat survey report, Volume 4</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.22.6).</p> <p><b>Section 22.6 of Chapter 22: Terrestrial ecology and nature conservation, Volume 2</b> of the ES</p>

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
	reference should be provided to offshore fish and shellfish.		(Document Reference: 6.2.22) provides an assessment for fish.
5.5.19	Where the Applicant concludes beneficial / positive effects which are reliant on successful implementation of biodiversity improvement / enhancement measures, evidence will need to be provided in the ES that the decision maker can be confident in their delivery through the DCO and / or other supporting legal mechanisms.	Terrestrial ecology and nature conservation	Assessment of beneficial/positive effects as a result of the onshore elements of the Proposed Development are addressed within <b>Section 22.9 of Chapter 22: Terrestrial ecology and nature conservation, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.22)
5.5.20	The ES Applicant should also assess any potential for likely significant effects to wildlife through altered thermal and EMF from buried cables, to which no reference is made in the Scoping Report (with cross reference to the Soils and Agriculture aspect chapter).	Terrestrial ecology and nature conservation	The potential effects of EMF on terrestrial ecology receptors are considered within <b>Section 22.6 of Chapter 22: Terrestrial ecology and nature conservation, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.22).
5.6	<b>Transport</b>		
5.6.1	The Inspectorate agrees that this matter can be scoped out on the basis that no hazardous loads are anticipated by the Applicant during construction or operation of the Proposed Development.	Transport	Acknowledged. Hazardous loads have been scoped out of the assessment within <b>Chapter 23: Transport, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.23).
5.6.2	The Scoping Report advises that the operation and maintenance requirements of the onshore part of the	Transport	Acknowledged. The assessment of operation and maintenance activities from the onshore works

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
	<p>Proposed Development would be occasional and therefore there would only be a limited number of vehicle movements. Whilst no further quantification of vehicle movements during operation has been provided, the Inspectorate is content that such activities will be below the threshold at which potentially significant effects could occur. Paragraph 6.7.49 of the Scoping Report does not provide any justification as to operational effects on PRoW. Whilst the impacts in this regard are likely to be predominantly experienced during construction, the ES should also consider the potential for significant effects during operation including (eg as a result of permanent diversions / changes to PRoW around the cable route and substation).</p>		<p>resulting in potential impacts on roads has been scoped out of the ES.</p> <p>The operation and maintenance effects on existing PRoWs of permanent onshore elements of the Proposed Development have been considered within the <a href="#">Outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan (PRoWMP)</a> (Document Reference: 7.8).</p>
5.6.3	<p>The Scoping Report has scoped out potential impact on local roads, PRoW and the users of these routes during decommissioning works on the basis that the effects of decommissioning will be lower than construction. The Inspectorate is unable to agree that this can be scoped out at this stage as the effects and subsequent mitigation have not been quantified for the construction phase. Although the transport impacts during decommissioning works would be similar or potentially lower than during construction, the ES should assess these matters where significant effects are likely to occur.</p>	Transport	<p>Acknowledged. It is anticipated that all onshore and offshore subsurface cable infrastructure will be left <i>in situ</i> as part of the decommissioning phase (outlined in <a href="#">Chapter 4: The Proposed Development, Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.4).</p> <p>Decommissioning effects will relate only to the removal of the onshore substation and traffic generation will therefore be lower than during construction.</p>



ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
5.6.4	<p>The Scoping Report states that the study area for the transport assessment will consider the onshore elements of the Scoping Boundary (and the “key routes outside” of this boundary). Routes that construction and operational traffic will take will be reviewed and amended in response to refinement of the onshore. The Inspectorate recommends that the geographical extent of the study area (with particular reference to “key routes” outside the Scoping Boundary) is agreed with the relevant highways authorities and Network Rail (where applicable).</p>	Transport	<p>An assessment of the decommissioning effects in relation to the decommissioning of the onshore substation is included in <a href="#">Section 23.12 of Chapter 23: Transport, Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.23)</p> <p>Construction traffic routing patterns are presented in <a href="#">Section 23.8 of Chapter 23: Transport, Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.23).</p> <p>The key routes have been agreed with the relevant transport and highways providers to inform the highways link assessments <a href="#">Chapter 23: Transport, Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.23).</p> <p>The Study Areas are provided in <a href="#">Section 23.4 of Chapter 23: Transport, Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.23) and <a href="#">Figures 23.5 and 23.6, Volume 3</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.23).</p>
5.6.5	<p>The Inspectorate welcomes the Applicant’s intention to agree the scope of assessment with the relevant consultation bodies. This is particularly important in agreeing the baseline position and the receptors which will be deemed sensitive in the assessment. It is also important that methodologies are justified, for example,</p>	Transport	<p>The scope of the assessment outlined in <a href="#">Section 23.4 of Chapter 23: Transport, Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.23) including baseline and receptors have been discussed with key stakeholders including West Sussex County Council (WSCC) and National Highways (further</p>

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
5.6.6	<p>The Scoping Report makes limited reference to how data will be collected to form the baseline assessment. The Inspectorate would expect the Applicant to agree the scope of any further baseline information to inform the assessment with the relevant authorities. The Inspectorate acknowledges the Applicants concerns regarding COVID-19 restrictions, the Applicant should refer to the advice provided in Section 3.4 of this Scoping Opinion.</p>	Transport	<p>details provided in <a href="#">Section 23.3</a> of <a href="#">Chapter 23: Transport, Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.23).</p> <p>Use of GEART (Institute of Environmental Assessment, 1993) has been applied as set out in <a href="#">Section 23.8, Chapter 23: Transport, Volume 2</a> (Document Reference: 6.2.23). The Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) (Standards for Highways, 2020) guidelines have been used within the <a href="#">Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP)</a> (Document Reference: 7.6) when setting out proposed permanent access designs.</p> <p>Discussion with WSCC on baseline surveys is set out in <a href="#">Section 23.3</a> of <a href="#">Chapter 23: Transport, Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.23).</p> <p>Details on the collation of the baseline data and how the COVID-19 pandemic issues have been addressed are in <a href="#">Section 23.5</a> of <a href="#">Chapter 23: Transport, Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.23). An agreement was reached with WSCC over the data used in the assessment. A combination of historic data and new traffic counts undertaken in 2021 have been</p>

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
5.6.7	The transport assessment should include an assessment of the potential impact on the rail network. Figure 6.7.1 indicates that several operational railway lines would be crossed. The assessment should also consider the potential impacts of any construction or diversion activities on public transport.	Transport	<p>used, given the COVID-19 pandemic restrictions were lifted.</p> <p>As part of the embedded environmental measures as part of the Proposed Development, it is proposed to provide a trenchless crossing of the rail network in two locations (outlined in commitment C-5) as seen in <b>Table 23-43 of Chapter 23: Transport, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.23), therefore there will no impact on the rail infrastructure as set out in <b>Table 23-44 of Chapter 23: Transport, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.23).</p>
5.6.8	No information is provided regarding any onshore vehicular movements associated with marine elements of the work (if any, and particularly in reference to nearshore / intertidal works). These should be included within the ES where significant effects are likely to occur. It is noted in paragraph 6.7.2 of the Scoping Report that the scope of offshore transport effects (beyond mean high water springs) are proposed to be considered elsewhere in the ES).	Transport	<p>Consideration is given to the traffic generation related to the onshore impacts of offshore works in the operation and maintenance phase. This is set out in <b>Section 23.10 of Chapter 23: Transport, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.23).</p> <p>Details as to why onshore impacts of offshore works in the construction phase are scoped out is set out in <b>Table 23-12 of Chapter 23: Transport, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.23).</p>

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
5.6.9	The Inspectorate welcomes the commitment to produce a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP), Abnormal Indivisible Load (AIL) access study and PRoW Management Plan. Drafts of these documents should be provided with the DCO application. It should be clear how the implementation of such plans would be secured in the DCO and the Applicant should consider how this plan would interact with the CoCP and other relevant plans.	Transport	An <b>Outline CTMP</b> (Document Reference: 7.6), <b>Outline PRoWMP</b> (Document Reference 7.8), and <b>Appendix 23.1: Abnormal Indivisible Load assessment, Volume 4</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.23.1) have been provided alongside the DCO application.
5.6.10	Any cross-referencing between aspect chapters should be clear within the ES and the Inspectorate welcomes the consideration of interrelationships on traffic and transport.	Transport	Cross referencing with other related aspect chapters is clearly set out throughout the chapter.
5.7	<b>Ground conditions</b>		
5.7.1	The Inspectorate considers that given the nature of the development the conclusion is reasonable and therefore agrees that these matters can be scoped out of the assessment. This is based on the justification that any maintenance would be subject to The Construction (Design and Management) (CDM) Regulations 2015 and safe working practices as part of normal construction health and safety management under the Health and Safety at Work Act (1974) and regulations made under the Act. The Inspectorate agrees that, with the	Ground conditions	<p>Acknowledged agreement to scope out effects from exposure to contamination via direct contact, inhalation and/or ingestion of soils and dusts resulting in health effects during temporary construction activities on or adjacent to landfills and other potentially contaminated sites.</p> <p>Additional detail on the legislation and embedded environmental measures, including how they will be employed and secured, has been included in</p>

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
	<p>implementation of measures to limit any potential pollution incidents, any potential impacts on ground conditions are unlikely to result in significant effects and therefore further assessment is not required. However, the Inspectorate seeks assurances as to the detail of such measures that would be employed and how they would be secured and therefore considers that this detail should be described within the ES.</p>		<p><b>Table 24-14 of Chapter 24: Ground conditions, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.24), in particular embedded environmental measure C-25 requiring all aspects of the construction work to be in accordance with the CDM Regulations 2015.</p>
5.7.2	<p>In relation to construction vehicle and equipment maintenance and storage of fuels/oils for construction vehicles and equipment (accidental spillages and leaks resulting in ground contamination and risks to human health) being scoped out:</p> <p>“The Inspectorate considers that given the nature of the development the conclusion is reasonable and therefore agrees that these matters can be scoped out of the assessment. This is based on the justification that any maintenance would be subject to The Construction (Design and Management) (CDM) Regulations 2015 and safe working practices as part of normal construction health and safety management under the Health and Safety at Work Act (1974) and regulations made under the Act.</p> <p>The Inspectorate agrees that, with the implementation of measures to limit any potential pollution incidents, any potential impacts on ground conditions are unlikely to</p>	Ground conditions	<p>Acknowledged agreement to scope out effects from accidental spillages and leaks resulting in ground contamination and risks to human health during construction activities.</p> <p>Additional detail on the legislation and embedded environmental measures, including how they will be employed and secured, has been included in <b>Table 24-14 of Chapter 24: Ground conditions, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.24), in particular embedded environmental measure C-25 requiring all aspects of the construction work to be in accordance with the CDM Regulations 2015.</p>

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
	<p>result in significant effects and therefore further assessment is not required. However, the Inspectorate seeks assurances as to the detail of such measures that would be employed and how they would be secured and therefore considers that this detail should be described within the ES.”</p>		
5.7.3	<p>The Inspectorate considers that given the nature of the development the conclusion is reasonable and therefore agrees that these matters can be scoped out of the assessment.</p>	Ground conditions	<p>Acknowledged agreement to scope out effects from accidental spillages and leaks resulting in ground contamination and risks to human health during operation and maintenance activities.</p>
5.7.4	<p>The Inspectorate considers that given the nature of the development (and likely activities during decommissioning) the conclusion is reasonable and therefore agrees that these matters can be scoped out of the assessment.</p>	Ground conditions	<p>Acknowledged agreement to scope out effects from exposure to contamination via direct contact, inhalation and/or ingestion of soils and dusts resulting in health effects during decommissioning activities.</p>
5.7.5	<p>The Inspectorate considers that given the nature of the development (and likely activities during decommissioning) the conclusion is reasonable and therefore agrees that these matters can be scoped out of the assessment.</p>	Ground conditions	<p>Acknowledged agreement to scope out effects from accidental spillages and leaks resulting in ground contamination and risks to human health during decommissioning activities.</p>
5.7.6	<p>The Inspectorate notes that the study area proposed is provisional and will be reviewed and amended in response to such matters as refinement of the onshore</p>	Ground conditions	<p>This ES uses the updated Study Area based on final onshore proposed DCO Order Limits and the criteria presented in <a href="#">Section 24.4</a> of <a href="#">Chapter</a></p>

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
	<p>components, the identification of additional impact pathways and in response, where appropriate, to feedback from consultation. The Inspectorate welcomes this approach and recommends that the ES should clearly define the chosen study area and provide a justification in support of its suitability.</p>		<p><b>24: Ground conditions, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.24). The Study Area used for this ES is shown on <b>Figure 24.1, Volume 3</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.24) and is based on these principles and the latest onshore cable corridor and onshore substation areas.</p>
5.7.7	<p>Table 6.8.6 of the Scoping Report sets out the data sources to be used to inform the baseline assessment. Effort should be made to agree the desk-based study area and need for site surveys (as may be necessary according to the desk study outcomes) with relevant consultation bodies.</p>	Ground conditions	<p>Consultation has been undertaken with stakeholders as detailed in <b>Chapter 24: Ground conditions, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.24) and included discussion of the Study Area and site inspection of key locations to support the desk study.</p>
5.7.8	<p>The Inspectorate notes the reference to the simple and detailed assessments which are ‘analogous’ to the stages of Land Contamination Risk Management (LCRM). The impact assessment should also include detailed and site-specific assessments to demonstrate that the risks to groundwater are acceptable, particularly in those areas identified as of greatest risk. Effort should be made to agree the approach to the assessment, including the simple and detailed assessment methodology and site-specific surveys, with the relevant consultation bodies, including the EA.</p>	Ground conditions	<p>The assessment presented in the desk study which supports <b>Chapter 24: Ground conditions, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.24) (<b>Appendix 24.1: Phase 1 geo-environmental desk study, Volume 4</b> (Application Document Reference: 6.4.24.1)) identifies where more detailed site-specific assessments are required.</p> <p>Consultation was undertaken with stakeholders as detailed in this Section of the chapter and included discussion of assessment methodology.</p>



ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
5.7.9	The Inspectorate notes that the term Conceptual Site Model (CSM) is included within the acronyms listed in the Scoping Report. However, there is no reference to a CSM within the Ground Condition section of the Scoping Report. The Applicant should seek to agree the scope of and coverage of any CSM with the EA and other relevant consultation bodies, as appropriate.	Ground conditions	Reference to CSM has been included in <a href="#">Chapter 24: Ground conditions, Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.24).  Consultation was undertaken with stakeholders as detailed this Section of the chapter and included discussion of the scope of the assessment, the baseline data and the CSM.
5.7.10	The ES should include specific consideration of any preferential pathways for pollution and contaminants that may be created as a result of the Proposed Development.	Ground conditions	Consideration of preferential pathway creation has been included as part the assessment of effects presented in <a href="#">Section 24.8 of Chapter 24: Ground conditions, Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.24).
5.8	<b>Historic environment</b>		
5.8.1	The Inspectorate agrees that effects on heritage assets out with 1km of the onshore landfall and cable route corridor can be scoped out of the assessment, particularly based on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="360 1206 1088 1278">• The temporary and transient nature of onshore construction (and decommissioning) works; and</li> </ul>	Historic environment	Acknowledged.  Heritage assets within 1km of the onshore part of the proposed Development Consent Order (DCO) Order Limits comprising the onshore cable corridor and landfall, and within 2km of the proposed DCO Order Limits comprising the onshore substation have been considered for effects arising through changes to setting of heritage assets ( <a href="#">Section 25.4, Section 25.9 to</a>



ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The limited nature of the visual effects during operation as a result of the landfall area (transition bays etc).</li> </ul> <p>This does not include scoping out effects of the substation on the same basis (which should be included where significant effects could occur). This also includes the connection to the existing Bolney substation, particularly given that an overhead line connection does not appear to have been expressly ruled out by the Applicant).</p>		<p><b>25.14, Chapter 25: Historic environment, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.25), <b>Figure 25.1, Volume 3</b> (Document Reference: 6.3.25)).</p> <p>Where the Proposed Development connects into the existing National Grid substation at Bolney, this will be via buried cable (C-1).</p>
5.8.2	The Inspectorate agrees that direct effects on assets outside of the scoping boundary can be scoped out of further assessment as there is no pathway for such direct effects	Historic environment	Acknowledged. The same logic is applied at ES whereby heritage assets outside of the onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits are scoped out as there is no pathway for such direct effects ( <b>Section 25.4 of Chapter 25: Historic environment, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.25)).
5.8.3	Noting the comments in box 5.8.4 below, the ‘extended study area’ has yet to be defined. Whilst the Inspectorate agrees with the logic and notes the intention to refine and agree this ‘extended study area’ to capture potential effects of the Proposed Development as necessary, the Inspectorate cannot	Historic environment	Acknowledged. Since the refinement of the proposed DCO Order Limits, extended Study Areas (onshore substation and seascape Study Areas) have been determined for the purposes of assessing the settings effects as a result of the onshore elements of the Proposed Development. These extend 2km from the onshore substation site and 25km from the offshore Area of Search

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
	agree to this being scoped out of the assessment as it's spatial extent is yet to be defined.		(see <a href="#">Section 25.4</a> of <a href="#">Chapter 25: Historic environment, Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.25) and <a href="#">Figure 25.1, Volume 3</a> (Document Reference: 6.3.25)).
5.8.4	Where an 'extended study area' will be used to identify heritage assets (to be determined through consultation with stakeholders and not purely based on an "arbitrary 5km or 10km boundary"), the definition and rationale for the selection of areas and relevant assets rather than simply the study area should be clearly explained.	Historic environment	Acknowledged. The rationale for determining the extended Study Areas and seascape Study Area is provided in <a href="#">Section 25.4 of Chapter 25: Historic environment, Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.25)
5.8.5	Paragraphs 2.4.20, 6.9.37 and 6.9.38 explain that Palaeolithic remains and deposits, as well as elements of a Bronze Age rural landscape, have been exposed by coastal erosion close to the landfall location at Climping. The Inspectorate therefore considers that the area has high archaeological potential (and Historic England highlight the possibility for discovery of remains of national importance). The ES should provide an assessment of significance of effects on these undesignated archaeological remains and how this is taken into consideration as part of the overall selection process for the landfall area (and onshore route).	Historic environment	An onshore historic environment desk study, geoarchaeological desk study and geophysical survey has been prepared to inform the ES assessment ( <a href="#">Appendices 25.2: Historic environment desk study, Volume 4</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.2), <a href="#">25.3: Onshore desk-based geoarchaeological and palaeoenvironmental assessment report, Volume 4</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.3) and <a href="#">25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report, Volume 4</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4) the historic environment baseline summarised in <a href="#">Section 25.6 of Chapter 25: Historic environment, Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.25). The relevant assessment of effects is presented in <a href="#">Section</a>

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
			<p data-bbox="1368 363 1989 472"><b>25.9</b> of <b>Chapter 25: Historic environment, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.25).</p> <p data-bbox="1368 512 2051 1059">The design of the onshore elements of the Proposed Development has been an iterative process (<b>Chapter 3: Alternatives, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.3), that has sought to broadly adopt these design principles including avoiding sensitive features in the landscape wherever possible. Historic environment receptors were a consideration in this design process, together with all other environmental and engineering constraints The landfall selection process including the options appraisal and constraints mapping approach undertaken is detailed in <b>Section 3.4</b> in <b>Chapter 3: Alternatives, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.23).</p> <p data-bbox="1368 1102 2063 1283">Early in the project design the cable installation method at landfall was chosen to be via HDD, which will be installed at a depth which would not encounter potential shallow buried/submerged archaeological remains within the landfall zone.</p>

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
5.8.6	Table 6.9.1 does not include a valuation for non-designated remains of national importance. On the basis of the information in that table, the Inspectorate understands that they would be classified as “high” sensitivity and the ES should consider the assessment of significance of effects on this basis.	Historic environment	For the purposes of assessing the significance of effects, <a href="#">Table 25-15</a> of <a href="#">Chapter 25: Historic environment, Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.25) details the four classes of heritage significance (or sensitivity). Non-designated remains of national importance are included under “high” heritage significance.
5.8.7	Section 6.9 of the Scoping Report is focused on only impact of the onshore works on heritage assets within the onshore works boundary. Limited information is provided in terms of assessment methodology of the potential impact of the offshore works on the settings of onshore heritage assets (which is not explicitly covered in the marine archaeology aspect chapter). The ES should present specific consideration of the potential for significant effects from offshore works during construction and operation on the setting of onshore assets (noting overlap with LVIA and SLVIA aspects).	Historic environment	<p>Assessment scope and methodology of the potential impact of the offshore works on the settings of onshore heritage assets is provided in <a href="#">Sections 25.4 and 25.5</a> of <a href="#">Chapter 25: Historic environment, Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.25). The assessment considers the potential for significant effects from offshore works during construction and operation on the setting of onshore assets in <a href="#">Sections 25.9 and 25.10</a> of <a href="#">Chapter 25: Historic environment, Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.25).</p> <p>A settings scoping appraisal is provided in <a href="#">Appendix 25.7: Settings assessment scoping report, Volume 4</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.7).</p>
5.9	<b>Water environment</b>		

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
5.9.1	<p>The Inspectorate agrees that as a result of the limited land disturbance during the earthworks associated with the landfall-cable it is unlikely for such activities to culminate in significant effects on groundwater levels. This is also the case in respect of disturbance during the operational and decommissioning stages. The Inspectorate agrees that this matter can be scoped out of the assessment, with the exception of the proposed substation. The ES will assess the potential for significant effects on groundwater levels from the proposed substation as set out in Table 6.10.11 However, the Inspectorate expects the ES will include an assessment of potential effects on groundwater quality during all phases and covering all aspects of the Proposed Development where significant effects are likely to occur.</p>	Water environment	<p>Onshore substation potential effects and also all effects on groundwater quality are retained in the assessment of effects. In addition to this, potential effects from the onshore cable route on groundwater levels have been scoped back in, in response to the request of the Planning Inspectorate. This assessment is presented in <b>Sections 26.9 to 26.11 of Chapter 26: Water environment, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.26).</p>
5.9.2	<p>The Scoping Report does not clearly identify the locations where the cable may cross below or run near a river. This should be detailed in the ES. Site-specific assessments for each location should also be undertaken to inform the cable crossing techniques at each main river and where significant effects may occur. Any mitigation and/or design measures relied upon for the purposes of the assessment should be explained in the ES and appropriately secured. Effort should be</p>	Water environment	<p>An assessment of effects from watercourse crossings is carried out for these watercourses within <b>Sections 26.9 to 26.11 of Chapter 26: Water environment, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.26), together with the provision of appropriate embedded environmental measures in <b>Section 26.7 of Chapter 26: Water environment, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.26). These embedded environmental measures have been secured as part of the <b>Outline Code of</b></p>

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
5.9.3	The assessment in the ES should take into account the potential impacts of climate change using the latest UK Climate Projections (UKCP18). Effort should be made to agree the climate change model and future flood risk allowance baseline with relevant consultation bodies including the EA and lead local flood risk authority	Water environment	<p><b>Construction Practice (CoCP)</b> (Document Reference: 7.2) and to date have been shared and agreed with stakeholders via the consultation process including targeted stakeholder meetings with the Environment Agency and the LLFA (see <b>Table 26-7 of Chapter 26: Water environment, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.26)).</p> <p>The future baseline accounting for climate change is presented in <b>Section 26.6 of Chapter 26: Water environment, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.26) and as part of the FRA presented in <b>Appendix 26.2: Flood Risk Assessment, Volume 4</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.26.2) which also considers flood vulnerability resilience. The climate change model and future flood risk allowance baseline have been discussed and agreed via the consultation process with the Environment Agency and LLFA, as set out in the Flood Risk Assessment within <b>Appendix 26.2: Flood Risk Assessment, Volume 4</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.26.2).</p>
5.9.4	The ES should clearly include in the baseline, a description of existing (and where relevant, proposed)	Water environment	The existing flood defences and future options are described in the FRA provided in <b>Appendix 26.2: Flood Risk Assessment, Volume 4</b> of the

ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
	flood defences or flood alleviation measures that could be impacted or required by the Proposed Development.		ES (Document Reference: 6.4.26.2) and summarised within <b>Section 26.6 of Chapter 26: Water environment, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.26). The FRA includes an assessment of all flood risk effects and associated embedded environmental measures required by the Proposed Development.
5.9.5	Where site specific mitigation measures are to be implemented, the ES should describe the mitigation clearly. The ES should also outline how the mitigation measures will be secured through the DCO or other legal mechanism.	Water environment	The provision of embedded environmental measures is outlined in <b>Section 26.7 of Chapter 26: Water environment, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.26) and they are secured via the <b>Outline CoCP</b> (Document Reference: 7.2) and DCO requirements.
5.9.6	The Inspectorate notes that little consideration has been given to any potential effects of the Proposed Development on marine water quality specifically (only by proxy in terms of it's bearing on benthic and fish ecology, coastal processes and other relevant aspects). Paragraph 6.10.3 sets out that the study area will encompass surface water bodies (river and transitional) and groundwater bodies but not coastal bodies. The ES should include any potential impacts of the works on marine water and sediment quality, particularly with regard to the two designated in proximity of the proposed cable corridor and landfall site (including cross reference to any standalone WFD assessment and other	Water environment	The assessment on marine water quality is provided within <b>Chapter 6: Coastal processes, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.6), <b>Chapter 8: Fish and shellfish ecology, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.8) and <b>Chapter 9: Benthic, subtidal and intertidal ecology, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.9), as the receptors are offshore and not land-based. Within <b>Sections 26.9 to 26.11 of Chapter 26: Water environment, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.26) potential effects from land-based activities at the proposed landfall are



ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
	relevant aspect chapters of the ES). The Inspectorate has also made comments to this effect in section 4.10 of this Opinion in respect of the proposed nature conservation aspect chapter.		considered on the Coastal Sussex WFD water body. A WFD compliance assessment has been provided in <a href="#">Appendix 26.3: Water Framework Directive compliance assessment, Volume 4</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.26.3) for all WFD bodies under consideration.
<b>6</b>	<b>INFORMATION SOURCES</b>	General	
<b>6.0.1</b>	<p>The Inspectorate's National Infrastructure Planning website includes links to a range of advice regarding the making of applications and environmental procedures, these include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pre-application prospectus</li> <li>• Planning Inspectorate advice notes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Advice Note Three: EIA Notification and Consultation;</li> <li>○ Advice Note Four: Section 52: Obtaining information about interests in land (Planning Act 2008);</li> <li>○ Advice Note Five: Section 53: Rights of Entry (Planning Act 2008);</li> <li>○ Advice Note Seven: Environmental Impact Assessment: Process, Preliminary</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	General	This comment is acknowledged. The Planning Inspectorate advice notes have been referred to throughout the development of the Proposed Development.



ID	Planning Inspectorate comments	Aspect	How this has been addressed in this ES
	<p>Environmental Information and Environmental Statements;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Advice Note Nine: Using the ‘Rochdale Envelope’;</li> <li>○ Advice Note Ten: Habitat Regulations Assessment relevant to nationally significant infrastructure projects (includes discussion of Evidence Plan process);</li> <li>○ Advice Note Twelve: Transboundary Impacts;</li> <li>○ Advice Note Seventeen: Cumulative Effects Assessment; and</li> <li>○ Advice Note Eighteen: The Water Framework Directive.</li> </ul>		
<b>6.0.2</b>	<p>Applicants are also advised to review the list of information required to be submitted within an application for Development as set out in The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedures) Regulations 2009.</p>	General	This comment is acknowledged.



## 2. Glossary of terms and abbreviations

**Table 2-1 Glossary of terms and abbreviations**

<b>Term (acronym)</b>	<b>Definition</b>
<b>Development Consent Order (DCO)</b>	This is the means of obtaining permission for developments categorised as Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects, under the Planning Act 2008.
<b>Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)</b>	The process of evaluating the likely significant environmental effects of a proposed project or development over and above the existing circumstances (or 'baseline').
<b>Environmental Statement (ES)</b>	The written output presenting the full findings of the Environmental Impact Assessment.
<b>Evidence Plan Process (EPP)</b>	A voluntary consultation process with specialist stakeholders to agree the approach and the information required to support the EIA and HRA for certain aspects.
<b>ETG</b>	Expert Topic Group
<b>FOC</b>	Fibre Optic Cable
<b>RIAA</b>	Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment
<b>MCZ</b>	Marine Conservation Zone
<b>RED</b>	Rampion Extension Development Ltd (the Applicant)
<b>MDS</b>	Maximum Design Scenario
<b>Electromagnetic field (EMF)</b>	An electromagnetic field is an electric and magnetic force field that surrounds a moving electric charge.
<b>Zone of Influence (Zoi)</b>	The area surrounding the Proposed Development which could result in likely significant effects.
<b>PEMP</b>	Project Environment Management Plan
<b>MPCP</b>	Marine Pollution Control Plan
<b>LBAP</b>	Local Biodiversity Action Plan
<b>BAP</b>	Biodiversity Action Plan

<b>Term (acronym)</b>	<b>Definition</b>
<b>CRM</b>	Collision Risk Modelling
<b>HRA</b>	Hydrological Risk Assessment
<b>Unexploded Ordnance (UXO)</b>	Unexploded ordnance are explosive weapons (bombs, shells, grenades, land mines, naval mines, etc.) that did not explode when they were deployed and still pose a risk of detonation, potentially many decades after they were used or discarded.
<b>WTG</b>	Wind Turbine Generator
<b>Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)</b>	Sites designated at the national level under the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 (as amended). They are a series of sites that are designated to protect the best examples of significant natural habitats and populations of species.
<b>Special Area of Conservation (SAC)</b>	International designation implemented under the Habitats Regulations for the protection of habitats and (non-bird) species. Sites designated to protect habitats and species on Annexes I and II of the Habitats Directive. Sufficient habitat to maintain favourable conservation status of the particular feature in each member state needs to be identified and designated.
<b>Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR)</b>	The written output of the Environmental Impact Assessment undertaken to date for the Proposed Development. It was developed to support Statutory Consultation and presented the preliminary findings of the assessment to allow an informed view to be developed of the Proposed Development, the assessment approach that was undertaken, and the preliminary conclusions on the likely significant effects of the Proposed Development and environmental measures proposed.

### 3. References

---

- Department for Energy Security & Net Zero (2023a). *Overarching National Policy Statement for energy (EN-1)* [online] Available at: [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/1147380/NPS\\_EN-1.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1147380/NPS_EN-1.pdf) [Accessed 25 July 2023].
- Department for Energy Security & Net Zero (2023b). *National Policy Statement for renewable energy infrastructure (EN-3)* [online] Available at: [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/1147382/NPS\\_EN-3.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1147382/NPS_EN-3.pdf) [Accessed 25 July 2023].
- Department for Energy Security & Net Zero (2023c). *National Policy Statement for electricity networks infrastructure (EN-5)* [online] Available at: [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/1147384/NPS\\_EN-5.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1147384/NPS_EN-5.pdf) [Accessed 25 July 2023].
- Environmental Protection UK (EPUK) and Institute of Air Quality Management (IAQM), (2017). *Land-Use Planning & Development Control: Planning for Air Quality*. [Online] Available at: <http://www.iaqm.co.uk/text/guidance/air-quality-planning-guidance.pdf> [Accessed 30 July 2023].
- Hammond, P., Lacey, C., Gilles, A., Viquerat, S., Borjesson, P., Herr, H., Macleod, K., Ridoux, V., Santos, M., Scheidat, M., Teilmann, J., Vingada, J. and Øien, N. (2017). *Estimates of cetacean abundance in European Atlantic waters in summer 2016 from the SCANS-III aerial and shipboard surveys*. [Online] Available at: <https://marine.gov.scot/sma/content/estimates-cetacean-abundance-european-atlantic-waters-summer-2016-scans-iii-aerial-and> [Accessed 27 July 2023].
- International Maritime Organization (IMO), (2018). *Revised Guidelines for Formal Safety Assessment (FSA) for Use in the IMO Rule-Making Process*. [Online] Available at: [https://wwwcdn.imo.org/localresources/en/OurWork/HumanElement/Documents/MSC-MEPC.2-Circ.12-Rev.2%20-%20Revised%20Guidelines%20For%20Formal%20Safety%20Assessment%20\(Fsa\)For%20Use%20In%20The%20Imo%20Rule-Making%20Proces...%20\(Secretariat\).pdf](https://wwwcdn.imo.org/localresources/en/OurWork/HumanElement/Documents/MSC-MEPC.2-Circ.12-Rev.2%20-%20Revised%20Guidelines%20For%20Formal%20Safety%20Assessment%20(Fsa)For%20Use%20In%20The%20Imo%20Rule-Making%20Proces...%20(Secretariat).pdf) [Accessed 30 July 2023].
- Planning Inspectorate, (2018). *Advice Note Nine: Rochdale Envelope*. [Online] Available at: <https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/legislation-and-advice/advice-notes/advice-note-nine-rochdale-envelope/> [Accessed 30 July 2023].
- Planning Inspectorate, (2020). *Scoping Opinion: Proposed Rampion 2 Offshore Wind Farm Case Reference: EN010117*. [Online] Available at: <https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/ipc/uploads/projects/EN010117/EN010117-000045-EN010117%20Scoping%20Opinion.pdf> [Accessed 27 July 2023].
- Rampion Extension Development Ltd (RED), (2020). *Rampion 2 Offshore Wind Farm Environmental Impact Assessment Scoping Report*. [Online] Available at: <https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp->

[content/ipc/uploads/projects/EN010117/EN010117-000006-EN010117%20-%20Scoping%20Report.pdf](#) [Accessed 30 July 2023].

Rampion Extension Development Ltd (RED), (2021). *Preliminary Environmental Information Report*. [Online] Available at: <https://rampion2.com/consultations-2021/formal-consultation-detailed-documents/> [Accessed 26 July 2023].

*The Construction (Design and Management) Regulations 2015*. [Online] Available at: <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2015/51/contents/made> [Accessed 30 July 2023].

Page intentionally blank

