

# Outer Dowsing Offshore Wind

## 5.1 Consultation Report

### Annex 5.1.4B Section 42 Consultation Responses

Date: March 2024

Document Reference: 5.1.4B

Rev: 1.0



Company:	<b>Outer Dowsing Offshore Wind</b>	Asset:	<b>Whole Asset</b>			
Project:	<b>Whole Wind Farm</b>	Sub Project/Package:	Whole Asset			
Document Title or Description:	Appendix 5.1.4B Section 42 Consultation Responses					
Internal Document Number:	PP1-ODOW-DEV-CS-REP-0145	3 <sup>rd</sup> Party Doc No (If applicable):	N/A			
Outer Dowsing Offshore Wind accepts no liability for the accuracy or completeness of the information in this document nor for any loss or damage arising from the use of such information.						
Rev No.	Date	Status / Reason for Issue	Author	Checked by	Reviewed by	Approved by
1.0	Mar 2024	DCO Application	ODOW	ODOW	ODOW	ODOW

## Table of Contents

Acronyms & Definitions .....	3
Abbreviations / Acronyms.....	3
Reference Documentation.....	6
1 Introduction.....	7
2 Applicant Regard to Phase 2 Section 42 Consultation Responses .....	8
2.1 Offshore.....	8
2.2 Onshore.....	97
3 Applicant Regard to Autumn Section 42 Consultation Responses.....	173
3.1 Offshore.....	173
3.2 Onshore.....	180
4 Applicant Regard to Targeted Winter Section 42 Consultation Responses.....	209

## Acronyms & Definitions

### Abbreviations / Acronyms

Abbreviation / Acronym	Description
BBC	Boston Borough Council
CLG	Community Liaison Group
CLO	Community Liaison Officer
DCLG	Department for Communities and Local Government
DCO	Development Consent Order
EEA	European Economic Area
EEZ	Exclusive Economic Zone
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
ECC	Export Cable Corridor
ELDC	East Lindsey District Council
EPP	Evidence Plan Process
ES	Environmental Statement
ETG	Expert Topic Group
GIG	Green Investment Group
GDPR	General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR)
GW	Gigawatt
HDD	Horizontal Directional Drilling
HGV	Heavy Goods Vehicle
HMLR	His Majesty's Land Registry
HND	Holistic Network Design
HRA	Habitats Regulation Assessment
HSE	Health and Safety Executive
IDB	Internal Drainage Board
LCC	Lincolnshire County Council
LCCP	Lincolnshire Coastal Country Park
LIG	Land Interest Group
LIQ	Land Interest Questionnaire
LNR	Local Nature Reserve
LPA	Local Planning Authority
LWT	Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust
LVIA	Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment
MHWS	Mean High Water Springs
MLWS	Mean Low Water Springs
MMO	Marine Management Organisation
MOD	Ministry of Defence
MW	Megawatt
NPS	National Policy Statement
NSIP	Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project
ODOW	Outer Dowsing Offshore Wind
OnSS	Onshore Substation
OTNR	Offshore Transmission Network Review
PEIR	Preliminary Environmental Information Report
PoC	Point of Contact

PINS	Planning Inspectorate
RIAA	Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment
S&ELCP	South & East Lincolnshire Councils Partnership
SHDC	South Holland District Council
SoCC	Statement of Community Consultation
SoS	Secretary of State
SSSI	Site of Special Scientific Interest
STEMNET	Science Technology Engineering and Mathematics Network
TCE	The Crown Estate Commissioners
ToR	Terms of Reference
TJBs	Transition Joint Bays
UKHSA	UK Health Security Agency

## Definitions

Term	Definition
2008 Act	The Planning Act 2008
Autumn Consultation	The Autumn Consultation relating to the Project carried out in October and November 2023
Development Consent Order (DCO)	An order made under the Planning Act 2008 granting development consent for a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP).
Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)	A statutory process by which certain planned projects must be assessed before a formal decision to proceed can be made. It involves the collection and consideration of environmental information, which fulfils the assessment requirements of the EIA Regulations, including the publication of an Environmental Statement (ES).
Environmental Statement (ES)	The suite of documents that detail the processes and results of the EIA.
Evidence Plan Process (EPP)	A voluntary process of stakeholder consultation with appropriate Expert Topic Groups (ETGs) that discusses and where possible agrees the detailed approach to the EIA and information to support Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA) for those relevant topics included in the process, undertaken during the pre-application period.
GT R4 Ltd	The Applicant making the application for a DCO. The Applicant is GTR4 Limited (a joint venture between Corio Generation and, TotalEnergies and Gulf Energy Development), trading as Outer Dowsing Offshore Wind.
Local Authority	A body empowered by law to exercise various statutory functions for a particular area of the United Kingdom. This includes County Councils, District Councils and the Broads Authority, as set out in Section 43 of the Planning Act 2008.

Mitigation	Mitigation measures are commitments made by the Project to reduce and/or eliminate the potential for significant effects to arise as a result of the Project. Mitigation measures can be embedded (part of the project design) or secondarily added to reduce impacts in the case of potentially significant effects.
Outer Dowsing Offshore Wind (ODOW)	The Project.
PEIR	Preliminary Environmental Information Report. The PEIR was written in the style of a draft Environmental Statement (ES) to support and inform the statutory consultation process in the pre-application phase. Following that consultation, the PEIR was updated to produce the Project's ES to accompany the application for the Development Consent Order (DCO).
Phase 1 Consultation	The Phase 1 Consultation relating to the Project carried out in November 2022.
Phase 1A Consultation	The Phase 1A Consultation relating to the Project and the proposed alternative route option carried out in February 2023.
Phase 2 Consultation	The Phase 2 Consultation relating to the Project including consultation on the PEIR carried out in June and July 2023.
Prescribed consultee	All consultees listed in Schedule 1 of the Infrastructure Planning (Application: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009 or by the Planning Inspectorate under Regulation 11(1)(c) of the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017)
Proposed Development	The Project
Scoping Opinion	The Scoping Opinion relating to the Project published by The Planning Inspectorate on 09 September 2022.
Section 44 Consultees	Consultees identified in accordance with Section 42(1)(d) of the 2008 Act.
Statutory consultee	Organisations that are required to be consulted by the Applicant, the Local Planning Authorities and/or The Planning Inspectorate during the pre-application and/or examination phases, and who also have a statutory responsibility in some form that may be relevant to the Project and the DCO application. This includes those bodies and interests prescribed under Section 42 of the Planning Act 2008. Not all prescribed bodies and interested parties will be statutory consultees.
The Planning Inspectorate	The agency responsible for operating the planning process for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIPs).
The Project	Outer Dowsing Offshore Wind, an offshore wind generating station together with associated onshore and offshore infrastructure.
Targeted Consultation	Winter The Targeted Winter Consultation relating to the Project carried out in December 2023 and January 2024

## Reference Documentation

Document Number	Title
5.1	Consultation Report
6.1.2	Need, Policy and Legislative Context
6.1.3	Project Description
6.1.4	Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives
6.1.5	EIA Methodology
6.1.6	Technical Consultation
6.1.7	Marine Physical Processes
6.1.8	Marine Water and Sediment Quality
6.1.9	Benthic and Intertidal Ecology
6.1.10	Fish and Shellfish Ecology
6.1.11	Marine Mammals
6.1.12	Offshore and Intertidal Ornithology
6.1.13	Marine and Intertidal Archaeology
6.1.14	Commercial Fisheries
6.1.15	Shipping and Navigation
6.1.16	Aviation, Radar, Military and Communication
6.1.17	Marine Infrastructure and Other Users
6.1.18	Seascape, Landscape and Visual
6.1.19	Onshore Air Quality
6.1.20	Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage
6.1.21	Onshore Ecology
6.1.22	Onshore Ornithology
6.1.23	Geology and Ground Conditions
6.1.24	Hydrology and Flood Risk
6.1.25	Land Use
6.1.26	Noise and Vibration
6.1.27	Traffic and Transport
6.1.28	LVIA
6.1.29	Socioeconomic Characteristics
6.1.30	Human Health
8.1	Outline Code of Construction Practice
8.1.1	Outline Noise and Vibration Management Plan
8.1.2	Outline Air Quality Management Plan
8.1.3	Outline Soil Management Plan
8.1.5	Outline Surface Water Drainage Strategy
8.8	Outline Offshore WSI
8.9	Outline Onshore WSI
8.10	Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Strategy
8.15	Outline CTMP
8.16	Outline Travel Plan
8.17	Outline PAMP

# 1 Introduction

1. The Applicant carried out consultation under section 42 of the Planning Act 2008 (the 2008 Act) in accordance with the Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC) agreed following consultation with the local authorities and other stakeholders.
2. The Applicant has undertaken three phases of consultation under section 42 of the 2008 Act as outlined in the below Table 1.1. All phases of consultation have been carried out in accordance with the provisions of the SoCC.

Table 1.1 *Consultation Phases carried out under section 42 of the 2008 Act*

Consultation Phase	Timeframe	Type
Phase 2	7 <sup>th</sup> Jun –21 <sup>st</sup> Jul 2023	Consultation on further refinements and the Project’s Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR)
Autumn	20 <sup>th</sup> Oct –24 <sup>th</sup> Nov 2023	Consultation on further project refinements
Targeted Winter	18 <sup>th</sup> Dec 2023 -19 <sup>th</sup> Jan 2024	Targeted consultation on specific project refinements



## 2 Applicant Regard to Phase 2 Section 42 Consultation Responses

### 2.1 Offshore

Table 2.1 Applicant Regard to Phase 2 Section 42 Consultation Responses (Offshore)

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard
1	Boston Borough Council	P2_5	The PEIR acknowledges the likely impacts on the Borough and other consultees will have more detailed knowledge to accept, or not, the methodology and conclusions of the impact. We have a fishing fleet and I note that the PEIR includes a chapter on fish and shellfish ecology and commercial fisheries. The commercial fishing chapter mentions consultation with fishermen (Page 19) but does not mention Boston. I do not know if the site impacts on the Boston fisherman's fishing grounds and so we should cover that in our response.	The Applicant has noted this comment. The appointed Fisheries Liaison Officer (FLO) engaged with fishermen in Boston and Kings Lynn in April 2022, as well as appointed FLOs for neighbouring wind farms. These discussions confirmed that the Boston fishermen do not operate north of Gibraltar Point, outside of the Project study area.
2	Boston Borough Council	P2_5	<p>This proposal is cleared with respect to radio link infrastructure operated by the local energy networks. JRC analyses proposals for wind farms on behalf of the UK Fuel &amp; Power Industry. This is to assess their potential to interfere with radio systems operated by utility companies in support of their regulatory operational requirements. In the case of this proposed wind energy development, JRC does not foresee any potential problems based on known interference scenarios and the data you have provided. However, if any details of the wind farm change, particularly the disposition or scale of any turbine(s), it will be necessary to re-evaluate the proposal.</p> <p>In making this judgement, JRC has used its best endeavours with the available data, although we recognise that there may be effects which are as yet unknown or inadequately predicted. JRC cannot therefore be held liable if subsequently problems arise that we have not predicted.</p> <p>It should be noted that this clearance pertains only to the date of its issue. As the use of the spectrum is dynamic, the use of the band is changing on an ongoing basis and consequently, developers are advised to seek re-coordination prior to considering any design changes</p>	The confirmation of the anticipated lack of impact is noted. Detailed consideration of potential impacts to radio systems including mitigation measures is provided in Chapter 16: Aviation, Radar, and Military and Communication.
3	Boston Borough Council	P2_5	Thank you for your email. The only comments any members of the council had were questions on what Compensation the Parish of Frampton would receive as there is construction works going on in our Parish, and we feel we deserve some sort of compensation or community benefit.	The Applicant has noted this comment. The Applicant is committed to developing a Community Benefit Fund which will be launched post consent
4	Cefas	P2_7	<p>I lead the advice work at Cefas for marine licence applications through the MMO/Planning Inspectorate. I note that you've sent out requests for responses to your public consultation for Outer Dowsing Offshore Wind Farm from Cefas. Please note that any consultation from Cefas for marine licence applications must come through the MMO and we - as an organisation - cannot provide bilateral consultation for your project/application.</p> <p>If you've already received a response(s) from Cefas which you have not received through the MMO then please could you disregard these responses and I'd be grateful if you could let me know of any such case</p>	The Applicant has noted these comments and continued to engage with Cefas.

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard
5	Environment Agency	P2_9	<p>Table 8 - Part 8: states that 8.1.8 is the 'Outline Preliminary Crossing Schedule Offshore' which aligns with Plan 2.10 and 8.1.9 is the 'Outline Preliminary Crossing Schedule Onshore' which aligns with Plan 2.09.</p> <p>However, within Part 8, document 8.1.8 is the Outline Preliminary Crossing Schedule – Onshore and document 8.1.9 is the Outline Preliminary Crossing Schedule – Offshore. If this document is to form the basis for any future guide to consultation material this should be corrected.</p>	The Applicant has noted this response. Document references and numbering have been updated throughout the ES.
6	Environment Agency	P2_9	<p>Requirement 16 (Contaminated land and groundwater) – we welcome the inclusion of this requirement in the draft Development Consent Order (DCO) to ensure that an appropriate written scheme is submitted and approved to ensure that any land contamination is dealt with appropriately to protect groundwater.</p> <p>Requirement 23 (Onshore decommissioning) – we request our inclusion as a consultee to the decommissioning plan in order to consider any potential impacts upon flood risk and our assets (e.g., cables under defences).</p>	The Applicant has noted this response. Requirement 24 (Onshore Decommissioning) has been updated and now requires that the onshore decommissioning plan be submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority in consultation with the relevant statutory nature conservation body.
7	Environment Agency	P2_9	Page 95, clause 4: The title of this clause appears to include a typo as it refers to this relating to 'Interpretation of Schedule 16', rather than Schedule 18.	The Applicant has noted this response. Document references and numbering have been updated throughout the ES.
8	Environment Agency	P2_9	There are sandbars offshore that benefit the beach/sea defence. We do not want these to be removed, therefore areas need to be chosen carefully based on those that contribute to wave breaking/dune sheltering/depth limiting benefits.	This Applicant has noted this response. Potential impacts to seabed features, including sandbars, is detailed in Chapter 7 Marine Physical Processes (document reference 6.1.7).
9	Environment Agency	P2_9	Are you able to confirm where your vessel activity base will be? Will this be within an existing port facility, or will you be building infrastructure on coast?	The Applicant has used the Humber ports as an indicative construction base. Further information has been detailed in Outline VMP (document reference 8.20) submitted as part of the application.
10	Environment Agency	P2_9	We have reviewed this chapter in so far as it relates to issues within our remit, and we are satisfied that the risk assessments undertaken to date are appropriate.	The Applicant has noted this response.
11	Environment Agency	P2_9	<p>We note from Chapter 7 that there is an expectation of bentonite release, and allowance is made for two failures. You have also quantified the expected release rate and duration and that these will result in increased sediment load, but the bentonite will behave in much the same way as seawater. It is a non-toxic mud and no impacts are predicted for release within the marine environment (indiscernible from background concentrations). At the landfall point, the SSSIs have been avoided to mitigate the risk of impact.</p> <p>However, contingencies must be in place to deal with any 'blow out' during installation of the duct/cable, which may restrict access/delay other works in the area. As discussed in our recent meeting all work in this area will need to be programmed around the Environment Agency's beach nourishment works and we will look to capture this in a legal agreement.</p>	<p>The Applicant will ensure that learnings from previous projects will be taken on-board to minimise the risk of a breakout, and the Project has already undertaken onshore geotechnical investigations which have confirmed the suitability of the landfall for <u>Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD)</u> installation methods.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, the procedures and methods to manage bentonite breakouts are detailed in the Outline Project Environmental Management Plan (document reference 8.4). The Applicant notes the requirement for a legal agreement regarding the timing of landfall works and will work with the Environment Agency to achieve this.</p>
12	Environment Agency	P2_9	<p>The proposed works are near to several designated bathing waters on the Lincolnshire Coast as correctly identified in Figure 8.1. In particular, the works are in very close proximity to Anderby and Moggs Eye (Huttoft) bathing waters.</p> <p>Both bathing waters are currently classified as 'Excellent'.</p>	The Applicant can confirm that, due to the use of trenchless installation techniques at the landfall, there is no requirement to close the beach during the works.
13	Environment Agency	P2_9	Mobilisation of sediments associated with the works could have the potential to increase bacteriological concentrations and impact bathing water quality. Information submitted indicates that sediment plumes and negative impacts on bathing water quality are likely to be short-lived. However, even short-lived water quality impacts have the potential to impact bathing water classification, where those impacts coincide with sampling. It is also unclear if the beaches would be closed during the works. It should be	The Applicant can confirm that, due to the use of trenchless installation techniques at the landfall, there is no requirement to close the beach during the works.

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard
			noted that even short-lived impacts could impact bathers at the time mobilisation of sediment works occurs.	
14	Environment Agency	P2_9	<p>We note that works will be outside the intertidal zone. However, whilst the exact distances from the bathing waters to the proposed exit pits are not clear, it appears this could be as little as a few hundred metres.</p> <p>We would strongly recommend that elements of the works with the potential to mobilise sediments close to the bathing waters are carried out outside of the Bathing Water season. Bathing Water season runs from 15th May to 30th September. We therefore would like to see the inclusion of the following condition in the draft DCO, Schedule 12 Part 2 (deemed Marine Licence conditions): Works within 500m of the intertidal area (or within the intertidal area itself) shall not be undertaken between 15 May and 30 September in any year unless a scheme to protect the current Bathing Water status has been submitted to and approved by the Marine Management Organisation, following consultation with the Environment Agency. The scheme must include:</p> <p>(1) An assessment of the impact of any works (with a particular focus on the potential bacte issues that may be caused by disturbed sediment), which will be undertaken during the bathing water season of 15 May to 30 September. (2) Identification of measures to mitigate any identified risks to ensure the current Bathing Water status is not impacted, shall be implemented in accordance with the approved scheme.</p>	<p>The HDD exit pits will be designed to be no closer than 500m to the MLWS mark. Therefore, no restriction on works is considered necessary as there will be no impact to the bathing waters.</p> <p>The Project activities are temporary and short-lived and following cessation of the activities the SSC levels are likely to reach background levels, it is therefore expected that any bacterial increases in the water column would be in the order of days (i.e., occurring for the plume duration only). Following the sediment plumes dispersion, and subsequent increases in UV light, the bacterial counts in the water column will return to "do-nothing" baseline conditions. Given the assessment undertaken we consider having a seasonal restriction to be disproportionate as a negligible significance on bathing water quality has been determined.</p>
15	Environment Agency	P2_9	We welcome the confirmation that a pre-construction drainage plan will be developed and that appropriate permits will be obtained for water discharges.	The Applicant has noted this response.
16	Environment Agency	P2_9	We have reviewed this chapter in so far as it relates to our marine ecology perspective and provided you can agree to appropriate mitigation measures to protect sensitive habitats including chalk reef, we are satisfied that the risk assessments undertaken to date are appropriate.	The Applicant has noted this. No chalk reef has been identified within the offshore ECC from the characterisation surveys undertaken by the Applicant, as outlined in Chapter 9 Benthic and Intertidal Ecology (document reference 6.1.9). Mitigation measures for other relevant sensitive habitats have been provided for and are described in Chapter 9 (document reference 6.1.9).
17	Environment Agency	P2_9	Environment Agency Registered Land: We have compared the route shapefile with the Environment Agency's registered land, and it crosses several parcels of our land, some of which are key to our ongoing projects as well as the need to maintain access for inspections and maintenance. We urge you to start engaging with our Estates team regarding this if you have not already done so.	The Applicant has noted this response. The Applicant has engaged with the Environment Agency as outlined in the Consultation Report (document reference 5.1)
18	GTC	P2_10	<p>Processing your plans and details I have deduced that the onshore scoping boundary includes a lot of GTC assets within it. Is this area going to be developed or is just the off shore red line site boundary where construction will occur? Please see the attached the images showing all of the GTC networks within the scoping boundary area.</p> <p>Please note there are no GTC assets in the offshore red line boundary.</p> <p>If you would require the onshore asset plans please let us know and we can forward them to you.</p>	This is noted by the Applicant.
19	Historic England	P2_11	<p>The detail provided about monopile maximum typical embedment depth below seabed 48-50m is important, as is seabed preparation depth of 4.8m for Gravity Base Structures and 20m for suction bucket jacket foundation type. Table 3.14 (Foundation installation summary) includes the statement that "...other seabed obstructions at foundation locations, these may be removed if the foundation cannot be micro-sited."</p> <p>Additionally, it is also stated that "...some seabed levelling, to ensure that all of the buckets/gravity bases for each structure can be placed at the same level." It is therefore important that we highlight the importance of archaeological analysis and interpretation of high-resolution geophysical survey data and other visual seabed</p>	Any necessary archaeological analysis of any material obtained, will follow a phased approach as outlined in COWRIE guidance (2011) as stated in the Outline Marine Archaeological WSI (document reference: 8.8).

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard
			survey techniques employed to ensure that the nature of any anomalies encountered are fully assessed. It is also relevant to consider the positioning and seabed working area of Jack Up installation vessels.	
20	Historic England	P2_11	The detail contained in these paragraphs is very important and a clear link is required to proposed mitigation measures for any presently known heritage assets (as defined in National Policy Statements EN-1 and EN-3). It is therefore important action is taken, informed by professional archaeological advice, to qualify anomalies encountered and to differentiate between contemporary debris (e.g. lost modern fishing nets) and sites or features of known or possible archaeological or historic interest (i.e. heritage assets).	This is noted by the Applicant. Proposed mitigation measures are presented in the Outline Marine Archaeological WSI (document reference: 8.8).
21	Historic England	P2_11	for intra-array cabling, interlink and four electricity export cable circuits, we note that "...debris, boulders and/or sandwaves..." may require removal with cable burial to 3m and boulder and sandwave clearance width 30m, per cable (Table 3.19). It is therefore apparent that considerable disturbance to the seabed and sub-seabed will be necessary. We therefore note the acknowledgment in paragraph 3.6.83 that more detail on the anticipated extent of sand wave clearance will be provided within the ES.	All project details presented in Chapter 3 Project Description (document reference 6.1.3) and Chapter 7 Marine Physical Processes (document reference 6.1.7) have been reviewed and updated where required. This includes the MDS for sandwave clearance/levelling, with details provided of the volumes within the IDRBNR SAC. An assessment of the potential impacts of sandwave levelling is provided in Chapter 7 Marine Physical Processes (document reference 6.1.7).
22	Historic England	P2_11	Ancillary operations - are described as inclusive of Unexploded Ordnance (UXO) clearance and in reference to paragraph 3.6.75, we encourage planning of detailed pre-construction surveys (should this project proceed) to be informed by professional, accredited and experienced archaeological advice. We fully appreciate the primacy of safety and we see participation in UXO survey planning as a means to support anomaly identification.	The Applicant confirms that a detailed assessment of the from UXO clearance will be included in an UXO marine licence application that will be submitted post-consent once the degree of UXO clearance required is known.
23	Historic England	P2_11	Boulder clearance - the planning of such work requires historic environment advice given the intention to clear 30m wide cable corridors in the array area and export cable route, using either a plough or grab. Paragraph 3.6.80 acknowledges that "...geophysical/geotechnical information of sufficient spatial resolution is not currently available..." It is therefore a crucial matter that the planning for further data acquisition is done so inclusive of setting archaeological objectives, so that a coordinated and effective approach is instigated for data gathering, interpretation and decision-making.	This noted by the Applicant. Further survey work will be undertaken in accordance with the Outline Marine Archaeological WSI (document reference: 8.8).
24	Historic England	P2_11	Pre-lay grapnel run - while we appreciate the statement made in paragraph 3.6.81 that "...PLGR work will take account of and adhere to any archaeological protocols developed for the Project". However, any protocol system employed will function as PLGR is conducted. It is therefore crucial that pre-construction route survey to inform boulder clearance works is informed by archaeological analysis and interpretation of survey data to assist the subsequent implementation of a protocol reporting system.	This is noted by the Applicant. Proposed mitigation measures are presented in the Outline Marine Archaeological WSI (document reference: 8.8).
25	Historic England	P2_11	Landfall construction - We understand that to bring the HVAC electricity export cables ashore Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD) could be used, subject to an assessment using geotechnical survey material to be obtained in "Q2 and Q3 2023" and that the results of this assessment will be used in the ES "...where possible." We also note the statement made in paragraph 3.7.12 regarding a more detailed plan of the landfall construction methodology will be provided following "...further site-specific surveys and feasibility studies..." We also offer the advice that liaison will be required with the relevant Local Authority Archaeological Advice Service, so that the planning of "temporary access" to any intertidal area for export cable installation avoids any heritage assets.	The Applicant can confirm that, due to the use of trenchless installation techniques at the landfall, there is no requirement to access the intertidal area.
26	Historic England	P2_11	the text suggests that thicker Holocene sedimentary deposits occur in the east of the proposed development area. Water depths across the array area are described as between 5 and 47m with the shallower areas characterised by sandbanks. We also noted that the electricity Export CableCorridor (ECC) is described as having "...a thin veneer of Holocene sands..." between 1 and 5m thick as revealed by geophysical survey.	The Applicant has noted this response.



Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard
27	Historic England	P2_11	Morphology - we note the description given in paragraph 7.4.22 regarding sandbanks in the north of the array area of between 10 and 12m, as well as other areas with identifiable sand waves with heights of up to 8m. Regarding the ECC, we note the description that sediment transport pathway(s) is predominantly north-westerly and that the Dowsing sandbank demonstrates some changes in crest level. Paragraph 7.4.25 provides a useful summary of the Inner Silver Pit paleo-valley feature including its 'fan' as extends to the south as crossed by the ECC. We are aware from the description provided in paragraph 7.12.18 that if seabed levelling is required within the array area to facilitate installation of GBSs that Trailer Suction Hopper Dredgers could be employed and that approximately 60% of cables could require sand wave clearance within the array area (paragraph 7.12.21) and 30% of the total length of the ECC (paragraph 7.12.22).	The Applicant has noted this response.
28	Historic England	P2_11	Table 13.1 (Legislation and Policy Context) - This entire table, which covers 32 pages, requires revision as we must question why almost all paragraphs in the UK Marine Policy Statement under Section 2.6.6 (Historic environment) are included with repetitive, generic text used in the "comments addressed" column. The same is apparent for inclusion of almost all paragraphs from National Policy Statements (NPSs) as published 2011 or draft in 2023. The use by the Applicant of repetitive statements or simply referencing other section of the PEIR is not efficient. We have looked at other thematic chapters for this PEIR and it is apparent that a far more succinct policy table is required.	The Applicant has noted this response.
29	Historic England	P2_11	It is apparent that not "All known and unknown marine archaeological and cultural heritage receptors within the marine archaeology study area that may be affected by the Project and their archaeological significance has been described..." given that analysis of geophysical data for the ECC is on-going.	The Applicant has noted this response. Analysis of geophysical data for the offshore ECC is presented in Chapter 13 Appendix 2 Geoarchaeological Phase 1 Report ECC (document reference 6.3.13.2).
30	Historic England	P2_11	It is very important for us to add that we will not offer any further advice as to the applicability of any matters raised in association with National Policy Statement which it is the exclusive responsibility of Secretary of State to determine.	The Applicant has noted this response.
31	Historic England	P2_11	Table 13.2 - includes a considerable amount of text copied from our response to the EIA Scoping Report consultation, as well as the opinion of the Inspectorate. It is not entirely clear why all this information is included or considered necessary in this PEIR. It is also unnecessary to, in effect, quote Expert Topic Group Minutes, only key matters should be highlighted as can be addressed within the PEIR or delayed for inclusion in the ES.	The Applicant has noted this response and, where relevant, has updated the approach within the ES.
32	Historic England	P2_11	Paragraph 13.4.2 - the text states that the use of an "...additional 1km buffer is industry standard and allows for the consideration of direct and indirect effects on marine archaeological and cultural heritage receptors..." We are not aware that a 1km buffer is an "industry standard", but one which has come into common practice. We add that the design of any buffer should be based on understanding of physical conditions, so that it is fit-for-purpose for consideration of direct and indirect effects.	The Applicant has updated the terminology used from 'industry standard' to 'common practice'.
33	Historic England	P2_11	Paragraph 13.4.6 (Compensation areas) - we note that the three proposed compensation areas (as illustrated in Figure 13.1) will be assessed within any subsequent ES. We therefore cannot offer any further comment as this stage on suitability of any proposed historic environment mitigation measures.	The Applicant has noted this response. Mitigation measures are outlined in Chapter 13 Marine and Intertidal Archaeology (document reference 6.1.13) where required and an Outline Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) submitted with protocols and practices to be incorporated in the final WSI and during construction.
34	Historic England	P2_11	The use of terms in this paragraph lacks clarity. The EIA Scoping Opinion published by the Planning Inspectorate (9th September 2022) sets the scope of the (environmental) assessment to be conducted. The PEIR should therefore identify marine archaeological and cultural heritage receptors that could be impacted (positively or negatively) by the proposed project. We also request that the term "marine archaeological and cultural heritage receptors" is replaced with Historic Environment (as defined in National Policy Statements, published and draft). We must also request that you	The Applicant has updated the terminology used to refer to Historic Environment and the paragraph has been amended accordingly.



Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard
			revise you approach to assessment as attention should be on how the proposed project may cause loss or harm to the significance of a heritage asset. It is therefore the case that consideration of the Historic Environment should follow the definition used in NPSs. We therefore cannot accept the general description provided in this paragraph.	
35	Historic England	P2_11	The statements made about ODOW geophysical and geotechnical survey data and archaeological analysis and interpretation, especially the distinction made about data acquisition for engineering purposes, should be reconciled with the Scoping Opinion of the Planning Inspectorate (ID Ref: 3.7.4).	The Applicant has considered the Scoping Opinion responses received, further details of which are outlined in Chapter 13 Marine and Intertidal Archaeology (document reference 6.1.13)
36	Historic England	P2_11	Historic seascape character is not a category of “sites or features” and the spatial identification of character does not equate to sensitivity. It is also important to explain that it is not the “potential to change HSC” (Table 13.20), but how perceptions of historic character can accommodate change.	The Applicant has updated the terminology used to refer to Historic Environment and these references have been amended accordingly.
37	Historic England	P2_11	It is apparent that the marine archaeology study area has been not been assessed and described as a whole for the baseline, given that the geophysical assessment for the ECC and 1km buffer has not be completed, as stated in Paragraphs 13.4.13 and 13.4.15.	Analysis of geophysical data for the offshore ECC is presented in Chapter 13 Appendix 2 Geoarchaeological Phase 1 Report ECC (document reference 6.3.13.2).
38	Historic England	P2_11	It is not the purpose of an Outline Marine WSI to “...further detail the findings...” it is the purpose of an archaeological WSI to specify methodologies for archaeological mitigation through optimising survey data acquisition programmes as are likely to be conducted in support of the proposed development project. See Archaeological Written Schemes of Investigation for Offshore Wind Farm Projects (2021) published by The Crown Estate.	The Applicant has noted this response. The Outline Marine Archaeological WSI (document reference: 8.8) sets out the recommended AEZ for geophysical anomalies, provides information about areas of archaeological potential and where further geotechnical works may provide evidence of archaeological interest, together with adaptive mitigation for further works that will require archaeological input, even when their main purpose is non-archaeological, so that the potential for information and efficiency is maximised.
39	Historic England	P2_11	We note that both the Technical Report (Volume 2, Appendix 13.1) and an Outline Marine WSI (Document Ref 8.5) will be updated following a review of the geophysical data for the ECC and buffer zone. The assessment of the historic environment as might be within the ECC is therefore based exclusively on a Desk-Based Assessment	The Applicant has noted this response and refers Historic England to the Outline Marine Archaeological WSI (document reference: 8.8).
40	Historic England	P2_11	It is not necessarily the case that military aviation losses will be “archaeologically significant”, which is a matter for determination by Historic England as the national curatorial body. The focus for attention here should be on their automatic status as protected places under the Protection of Military Remains Act 1986, which includes the offshore marine planning area if they are determined to be of UK origin.	This Applicant has noted this response. Chapter 13 Marine and Intertidal Archaeology (document reference 6.1.13) includes a provision that any in situ remains associated with any military aviation losses will be considered archaeologically significant and protected under the Protection of Military Remains Act 1986.
41	Historic England	P2_11	The text attempts to differentiate between “unknown and unlocated sites” and further clarity is required. These are separate matters; whereby “unlocated” would suggest that a record of loss exists with which it can be reconciled, whereas “unknown” would suggest a new discovery. We must also add that it is entirely likely that many sites will not be revealed by pre-construction surveys due to low-resolution campaigns designed to characterise the proposed development area as sufficient for EIA purposes. The mention of “mitigation for unlocated marine archaeological and cultural heritage receptors” is, equally applicable for presently unknown sites of potential archaeological interest.	The Applicant has noted this response and updated the terminology. Unlocated Historic Environment receptors are discussed in Chapter 13 Marine and Intertidal Archaeology (document reference 6.1.13).
42	Historic England	P2_11	The application of the Protection of Military Remains Act 1986 to UK military aircraft will occur regardless of whether the remains were discovered in the marine archaeology study area or not.	The Applicant has noted this. As outlined in Chapter 13 Marine and Intertidal Archaeology (document reference 6.1.13) if any material associated with a vessel or aircraft that was in military service when lost or wrecked is located, the area will be protected. There are currently no aircraft wreck sites within the marine archaeology study area. Should an aircraft wreck site be identified the Applicant will comply with all relevant legislation and regulatory requirements before any works that may impact the wreck commence.

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard
43	Historic England	P2_11	The explanation of how Historic Seascape Characterisation (HSC) has been used by this project is not aligned with established procedures for using the published methodology for HSC. It also seems that consideration of HSC has been conflated with the separate process of conducting seascape and landscape visual assessment. For example, perception by the public is just one perception to consider. We cannot therefore offer any further advice as the approach taken here will not adequately support this EIA exercise.	This is noted by the Applicant. Historic Seascape Character has been assessed as the historic cultural influences which shape present perception of the seascape, its uses, and its ability to accommodate change which has been used a measure to provide a contextual and regional approach to the marine archaeology study area.
44	Historic England	P2_11	We note that for those data which were subject to archaeological interpretation that the “quality” of Side Scan Sonar (SSS), Multi-Beam Echo Sounder (MBES) and Sub-Bottom Profiler (SBP) was considered “good”. Magnetometer (MAG) data was assessed as “adequate”.	This Applicant has noted this response.
45	Historic England	P2_11	There is no attempt to describe why any anomalies that are considered to be “wreck” are of archaeological or historic interest. We therefore cannot offer any further comment or advice.	This Applicant has noted this response. All geophysical anomalies have been cross-referenced with records of Historic Environment identified during the baseline assessment. The definition of the archaeological potential of the anomalies is defined in Appendix 13.1 Marine and Intertidal Archaeology Technical Report (document reference 6.3.13.1).
46	Historic England	P2_11	there is no attempt to offer archaeological interpretation of any anomalies primarily identified from MAG data, which we already note was graded as “adequate”. We therefore cannot offer any further comment or advice as to whether or not such anomalies may have potential historic environment interest.	This Applicant has noted this response. All geophysical anomalies have been cross-referenced with records of Historic Environment identified during the baseline assessment. The definition of the archaeological potential of the anomalies is defined in Appendix 13.1 Marine and Intertidal Archaeology Technical Report (document reference 6.3.13.1).
47	Historic England	P2_11	Paragraph 13.6.1 - it is noted that assessment should continue through a “phased approach” with reference made to Offshore Geotechnical Investigation and Historic Environment Analysis (COWRIE, 2011). However, it is unfortunate that attention here was note given to the importance, as detailed within this publication, of producing a defined product from any such analysis - a sedimentary deposit model. The use of a phased programme of analysis must be seen in the context of what is necessary to produce the required model.	This Applicant has noted this response.
48	Historic England	P2_11	<p>Table 13.7 (Outline Deposit Model) - this is not a deposit model, it lists, alphabetically, geological units without any spatial relationship to the proposed development location. It is therefore not readily possible to relate this information to Figure 13.9 which utilises information derived from the North Sea Palaeolandscapes Project by V. Gaffney et al., (2007). It is also conspicuous that no attention is given to geotechnical ground-truthing as will be necessary to effectively guide this proposed project. In the absence of any information regarding palaeo-environmental potential in the ECC, we cannot offer any further comment or advice at this stage.</p> <p>We note subsequently in the same document that the ‘Deposit Model’ is provided (Volume 1, Chapter 13 - Marine and Intertidal Archaeology, Document No. 6.1.13) and it states:</p> <p>13.8.12 At this time there have been no offshore geotechnical surveys undertaken for archaeological assessment, however, these are planned post consent. Geoarchaeological sub-sampling will be included and informed by the results of the sub-bottom data analysis and previous geoarchaeological assessment of the area.</p> <p>Regardless of whether dedicated archaeological borehole surveys has yet been undertaken, the opportunity should have been taken to integrate archaeological assessment into any appropriate geotechnical work that was underway.</p>	This Applicant has noted this response.
49	Historic England	P2_11	the use of references e.g. “MA3005” are not explained in the Key to this figure or in any accompanying text in this chapter.	This has been amended by the Applicant.

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard
50	Historic England	P2_11	<p>direct impact or compression is only described for “piling foundation” which is not explicitly clear that this is inclusive of the full range of foundation designs as could be utilised for this proposed development. These “impacts” are to be expanded to include the other foundation designs described in Volume 1, Chapter 3. Impact 11, 18 and 22 (Indirect impacts causing changes to the Historic Seascape Character) are not relevant for the explanation provided previously.</p> <p>Paragraph 13.7.6 - any consideration of a Maximum Design Scenario (MDS) should be described in reference to Historic Environment receptors as defined within National Policy Statements.</p>	This has been amended by the Applicant.
51	Historic England	P2_11	<p>We offer the following comments as matters that must be addressed in any ES subsequently produced:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For Impact 2, 3, 4 and 5 (vis. direct impact by penetration of piling foundations), the MDS assessment appears to be focused on “seabed preparation” as a spatial extent utilising suction bucket jackets as the MDS.</li> </ul> <p>The “Justification” text column refers to “maximum disturbance by piling” which would not appear to be relevant if considering suction bucket foundations. We also do not agree with this assessment as the use of Gravity Base Foundations would appear to represent the “Realistic Worst Case Scenario”. We also note the repeated statement that the maximum pressure of the structures (WTG and OSS) should be assessed within the ES. We therefore cannot offer any further advice regarding this matter.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact 8 (vis. direct impact by penetration of jack up barges), the MDS refers to volume of sediment disturbed without apparent consideration of actual depth into and under the seabed and therefore risk to presently unknown elements of the historic environment.</li> </ul>	This Applicant has noted this response.
52	Historic England	P2_11	<p>Table 13.9 - the description provided about a WSI is to be amended in any ES subsequently produced to focus on the following factors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The methodological approaches to survey data capture standards and analysis that will best support archaeological analysis and interpretation;</li> <li>• Defined mitigation measures necessary for this project which builds on the baseline characterisation completed to date for the entire proposed development;</li> <li>• The use of in-situ mitigation measures such as AEZs, as are presently spatially identified, with clear instruction that the Outline Marine WSI provides the basis for steering the proposed project post consent (should permission be obtained) and a draft Marine WSI to be produced pre-construction in accordance with any DCO held as relevant to defined phases of this proposed project;</li> <li>• The description provided about AEZs lacks clarity and is to be revised;</li> <li>• The application of a PAD, as well as applicable to any defined project stages, will also be applicable to any post-consent and pre-construction phase;</li> <li>• Any and all reference to “Archaeological assessment of available data” must be in association with a WSI produced in consultation with Historic England; and</li> <li>• It is not entirely clear why the post-construction monitoring plan should identify areas or sites of “high” archaeological interest for further investigation.</li> </ul> <p>Paragraph 13.7.12 - the WSI must also provide a methodological approach to inform any subsequent geophysical survey campaigns as much as any geotechnical works to best support archaeological objectives necessary to steer the design of this proposed development. This matter is directly relevant for subsequent survey work to ascertain</p>	The Applicant has noted this response and updated Chapter 13 Marine and Intertidal Archaeology (document reference 6.1.13) accordingly.

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard
			whether an anomaly presently identified as “low archaeological potential” is correct, as alluded to in paragraph 13.7.19. Furthermore, paragraphs 13.7.24 to 13.7.27 manage to avoid any reference to the use of a WSI, this is an omission that must be rectified in any ES produced. It is important to also add that any production of “phased geoarchaeological reports” is done so to achieve an agreed outcome - a geoarchaeological deposit model.	
53	Historic England	P2_11	No information has been presented to demonstrate why any presently identified wreck or other anomalies can be considered to be heritage assets, as defined in national policy; although it is appreciated that mutual avoidance is a valid strategy for seabed obstacles. Clarity must therefore be provided if when an AEZ is required which merits inclusion in this chapter.	The Applicant has defined heritage assets in Appendix 13.1 Marine and Intertidal Archaeology Technical Report (document reference 6.3.13.1).
54	Historic England	P2_11	It must be made clear that “risk of later design modifications” is likely if archaeological advice is not built into all subsequent survey planning and commissioning.	The Applicant has acknowledged this in Chapter 13 Marine and Intertidal Archaeology (document reference 6.1.13) which states that archaeological advice will be built into all subsequent survey planning and commissioning.
55	Historic England	P2_11	Amend column heading “Marine Archaeological and Cultural Heritage Receptors” to Historic Environment receptors and revise text to “interest” not “significance”.	The Applicant has noted this comment and updated Chapter 13 Marine and Intertidal Archaeology (document reference 6.1.13) accordingly.
56	Historic England	P2_11	the ES must provide justification for a Zone of Influence of 50km. We do not concur with the initial determination that there are no direct or indirect cumulative impacts on the Historic Environment expected in reference to other offshore energy projects. The assumptions made regarding reliance on embedded mitigation is therefore selective and not reflective of the risk presented by this proposed development or other developments. However, we agree with your statement that “...archaeological input is of paramount importance throughout the life of the Project.”	This has been amended by the Applicant.
57	Historic England	P2_11	We cannot comment further on the conclusions offered given the partial completion of archaeological assessment conducted for this proposed project and therefore the validity of the assumptions made regarding significant effects.	This has been amended by the Applicant.
58	Historic England	P2_11	We note the matters that the Applicant will now address and we must stress the importance of further engagement with Historic England with attention given to updating the Outline Marine WSI, geophysical data review for the ECC and an assessment of impact in the proposed compensation areas.	This Applicant has noted this response and continued to engage with Historic England throughout the pre-application phase including through the EPP.
59	Historic England	P2_11	the text implies that the National Record for the Historic Environment (NRHE) provides “full coverage of the marine archaeology study area”. However, there do not appear to be any NRHE references used anywhere else in this report (see also statement made in paragraph 13.2.14). UK Hydrographic Office (UKHO) and Admiralty Charts are one in the same data resource and should be clearly differentiated from “wrecksite.eu” which appears to be an online initiative and is not the same as Admiralty Data Maritime Solutions which is maintained by UKHO. It is unfortunate to see that benefits of optimising data gathering strategies for geotechnical survey have not been realised.	The Applicant has noted this comment and Chapter 13 Marine and Intertidal Archaeology (document reference 6.1.13) has been updated accordingly.
60	Historic England	P2_11	We note the recognition that Embedded Mitigation is applicable to where sites of known or possible Historic Environment interest are identified from desk-based sources and/or available survey data.	The Applicant has noted this response
61	Historic England	P2_11	It is not the purpose of this exercise to determine “significance”. See comments as made above. It is apparent that text from this section has been copied into Chapter 13, including the typo in paragraph 13.3.12.	This has been amended by the Applicant.
62	Historic England	P2_11	Paragraph 13.3.40 mentions two sailing vessel records from UKHO which should be illustrated in an accompanying figure in the ES.	The Applicant has noted this response and updated Figure 13.2 accordingly.



Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard
63	Historic England	P2_11	Provide a good indication of how losses in this area could be considered as having a setting which contributes to their historic environment interest.	This has been amended by the Applicant.
64	Historic England	P2_11	the focus should be determining archaeological interest as a heritage asset (See Draft EN-1 dated March 2023, paragraph 5.9.3) rather than referral to significance assessment guidance which is linked to evidence gathering and the use of criteria to recommend sites for statutory protection. All subsequent paragraphs in this section require revision.	The Applicant has defined heritage assets in Appendix 13.1 Marine and Intertidal Archaeology Technical Report (document reference 6.3.13.1).
65	Historic England	P2_11	Require revision to describe how archaeological interest can be identified which could enable the site to be recognised as a heritage asset. Sites which cannot be identifiable as heritage assets should not be included e.g. MV Basto (1988) Ref: UKHO9417. If heritage assets are identifiable, for sites within the East Inshore Marine Plan area, this information might be used by Historic England, to determine significance in accordance with our published Conservation Principles. It is also recommended that attention is given to the concept of setting as relevant to the identifiable interest associated with a heritage asset e.g. the description provided about the events of October 1939 and the losses of Capitaine Edmond Laborie, MV Deodata and Konstantinos Hadjipateras all lost in the same enemy minefield laid off the Inner Dowsing Light Vessel and rescued by the lifeboat Louise Stephens. Figure 13.2 is of very limited use and requires revision to clearly highlight available records which can be identified as heritage assets.	This has been amended by the Applicant.
66	Historic England	P2_11	States that off the Lincolnshire coastline there are 118 RAF aircraft losses recorded; further information should be added to include other Allied losses as well as German recorded losses.	The Applicant has noted this comment and updated Chapter 13 Marine and Intertidal Archaeology accordingly. There are currently no aircraft wreck sites within the marine archaeology study area. Should an aircraft wreck site be identified the Applicant will obtain a licence before any works that may impact the wreck can commence.
67	Historic England	P2_11	<p>require editing and revision as it is apparent that the published methodology for Historic Seascape Characterisation (HSC) has not been used. This assessment exercise should have updated Broad Historic Character Types (BHCT) as spatially relevant to the proposed development area to include other contemporary infrastructure. It is therefore not possible for this assessment to conclude that "...no significant change in the multiple characters and dimensions of the marine environment as a result of the Project in isolation or cumulatively with neighbouring developments is identified."</p> <p>The geographic extent of the assessment exercise is proportionate to the proposed development area and should be revised accordingly e.g. there is no apparent reason why "flood and erosion defences" or "transport" or "woodland" are included. It also appears to be the case that the interpretation of perception is directed towards public awareness of character types and therefore that some aspects of historic character "...are less likely to enter the perceptions of the public due to their remoteness and inaccessibility..." (13.3.330) The focus for attention should be on how the Applicant perceives proposed change to HSC.</p> <p>It is a core principle of HSC that character type does not equate to sensitivity and therefore does not accommodate the concept of EIA receptors, therefore it is not possible to determine whether there could be any "potentially beneficial" impact or any other impact on HSC e.g. "neutral" or otherwise. We also do not agree that some elements of historic spatial character are less perceptible given the established methodology for conducting HSC. The approach used here to try and determine impact to each BHCT does not allow for consideration of a holistic approach regarding perception of historic character.</p>	The Applicant has noted this comment and updated Chapter 13 Marine and Intertidal Archaeology accordingly.



Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard
			It should not be the approach to try and determine if current historical seascape perception has changed, but what change will be introduced by the proposed development and how such change might be perceived given its spatial historic character. Regarding broad character assessment, statements that the proposed project could contribute to the existing perception without explaining what that perception is or even “positively change” perception are not explained. The assessment presented has not delivered the purpose of HSC as outlined in paragraph 13.3.332.	
68	Historic England	P2_11	<p>We understand that archaeological assessment of geophysical data was conducted for the array area and a 1km buffer, with all geophysical anomalies cross-referenced with records of historic environment receptors identified during the baseline assessment. We also note that the archaeological analysis of shallow geophysical and Ultra-High Seismic (UHSR) survey data collected across the array area and offshore ECC is ongoing and should be included within the ES.</p> <p>Paragraph 13.4.4 explains that 13 anomalies have been assessed as having “High archaeological potential” on the basis as having been seen in SSS, MBES and MAG data of which 10 correlate with UKHO/NRHE/Lincolnshire HER records. See our comments as above as the only correlation appears to be with UKHO data.</p>	This is noted by the Applicant.
69	Historic England	P2_11	<p>Table 13.21 includes the Basto (UKHO9417), which given its period of construction, operation and loss cannot be considered to be a heritage asset or a high potential anomaly. The 33 anomalies of “Medium” archaeological potential which do not correlate with any known UKHO/NRHE/Lincolnshire HER records include numerous entries based on Mag data and therefore questionable given the “adequate” standard of data used.</p> <p>1,096 “Low potential anomalies” are thought to be a mixture of “...isolated small features, often boulder-like, or isolated linear features and potentially modern debris such as rope, chain, fishing gear or lost equipment.” Further evaluation is required in the ES to remove anomalies which equate to contemporary debris. We also note that magnetic anomalies (&lt;5nT and &gt;100nT) which cannot be corroborated have been assigned low archaeological potential. See comment made about adequate mag data.</p>	This has been amended by the Applicant. A table of data sources is provided in table 13.3 of Chapter 13 Marine and Intertidal Archaeology (document reference 6.1.13).
70	Historic England	P2_11	Paragraph 13.5.2 mentions utilising the research, i.e. resource assessment, included in the North Sea Prehistory Research Management Framework (NSPRMF), which only makes partial use of NSPRMF. More attention should be given to themes and research questions.	This has been amended by the Applicant.
71	Historic England	P2_11	Paragraph 13.5.8 includes the statement “ELF002 contained reddish brown silty fine sand and clay, ELF007 and ELF2009 both contained dark brown/black peat of high geoarchaeological potential illustrating the importance of early archaeological involvement in geotechnical campaigns at large infrastructure projects.” It is therefore difficult to reconcile the approach taken by this project to allow geoarchaeological participation only at a later stage. However, we note the potential identified and we await a full assessment of the geoarchaeological potential of the vibrocores collected to date to be presented in a “Stage 1 geoarchaeological report”. As commented on previously we cannot consider Table 13.23 to represent an Outline Deposit Model.	This Applicant has noted this response. Analysis of relevant data for the offshore ECC is presented in Chapter 13 Appendix 2 Geoarchaeological Phase 1 Report ECC (document reference 6.3.13.2). Analysis of relevant data for the array is presented in Chapter 13 Appendix 3 Geoarchaeological Phase 1 Report Array (document reference 6.3.13.3).
72	Historic England	P2_11	Paragraph 13.6.2 - it is not the purpose of this EIA assessment exercise to determine archaeological significance. It is the task of national curator to use criteria set in the Scheduled Monuments and Nationally Important but Non-Scheduled Monuments guidance to determine significance which is of national importance.	The Applicant has noted this comment. The Applicant is committed to developing a Community Benefit Fund which will be launched post consent

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard
73	Historic England	P2_11	All presently proposed AEZs are to be reassessed for the ES to determine if they can be considered to represent heritage assets. An AEZ should not be used as a matter of convenience for other contemporary seabed debris which should be avoided.	The Applicant has noted this comment.
74	Historic England	P2_11	the text is to be clarified to explain that presently the project has not identified sites subject to the provisions of the Protection of Military Remains Act 1986.	The Applicant has noted this comment and included a statement within Chapter 13 Marine and Intertidal Archaeology.
75	Historic England	P2_11	no mention is made that production of method statements will be in reference to an archaeological Written Scheme of Investigation.	The Applicant has noted this comment. An Outline WSI has been provided as part of the application that will form the framework for mitigation strategies and WSIs that will be submitted post consent, including in relation to the development of method statements.
76	Historic England	P2_11	Paragraphs 13.6.13 to 13.6.20 - while mention is made of a project specific Outline PAD, it is inadequate not to mention an outline WSI in reference to a methodological approach for removal of "items" of known or possible archaeological interest and all subsequent requirements in accordance with professional archaeological standards.	The Applicant has amended relevant documents and included reference to the Outline Marine Archaeological WSI (Document Reference: 8.08).
77	Historic England	P2_11	Figures 13.10 and 13.11 - these should be combined to aid clarify about known loss records and identification through geophysical data.	The Applicant has amended relevant documents and included as Figure 13.8 (Document Reference: 6.2.13.8).
78	Historic England	P2_11	Reference should be made to WSI production as relevant to preparation of the DCO application and measures to follow for preparations of WSIs should consent be obtained e.g. post-consent and pre-commencement.	The Applicant has noted this comment. An Outline WSI has been provided as part of the application that will form the framework for mitigation strategies and WSIs that will be submitted post consent.
79	Historic England	P2_11	We note that the three proposed compensation areas have not been assessed as part of the EIA baseline and that such assessment should be forthcoming within the ES.	This Applicant has noted this comment.
80	Historic England	P2_11	The text here requires clarification to explain that while the Protocol for Archaeological Discoveries (PAD), as previously supported by the Crown Estate, can be used as a model, it will be the responsibility of the Applicant to deliver in its entirety, should consent be obtained.	The Applicant has noted this comment and Chapter 13 Marine and Intertidal Archaeology has been updated accordingly.
81	Historic England	P2_11	We concur that an Outline Marine WSI should provide a framework for archaeological investigations for the proposed project and that subsequent archaeological analysis of survey data acquired post consent (should permission be obtained) and any intrusive and/or works of an archaeological nature will be undertaken in accordance with MSs produced in consultation with Historic England.	The Applicant has noted this comment.
82	Historic England	P2_11	Reference should just be to Historic England.	The Applicant has noted this comment and Chapter 13 Marine and Intertidal Archaeology has been updated accordingly (document reference 6.1.13),
83	Historic England	P2_11	To aid clarity we request that these figures are combined to demonstrate the spatial distribution of records seen within the geophysical data that have been assigned 100m AEZs and how records that were not seen in the geophysical data have been assigned 50m AEZ.	This is provided as 13.10 (Document Reference: 6.2.13.10)
84	Historic England	P2_11	(Historic Seascape Characterisation) are to be removed as they are not relevant to the purpose of a WSI.	The Applicant has noted this comment and the documentation has been updated accordingly.
85	Historic England	P2_11	This WSI should highlight the relevant themes and questions from available research (and management) frameworks. It is not accepted that that such detail should only be provided through a draft Method Statement.	The Outline Marine Archaeological WSI (document reference: 8.08) considers the relevant themes and questions from available research.
86	Historic England	P2_11	Clear explanation should be provided about where the quoted legal protection is applicable and should be expanded to include government policy for cultural heritage as might be found anywhere within the UK Marine Area.	This is noted by the Applicant.
87	Historic England	P2_11	The methodology approach for assessing anomalies should not be set out in Volume 2, Appendix 13.1. It should be specified in the Outline Marine WSI such as within paragraphs 1.6.28 to 1.6.31	The methodology approach for assessing anomalies within section 1.2.3 of the Outline Marine Archaeological WSI (Document Reference: 8.08)
88	Historic England	P2_11	There are presently no identified sites as could be subject to the provisions of the Protection of Military Remains Act 1986.	The Applicant has noted this comment and included a statement within Chapter 13 Marine and Intertidal Archaeology.

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard
89	Historic England	P2_11	It is possible that offshore renewable developments will subsequently identify previously unknown and unlocated sites of archaeological interest which should be considered as heritage assets.	The Applicant has noted this comment. As stated in Chapter 13 Marine and Intertidal Archaeology the Project specific PAD will be utilised for any additional unknown or unexpected archaeological and cultural heritage receptors identified.
90	Historic England	P2_11	To be able to identify TEZs it must be explained how data should be acquired and analysed to best support archaeological interpretation.	Advice on Temporary Exclusion Zones (TEZs) and mitigation strategies will be sought from retained archaeologists
91	Historic England	P2_11	It is insufficient to state that if anomalies are likely to be impacted, they should be assessed on a case-by-case basis without including the methodological approach in this WSI.	The Applicant has noted this response. All geophysical anomalies have been cross-referenced with records of Historic Environment identified during the baseline assessment. The definition of the archaeological potential of the anomalies is defined in Appendix 13.1 Marine and Intertidal Archaeology Technical Report
92	Historic England	P2_11	(Definition of Archaeological Potential) - it is insufficient to attribute "High" archaeological potential to archaeological interest such as wrecks or crash sites without any attempt to explain how archaeological interest, as a heritage asset, is to be ascertained.	The Applicant has defined heritage assets in Appendix 13.1 Marine and Intertidal Archaeology Technical Report
93	Historic England	P2_11	We do not agree with the list of AEZs presently identified	The Applicant has noted this response.
94	Historic England	P2_11	In recognition that all phases of the Project may cause direct impact to deposits of geoarchaeological interest, it is essential that a strategic approach is explained to cross reference the possible engineering design of this project e.g. foundation types and optimal cable burial with penetration depths, as outlined in Volume 1, Chapter 3.	The Applicant has noted this response.
95	Historic England	P2_11	Geoarchaeological assessment and mention of "further archaeological works" should be elaborated in this WSI, general referral to the use of Method Statements is insufficient.	The Applicant has noted this comment and the Outline Marine WSI has been updated accordingly to refer to geoarchaeological assessment and further archaeological works
96	Historic England	P2_11	(further archaeological works) should provide a clear framework for how different geophysical and geotechnical survey techniques will be optimised for archaeological analysis.	The Applicant has noted this comment. The Geotechnical campaign will have a method statement that will include archaeological elements.
97	Historic England	P2_11	the description given of Historic England's remit for providing advice is incorrect and must be amended.	The Applicant has noted this comment and updated the document accordingly.
98	Historic England	P2_11	we do not agree with the assumptions made regarding a specified time period expected of national and local curatorial bodies	This has been amended by the Applicant.
99	Historic England	P2_11	These bullet points are the primary matters which this document should address. The detail provided in paragraphs 1.8.11 to 1.8.14 should be far more prominent and accessible in this document.	This has been amended by the Applicant.
100	Historic England	P2_11	Insufficient attention is given to setting an agree objective for using a phased approach to geotechnical analysis. The referenced COWRIE guidance is clear that the purpose should be to support production of a sedimentary deposit model. While we appreciate referral to standards and guidance this document should be tailored accordingly to the proposed development.	The Applicant notes this response
101	Historic England	P2_11	The text should be clear that in instances when live ordnance are discovered that primacy is given to safety requirements and procedures.	This has been amended by the Applicant.
102	Historic England	P2_11	There are presently no identified sites as could be subject to the provisions of the Protection of Military Remains Act 1986.	The Applicant has noted this comment and included a statement within Chapter 13 Marine and Intertidal Archaeology.
103	Historic England	P2_11	This Outline Marine WSI has presented mitigation measures based on the archaeological assessments completed to date and will require amendment to included completion of ECC assessment and proposed compensation areas.	The Applicant has submitted an Outline Marine WSI as part of the DCO application
104	Historic England	P2_11	We do not agree that this Outline Marine WSI provides "The methodological frameworks for the archaeological analysis and interpretation of survey data throughout the lifetime of the Project..."	The Applicant has noted this comment. The Applicant has submitted an updated Outline Marine WSI as part of the DCO application.
105	Historic England	P2_11	we concur that an Outline Marine WSI produced pre-consent should inform a Draft Marine WSI to be implemented post consent (should permission be obtained) and should form the framework for mitigation delivery in accordance with any Development Consent Order	The Applicant has noted this comment.

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard
			(including Deemed Marine Licences). However, its preparation is a separate matter to formal agreement of a Marine WSI prepared prior to commencement of relevant marine licensed activities.	
106	Historic England	P2_11	<p>It will be important as design is developed that there is no loss of coverage between the Marine and Terrestrial WSI's - this should be specifically reviewed to ensure continuous coverage of archaeological methodology. In addition, where remains such for instance as buried soils or shoreline structures span between the two regimes it will be important that investigation and report are integrated.</p> <p>With regards to both Marine and Terrestrial investigations we point you towards our Geoarchaeology and Deposit Model guidelines.</p> <p>Historic England. 2015. Geoarchaeology: Using earth sciences to understand the archaeological record. Swindon: Historic England &lt;<a href="https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/geoarchaeology-earth-sciences-to-understand-archaeological-record/">https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/geoarchaeology-earth-sciences-to-understand-archaeological-record/</a>&gt;</p> <p>Historic England. 2020. Deposit Modelling and Archaeology: Guidance for Mapping Buried Deposits. Swindon: Historic England &lt;<a href="https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/deposit-modelling-and-archaeology/">https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/deposit-modelling-and-archaeology/</a>&gt;</p>	A nominated contact or retained archaeologist (where required) will be used to ensure continuous coverage of methodology.
107	Historic England	P2_11	The post-construction monitoring plan should focus on areas or sites of archaeological interest and outline proposed measures to avoid or monitor such areas or sites. It will be for curatorial bodies to advise as to the historic environment significance.	An archaeological post-construction monitoring plan will be developed and submitted to the relevant Archaeological Curator(s) and will outline the monitoring methodology and reporting structure as secured in the Outline Marine WSI.
108	King's Lynn & West Norfolk Borough Council	P2_14	<p>It is assumed that the relevant ecological and environmental reports will be completed to ascertain the full impacts of the proposal and how these impacts can be mitigated.</p> <p>The Borough Council has NO COMMENT to make on the proposal at this stage, provided the relevant ecological and environmental reports are prepared to ascertain the full impacts of the proposal and how these impacts can be mitigated. Can you please ensure that the Borough Council of Kings Lynn and West Norfolk are advised when the application is submitted for determination.</p>	The Applicant has noted that there are no comments.
109	Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	P2_17	<p>LWT echoes and strongly supports Natural England's concerns voiced in their response to the ODOW Scoping Report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 'Given the planned submission timescales for this project and potential known requirements for further compensatory measures, Natural England highlights that there is a reasonable risk that it will not be possible for robust derogations cases to be developed by the point of application.'</li> </ul> <p>We do not feel that the Applicant is allowing for enough time to properly assess the various aspects of this Project, and their potential harm on receptors. If these factors are not given appropriate consideration early on in the assessment process, this will cause unnecessary delays at the examination and decision phases, as has been experienced in past projects.</p>	The Applicant has provided a Without Prejudice Derogation Case as part of the DCO application together with a suite of Compensation Plans
110	Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	P2_17	Given the unfavourable condition of Annex 1 features according to Natural England's 2019 condition assessment and the outcomes from the 2023 Advice on Operations assessment matrix (Fig. 1), LWT argues that it is logical to conclude that the Annex 1	The justification for the site selection and the alternative routing options considered for the Project is detailed in Chapter 4 Site Selection and Assessment of Alternatives. It was not considered possible to avoid the SAC and the features of the site. In cognisance of the sensitivity of these features, extensive mitigation measures have been proposed for the cable routing



Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard
			features within the IDRBNR SAC could be considered 'red risk features' and should therefore be avoided.	through the SAC, as outlined within Chapter 3: Project Description and Chapter 9 Benthic and Intertidal Ecology
111	Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	P2_17	LWT does not agree with the Applicant's assessments of vulnerability and sensitivity, given the evidence provided above from both Natural England and the JNCC. LWT would like to refer to the above evidence provided by Natural England's condition assessment from 2019, which outlines unfavourable conditions and no signs of recovery for all Annex 1 habitat assessed within this protected area. Unfortunately, the Applicant's claims are in direct conflict with both the current evidence base and conservation guidance.	The Applicant has reviewed the assessment in light of SNCB comments, including an appraisal of the most recent condition assessment for the IDRBNR SAC. The conclusions have been amended accordingly where appropriate. Additionally, further engineering work has been undertaken to refine the worst-case scenarios for impacts to sandbanks within the SAC and the whole project combined, including a commitment to the use of only removeable cable protection in the event that any is required over the sandbank features of the SAC, as secured within the Outline Scour Protection Cable Protection Management Plan (document reference 8.21).
112	Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	P2_17	The Secretary of State's decision letter in response to the Hornsea Project Three sets a precedence regarding the long-term impact of cable protection on Annex 1 sandbank features: 'In respect of the North Norfolk Sandbanks and Saturn Reef SAC and the Wash and North Norfolk Coast SAC, the Secretary of State considers that habitats which are subjected to cable protection, will experience the effects of habitat loss, habitat modification and changes in epifauna communities. As the cable protection will be in place for 35 years, this is considered a long-term effect. Furthermore, cable protection measures are likely to impede the restoration of the Annex 1 habitats for the duration that they are in place. These habitats are currently in unfavourable condition, and delays to their restoration would be contrary to the Conservation Objectives for the SACs.' We believe that this ruling directly applies to the impacts of the ECC of this Project. With regards to the impacts of the ECC on the IDRBNR SAC, we have outlined that: 1. The features of IDRBNR SAC (H1170 Reefs and H1110 Sandbanks) are in unfavourable condition with no signs of recovery, according to Natural England's 2019 condition assessment. 2. IDRBNR Annex 1 habitats are sensitive to ECC activities, which pose medium high risk to these features, as demonstrated by the Advice on Operations matrix (Fig. 1) 3. The Crowne Estate has clearly outlined that avoidance to be applied in the event of high-risk activities to at-risk features (evidence to support the assumption of high risk given by items 1 and 2) 4. There is a gross underestimation of the length of impact on protected features within the PEIR, and this claim is supported by a precedent set by Secretary of State's decision to Hornsea Project Three.	The Applicant has reviewed the assessment in light of SNCB comments, including an appraisal of the most recent condition assessment for the IDRBNR SAC. The conclusions have been amended accordingly where appropriate. Additionally, further engineering work has been undertaken to refine the worst-case scenarios for impacts to sandbanks within the SAC and the whole project combined, including a commitment through additional mitigation to the use of only removeable cable protection in the event that any is required over the sandbank features of the SAC as secured within the Outline SPCPMP.
113	Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	P2_17	Impacts to Sandeel Nursery and Spawning Grounds:  we do not agree with the final decision to classify this receptor as having 'medium sensitivity'.	This is noted by the Applicant. Further justification for the assignment of this sensitivity score has been added to the assessments in Chapter 10 Fish and Shellfish Ecology
114	Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	P2_17	LWT would like to point out that this comparison between the amount of suspended material following offshore windfarm development and natural resuspension of sediment is misleading and in direct conflict with the literature, which has shown that suspended particulate matter (SPM) plumes in the wake of OWF construction can reach concentrations up to 5 times that of background concentrations.  Given the intended impact to an important source habitat for <i>A. marinus</i> and the lack of evidence for recovery, LWT believes that this project does impose significant risk to the Southern North Sea sandeel population.	The Applicant acknowledges these concerns raised by the Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust and note that the modelled release of suspected sediments are based on worst case construction scenarios, details of which are summarised in Chapter 7 Marine Physical Processes, and Physical Processes Modelling Report. A full assessment of the potential impacts on sandeel populations is undertaken in Chapter 10 Fish and Shellfish Ecology, Impact 2, and further justification for the sensitivity score of sandeel has been provided.
115	Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	P2_17	Dredging and Disposal of Dredged Material: LWT is particularly concerned with the statement that, 'any material dredged from within	The Applicant acknowledges these concerns raised by the Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust and note that physical processes modelling is based on worst case construction scenarios, details of which are



Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard
			<p>the SAC will deposited back within the SAC' (Section 9.7.8). While LWT appreciates the reasoning behind this—likely an attempt to minimise harm to SAC sandbank features—we are nonetheless concerned with the redeposition of sediment across Annex 1 habitat (H1110 Sandbanks and/or H1170 Reefs), as this would greatly impact benthic and pelagic communities that rely on these unique and important ecosystems.</p> <p>Given the above concerns for direct impact and loss of important spawning habitat for sandeel, LWT would recommend minimising the need for dredging within the Inner Dowsing, Race Bank and North Ridge SAC, and any other unprotected Annex 1 sandbank, (avoidance) and mitigating the disposal of dredged material either outside of the SAC or outside of important spawning seasons. We anticipate a full evaluation of the impacts of dredging and sediment redeposition on these and other receptors in the ES, as well as due diligence towards the mitigation hierarchy for any projected impacts.</p>	<p>summarised in Chapter 7 Marine Physical Processes, Physical Processes Technical Baseline and Physical Processes Modelling Report. The Applicant is seeking a defined disposal ground in parallel to the DCO application. The Applicant is committed to micro-siting infrastructure around Annex I habitat as far as practicable, to avoid direct significant impacts on these sensitive habitats where possible (as detailed within the Outline Biogenic Reef Mitigation Plan (document reference 8.22) and Outline Cable Specification and Installation Plan (document reference 8.5)). Impacts to benthic habitats are considered within Chapter 9 Benthic and Intertidal Ecology and where impacts may arise to the SAC, within the RIAA (document reference 7.1). A full assessment of the potential impacts of direct impact and loss of important spawning habitat for sandeel is undertaken in Chapter 10 Fish and Shellfish Ecology.</p>
116	Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	P2_17	<p>Modelling the Impacts of Noise and Cumulative Noise:</p> <p>LWT appreciates the Underwater Noise Assessment provided in Volume 2, Appendix 3.2, which includes 1) hearing thresholds for marine mammals and fish, 2) qualitative assessment of potential effects on a variety of species, including fish with specialist and nonspecialists hearing, sea turtles, and eggs and larvae, and 3) noise propagation modelling along with estimated received noise levels for receptors. However, we believe that this evaluation could be greatly improved by modelling species distributions based on current data in conjunction with noise propagation models based on the location and time of year of the construction phase. This type of investigation might be used to quantify potential risk to sensitive species based on the anticipated timing of construction and predicted habitat use, and therefore would be a valuable tool for avoiding/mitigating impacts (e.g., timing construction based on anticipated risk and interaction with sensitive species). This sort of exercise may also be applied for other important impacts, such as sediment redeposition and pelagic and/or demersal spawning periods.</p>	<p>Consideration of the potential impacts from underwater noise on fish and shellfish receptors is presented in Chapter 12: Fish and Shellfish Ecology, including potential impacts on spawning and nursery grounds, as well as potential migration routes where applicable. The Underwater Noise Assessment provides the modelled results based on the project parameters, which then informs the ecological assessment.</p>
117	Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	P2_17	<p>LWT also highlight that there is significant potential for construction timelines to overlap with other noisy activities in the region, and therefore there is significant potential to exceed the area-based noise thresholds for the Southern North Sea SAC. These thresholds have already been close to being exceeded due to current, and much lower, levels of activity. We urge that collaboration between regulators and other developers (including those from other industries) will be paramount to ensuring that these thresholds are not exceeded, and no adverse impact on the harbour porpoise population of the Southern North Sea SAC occurs. Therefore, due to their likely requirement, the use of mitigation and noise abatement technologies should be explored as soon as possible.</p>	<p>The Applicant has considered potential impacts to the Southern North Sea SAC within the RIAA and the Project has committed to developing a Site Integrity Plan( SIP) based on the Outline SIP submitted as part of the application.</p>
118	Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	P2_17	<p>LWT will consider endorsement of ODOW provided that the above concerns are addressed appropriately. LWT request a meeting with ODOW to discuss the issues detailed in this response. LWT will continue to work with the developers during the planning process to ensure the correct data is gathered and assessed in order to address our concerns.</p>	<p>The Applicant has noted this comment. The Applicant has continued to liaise with the LWT throughout the pre-application period.</p>
119	Marine Management Organisation	P2_18	<p>correctly identified that the proposed development is within the East Marine Plan areas and the MMO welcomes the developer's commitment to produce a marine plan conformance assessment. The MMO notes that in Table 6.39 of Document 8.2 Planning Statement some marine planning policies are identified. The MMO requests that all policies are reviewed within a table to show compliance. This must be produced as the Secretary of State must use the East Marine Plan when making planning decisions for the sea, coast, estuaries and tidal waters, as well as developments that impacts these areas, such as infrastructure.</p>	<p>The Applicant has addressed planning and policy matters within the Planning Statement and the Policy Compliance Document submitted as part of the DCO application.</p>

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard
			The East Marine Plan policies can be accessed using Explore Marine Plans: <a href="https://www.gov.uk/guidance/explore-marine-plans">https://www.gov.uk/guidance/explore-marine-plans</a>	
120	Marine Management Organisation	P2_18	The MMO would like to discuss further the management of Works 11 and any related plans to ensure a consistent approach with the Local Planning Authority on the area between MHWS and Mean Low Water Springs.	The Applicant notes the requirement for further discussions on Works 11 and ensuring consistency for the approach to the management of works between MHWS and MLWS, while noting that the only works between MHWS and MLWS will be landfall HDD works.
121	Marine Management Organisation	P2_18	Appropriate data sources have been identified for marine physical processes as discussed in Section 7.4.3 and Table 7.1 in Appendix 7.1. These are a mixture of desk-based studies as well as project specific studies, including geophysical and Metocean measurements. There are also other Offshore Wind Farm (OWF) projects with data the applicant can use, the MMO expresses caution with relying heavily on older OWF projects (such as Race Bank OWF) where datasets are as old as 2009. Whilst older datasets can be considered please take caution in relying on that too heavily.	The Applicant notes the MMO's caution on using evidence from existing, older, OWF studies. Where appropriate and available, this evidence has been supported by more recent, project-specific surveys and numerical modelling exercises, as outlined in Chapter 7 Marine Physical Processes.
122	Marine Management Organisation	P2_18	The MMO agrees with scoping out the hydrodynamic impacts from installation vessels such as the jack-up rigs and cable laying vessels during construction phase.	The Applicant welcomes the MMO response that hydrodynamic impacts from installation vessels such as the jack-up rigs and cable laying vessels during construction phase, can be scoped out.
123	Marine Management Organisation	P2_18	The MMO notes that impacts on coastal processes and geomorphology above the MHWS on construction has been scoped out. The MMO does not agree that this should be scoped out. Section 7.7 sets out what is to be scoped in and Impact 3 of construction is modifications to littoral transport and coastal behaviour (erosion), including at landfall. Landfall has been defined as the location at the land-sea interface where the offshore export cable will come ashore. The MMO would expect that coastal processes and geomorphology above MHWS would be discussed within this Impact 3 as the Impact Assessment (Section 7.12 in Volume 1, Chapter 7: Marine Physical Processes. Rev V1.0. June 2023) mentions temporary beach access (which is not known to be below MHWS or not) which could impact beach geomorphology. Also, within that section (7.12.76) it is noted that cable protection could act in a similar way to submerged breakwaters which could impact beach morphology, and littoral sediment transport which in the nearshore is driven by the wave regime. These impacts do not stop at the MHWS but will impact coastal processes above this line. Therefore, Impact 3 should consider impacts above the MHWS. The MMO requests that ODOW clarify if 'landfall' in this instance does include above MHWS. If it does not, then this should be included.	Potential impacts on coastal behaviour at the landfall site, including below MHWS and certain features above MHWS (specifically dune features behind the landfall beach), have been assessed in Chapter 7 Marine Physical Processes. These receptors have also been included within Impact 8.
124	Marine Management Organisation	P2_18	The MMO recommends that impacts above MHWS are also included in Impact 4 (Modifications to the wave and tidal regime and associated potential impacts to the sediment transport regime and morphological features) and Impact 8 (Modifications to littoral transport, coastal behaviour (erosion) including at landfall) and should be scoped into the Operations and Maintenance and Decommissioning. This is to include the beach evolution over the lifespan of the project and to consider impacts of sea level rise on the beach profile, which could change the MHWS line.	The Applicant confirms that potential features below MHWS and certain features above MHWS have been included as receptors within Impact 8 as appropriate.
125	Marine Management Organisation	P2_18	Table 7.4 highlights the mitigation proposed. Please note the use of scour protection is proposed in areas where scour would be predicted to occur, therefore potential impacts from sediment that would be mobilised due to erosion occurring during scour development is not fully assessed. The impacts of using scour protection (relating to a greater footprint of hard substrate being introduced, which may lead to habitat change/loss) should be compared to the impacts of simply designing foundations which can accommodate scour development. The resulting effects of scour (lowering of the seabed, winnowing/coarsening of sediment, plus release of sediment into the wider environment after installation) may have a lesser impact than compared to the introduction of hard substrate into the environment (particularly given that rock scour and/or cable protection is difficult to decommission).	The impacts of introducing scour protection and/or the formation of scour pits on benthic habitats has been assessed within Chapter 9 Benthic and Intertidal Ecology. An assessment of potential impacts associated with seabed scouring, including impacts associated with secondary scour, and relevant mitigation measures are provided in Chapter 7 Marine Physical Processes.

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard
126	Marine Management Organisation	P2_18	Secondary scour can occur around the edges of scour protection and the potential for this to increase the footprint of the project effects should be assessed. It is noted that 'there is limited numerical basis for the prediction of this secondary scour'. The MMO recommends that further evidence is collected from field data/monitoring evidence from other wind farms if available, acknowledging that empirical assessment methodologies are less established for edge/secondary scour than they are for primary scour where no scour protection is applied.	Potential impacts from secondary scour have been considered within the assessment set out in Chapter 7 Marine Physical Processes.
127	Marine Management Organisation	P2_18	The Applicant has undertaken project specific surveys to characterise the material within the project area, which includes sediment grab samples collected for particle size analysis (PSA) and contaminant analysis (trace metals, organotins, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), and organochlorine pesticides (OCPs)). Under this survey, 30 samples were collected from within the Array area, and 28 samples were collected from within the Export Cable Corridor (ECC) area, all of which were analysed for contaminants by SOCOTEC. The MMO notes that SOCOTEC are not validated to undertake PSA in support of marine licences, but as this is not strictly a dredge and disposal application, the MMO is content that the data may be used as appropriate evidence.	The Applicant welcomes MMO's validation of the use of SOCOTEC to analyse sediment PSA and contaminants.
128	Marine Management Organisation	P2_18	The results of the contaminant analysis were compared to Cefas Action Levels (AL) (where available) and, for PAHs, to Effects Range Low (ERL) and Effects Range Median (ERM) based on the Gorham-Test method (Gorham-Test et al., 1999), which is appropriate. In addition, results were compared to the Canadian Marine Sediment Quality Guidelines and United States Environmental Protection Agency Guidelines, which is appreciated for the additional level of detail.	The Applicant welcomes MMO's validation of the assessment of sediment contamination
129	Marine Management Organisation	P2_18	It is noted that the report does not specify the need for a disposal site to be designated for these works. However, as per the UK's obligations under the London Convention and Protocol (LCLP) and OSPAR, any disposal of material below MHWS must be to a licenced disposal site, and the volumes of material disposed under such operations must be reported annually. The seabed preparation works detailed within the report, particularly as it refers to the use of Trailing Suction Hopper Dredgers (TSHD), would fall under this requirement, and therefore the MMO recommends this need is identified within the Environmental Statement (ES). A Site Characterisation Report must be submitted to enable the MMO to designate one or more disposal sites.	The Applicant can confirm that a Site Characterisation Report has been submitted to the MMO alongside the ES.
130	Marine Management Organisation	P2_18	Drill arisings must be included within the Chapters and be included in any disposal site worst case scenario figures.	A full and detailed assessment of drill arisings, including numerical modelling, is provided in Chapter 7 Marine Physical Processes, the results of this have been applied to the assessment where appropriate.
131	Marine Management Organisation	P2_18	The MMO agrees with the benthic receptors that have been scoped into the assessment. It appears that the only relevant benthic feature that has been scoped out of the assessment is Annex I stony reef, and this is because the stations that potentially qualified as this habitat based on the presence of cobbles within the Array Area and ECC did not meet the required physical and / or ecological criteria (Sections 9.4.102 and 9.4.105 and Section 4.8.2 (Appendix 9.1), and Section 4.9.2 Appendix 9.2). The MMO defers to Natural England on this matter but would highlight that it may be appropriate to be more precautionary when identifying potential Annex 1 stony reef along the ECC within the Inner Dowsing, Race Bank and North Ridge (IDRBNR) Special Area of Conservation (SAC), within which 'Reefs' is a protected feature.	The Applicant acknowledges the concerns raised by MMO in relation to stony reef. However, it should be pointed out the only two features designated within the SAC are 'biogenic reefs' and 'sandbanks'. 'Stony reef' is a separate Annex I habitat which is not a feature of the SAC. The Applicant has undertaken pre-construction surveys of the proposed development in order to determine the location, extent and composition of any Annex I reef and have committed to micro-siting infrastructure where practicable. Discussion in relation to <i>S. spinulosa</i> recorded during site specific surveys and associated reef features is set out in Chapter 9 Benthic and Intertidal Ecology.
132	Marine Management Organisation	P2_18	Regarding the impact of temporary habitat disturbance during the construction phase, it is stated that pre-construction surveys of <i>Sabellaria spinulosa</i> reef (an Annex I habitat within the IDRBNR SAC) will be conducted, and that if this feature is present then a mitigation plan will be created in consultation with the MMO and Natural England (see sections 9.7.14 and	The Applicant acknowledges the concerns raised by MMO in relation to the detection of <i>S. spinulosa</i> reef. However, it is typical for well established 'reef' to be evident as irregular ridges and low-grade reef within mixed sediment is increasingly difficult to delineate. The Applicant undertook a high sampling strategy for the baseline characterisation ground-truth



Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard
			9.7.32 of the document cited in Volume 1, Chapter 9: Benthic and Intertidal Ecology. Rev V1.0. June 2023). As the data collected during the most recent geophysical surveys of the Array Area and ECC did not reveal a unique signature associated with <i>Sabellaria spinulosa</i> aggregations observed in the ground-truthing data (see section 9.4.107 of Volume 1, Chapter 9: Benthic and Intertidal Ecology. Rev V1.0. June 2023), it seems possible that potential <i>Sabellaria spinulosa</i> reef could go undetected in future geophysical surveys. The MMO advises that ODOW indicate how they will ensure that the pre-construction surveys will be able to identify any areas of potential <i>Sabellaria spinulosa</i> reef so that they can be avoided by micro-siting / routeing.	campaign. The evidence from that survey did reveal that <i>S. spinulosa</i> found was low-grade and patchy in nature, supporting the geophysical results. Furthermore, a reanalysis of the geophysical and benthic characterisation data along the offshore ECC has been undertaken by Envision Ltd and is presented in the Envision Data Analysis with the results of this work used to inform the assessment in Chapter 9 Benthic and Intertidal Ecology. The Applicant has committed to pre-construction surveys to identify the quality and extent of <i>S. spinulosa</i> reef and enable robust micro-siting of infrastructure to occur.
133	Marine Management Organisation	P2_18	Regarding the impact of permanent habitat loss / alteration during the operation & maintenance phase, the total area that may be affected is large (5.5 km <sup>2</sup> ). The MMO recommends that this area is reduced by design if practicable. The possible loss of habitat within the IDRBNR SAC due to any required cable protection is also a particular concern. However, it is noted that a cable burial risk assessment (CBRA) will be undertaken to help avoid significant impacts to Annex I sandbanks, though it is unclear whether impacts on Annex I reef can be avoided at this stage.	Further engineering work has been undertaken to refine the worst-case scenarios for impacts to sandbanks within the SAC and the whole project combined. Further evidence, inclusive of updated project parameters, has been used to inform the assessment, and the figure regarding the area of permanent/long term habitat loss/alterations has been revised to 4.4 km <sup>2</sup> as indicated in Chapter 9 Benthic and Intertidal Ecology. Additional mitigation is committed to Annex I sandbanks and Annex I reef. As detailed within Chapter 9 additional mitigation will be applied to cable protection within the IDRBNR SAC (if required), this aims to reduce pressures on the sandbank features within this site. This mitigation plan has been developed in line with Natural England's mitigation hierarchy for designated sites. As detailed within the Outline Biogenic Reef Mitigation Plan windfarm infrastructure will be micro-sited around Annex I reef as far as practicable, to avoid where possible direct impacts to these sensitive habitats. As detailed within the In Principle Monitoring Plan a pre-construction Annex I habitat survey will be undertaken and will subsequently be used to inform any micro-siting of windfarm infrastructure.
134	Marine Management Organisation	P2_18	Section 0.7.97 sets out the impact of colonisation of the Wind Turbine Generators (WTGs) and scour / cable protection during the operation & maintenance phase, it is stated that this would affect an area of 0.8 km <sup>2</sup> (see section 9.7.97 of Volume 1, Chapter 9: Benthic and Intertidal Ecology. Rev V1.0. June 2023). However, based on the information presented in Table 9.10 of the same document, it appears than an area of 8 km <sup>2</sup> would be affected. The MMO requests clarity on what the affected area will be and, if it's the larger area – as appears to be the case – then ODOW should indicate whether this affects their conclusion.	Further engineering work has been undertaken to refine the worst-case scenarios for impacts with further evidence, inclusive of updated project parameters having been used to inform the assessment, and the figure regarding the impact of colonisation of the Wind Turbine Generators (WTGs) and scour/cable protection during the operation & maintenance phase has been revised to 2.4 km <sup>2</sup> as indicated in Chapter 9 Benthic and Intertidal Ecology
135	Marine Management Organisation	P2_18	Regarding the potential spread of invasive non-native species (INNS) due to the presence of infrastructure during the operation & maintenance phase, it is acknowledged that the uncertainty regarding whether this impact will occur, and which species will be involved if it does. Given this uncertainty, the MMO queries whether it would be suitably precautionary to increase the impact magnitude above 'negligible'? When considering the risk of this impact, it would be useful to consider the proximity of the infrastructure to other artificial or natural hard habitats in the area in the Cumulative Effects Assessment (CEA). This would indicate the potential for the installed infrastructure to act as stepping stones for the spread of Invasive Non-Native Species (INNS) in the region. Given the high level of uncertainty regarding the potential spread of INNS, the MMO considers it would be appropriate to monitor selected infrastructure for colonisation by INNS, followed by discussions with MMO regarding the possible application of adaptive management measures if INNS are recorded and action is deemed appropriate.	The Applicant has reviewed the assessment of INNS in light of MMO comments. Details of mitigation included in the PEMP are outlined in Chapter 9 Benthic and Intertidal Ecology which the Applicant considers adequate to ensure that the magnitude of any potential impact associated with INNS remains negligible. The Applicant has committed to INNS monitoring in the event that GBS are used.
136	Marine Management Organisation	P2_18	The MMO does not have any comments or concerns at this stage on the receptors that have been scoped out with regards to shellfish and defers to the Eastern Inshore Fisheries & Conservation Authority (EIFCA) for comments on potential impacts of the development on cockle and whelk features in The Wash.	The Applicant has noted this response.
137	Marine Management Organisation	P2_18	The MMO notes the use of several data sources for shellfish and shellfisheries. These are a combination of desk sources and additional opportunistic surveys. However, the listed data sources do not cover the array or cable corridor, and several are over 10 years old, which could be considered outdated. Furthermore, as acknowledged by ODOW, the	The Applicant confirms that the limitations of these datasets have been acknowledged in Chapter 10 Fish and Shellfish Ecology. The Coull <i>et al.</i> (1998) and Ellis <i>et al.</i> (2012) data sources are widely accepted across the offshore wind industry. However, to supplement these data sources, site specific PSA data have been used to inform the locations of suitable spawning substrates for

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard
			surveys conducted are not shellfish targeted surveys and are therefore only indicative of presence and absence of shellfish species. It is acknowledged that the report states “the MMO agreed that the baseline datasets identified in the Scoping Report (Outer Dowsing Offshore Wind, 2022) were appropriate for characterisation and the MMO confirmed no need for site-specific surveys.” However, the MMO would expect more recent data to inform the baseline environment for shellfish receptors and shellfisheries.	demersal spawning receptors such as herring and sandeel. Site-specific epibenthic trawls, and eDNA surveys have also been undertaken to inform the fish and shellfish baseline, and the assessment. Literature has also been drawn upon to further inform the baseline environment for shellfish receptors and shellfisheries as outlined in Appendix 1 Fish and Shellfish Ecology Technical Baseline.
138	Marine Management Organisation	P2_18	The MMO has no concerns regarding the scoping in/out of impacts or receptors for fish. The fish species present in and around the project’s study area have been correctly identified, as have the spawning and nursery grounds found within the vicinity of the project. The potential impacts to fish receptors and commercial fisheries have been appropriately scoped in/out. As agreed at scoping stage, impacts arising from accidental pollution during the construction, operation and maintenance (O&M), and decommissioning phases have been scoped out of further assessment on the basis that a Project Environmental Management and Monitoring Plan (PEMMP) will be implemented to mitigate pollution events.	This is welcomed by the Applicant.
139	Marine Management Organisation	P2_18	Impacts from direct disturbance during the O&M phase have now been scoped in, which is appropriate. Impacts arising from changes in fishing pressure due to displacement have been scoped out of further assessment for fish ecology, but scoped into the assessment for commercial fisheries, which is supported. Transboundary impacts have been scoped into the assessment in respect of Annex II migratory fish species listed as features of European sites in other EEA States. The assessment of impacts to fish from underwater noise and habitat disturbance for some species (primarily herring and sand eel) requires further consideration and some clarification is also needed to ensure the ES is robust and fit for the purpose of assessing the likelihood of significant impacts occurring to fish.	This is noted by the Applicant. Further consideration of potential impacts from underwater noise and habitat disturbance for some species (primarily herring and sandeel) has been incorporated into Chapter 10 Fish and Shellfish Ecology and conclusions updated accordingly
140	Marine Management Organisation	P2_18	The MMO notes the increase in hammer energies being used to install monopiles at OWFs. Monopile hammer energies have typically been in the region of 4,000 – 5,000 kilojoules (kJ). It is noted that 6,000 – 7,000kJ is proposed. These higher hammer energies are likely to result in noise impacting a larger area. Whilst receptor-specific mitigation is recommended by the MMO when the evidence suggests that significant impacts to a particular species of fish are likely to occur, additional noise abatement measures may be required, such as bubble curtains (see Würsig et al. (1999)), or other alternative measures.	The Applicant reassures the MMO that due consideration to the potential for impacts on fish and shellfish receptors from underwater noise is given in Chapter 10 Fish and Shellfish Ecology. Where the assessment concludes that further mitigation is required this is detailed in Chapter 10.
141	Marine Management Organisation	P2_18	The MMO would highlight that given the wider context of the current ramp up of offshore wind development at unprecedented scale in the North Sea it is vital that these discussions begin as soon as possible. To ensure adequate preparations are made and potential delays avoided, it is therefore in the applicant’s interest to plan for noise abatement measures at the earliest opportunity and to incorporate such measures into any future MMMP.	The Applicant reassures the MMO that due consideration to the potential for impacts on fish and shellfish receptors from underwater noise is given in Chapter 10 Fish and Shellfish Ecology. Where the assessment concludes that further mitigation is required this is detailed in Chapter 10.
142	Marine Management Organisation	P2_18	In the benthic survey report for the array area (Appendix 9.1: Benthic Ecology Technical Report (Array). Document Number: 6.2.9.1, Rev. v1.0.), it is noted that ‘numerous sandeels were observed on the video footage across the sand dominated sediments’ and that ‘sandeels were also the most prominently identified chordates in seabed photographs and video footage’. Raitt’s sand eel ( <i>Ammodytes marinus</i> ), smooth sandeel ( <i>Gymnammodytes semisquamatus</i> ), lesser sandeel ( <i>Ammodytes tobianus</i> ) and greater sandeel ( <i>Hyperoplus lanceolatus</i> ) were all caught in the trawl surveys. With this in mind, it would be helpful to know the numbers of each sandeel species caught in the trawl surveys (and grab samples if applicable), and the locations of where sandeel were caught, or observed, the MMO recommends that an additional layer to the map of sandeel habitat is provided (similar to that shown in Figure 10.2 but indicating those locations where sandeel were caught/observed). Given that 2 metre (m) beam trawls and grabs are not suitable fishing methods for targeting sandeels, it is interesting to see such high numbers caught, and	This is noted, and the distribution of sandeel as informed by the site-specific benthic surveys have been presented in Figure 10.18 and used to inform the baseline in Appendix 10.1 Fish and Shellfish Ecology Technical Baseline and the assessment within Chapter 10 Fish and Shellfish Ecology.



Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard
			whilst the data would only be an anecdotal indicator of their presence, it would be useful to plot the locations of sandeel catches and observations across the site to see if any further useful context could be gained relating to sediment type and seabed features, such as the noted absence of sandeels in areas where water depth exceeded 30m.	
143	Marine Management Organisation	P2_18	It is recommended that the sandeel habitat assessment is supplemented with data from the North Sea Sandeel Survey (NSSS) carried out in Sandeel Area 1 in December each year. This targeted sandeel dredge survey has been carried out since December 2004 and includes a number of stations in and around Outer Dowsing (see Annex 1). The NSSS data can be downloaded from ICES at Datras: Download (ices.dk).	The suggestion of this data source is welcomed by the Applicant and the data have been presented in Figure 10.18..
144	Marine Management Organisation	P2_18	Vessel Monitoring System (VMS) data for bottom trawled gear is a further source of data that is recommended for the assessment to identify areas where high intensity fishing may be occurring in the project study area.	The suggestion of this data source is welcomed by the Applicant. Landings data from the MMO has been used to inform the fish and shellfish baseline in Appendix 10.1 Fish and Shellfish Ecology Technical Baseline and the assessment of potential impacts to commercially important species undertaken in Chapter 10 Fish and Shellfish Ecology. VMS data have been used to inform Chapter 14 Commercial Fisheries to identify areas of high intensity fishing activity.
145	Marine Management Organisation	P2_18	The MMO notes that it has been recognised that sandeels play an important role in the North Sea's food web as prey for birds, marine mammals and piscivorous fish. The project array overlaps the Southern North Sea Harbour Porpoise Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and the ECC overlaps the Greater Wash Special Protected Area (SPA) which incorporates red throated divers, little gull, common scoter, Sandwich tern, little tern and common tern as Annex I features. It is likely that some of these predatory receptors will rely on sandeels as part of their diet whilst foraging in the project area and may experience reduced foraging success and/or incur greater energy expenditure travelling to new feeding grounds as a result of localised impacts to fish populations during the construction of the wind farm, especially those receptors with relatively small and/or coastal restricted foraging areas. Given the ecological importance of sandeels to support marine predators in the study area and given the potential abundance of sandeels within the project boundary and the suitability of the habitat, it is recommended that ODOW makes use of the additional data sources outlined in above to ensure that the potential impacts to Annex I species resulting from regional adverse impacts to sandeel populations can be assessed in more detail.	This is noted by the Applicant, and the suggested data sources have been incorporated into the fish and shellfish ecology baseline in Appendix 10.1 and have been used to inform the assessment of potential effects on sandeel as prey species for Annex 1 features in Chapter 10 Fish and Shellfish Ecology.
146	Marine Management Organisation	P2_18	To complement the maps of herring spawning habitat suitability in Figures 10.10 – 10.13, International Herring Larvae Survey (IHLS) abundance data for the years 2009 – 2021 have been plotted as a cumulative data set (Figure 10.14) and by individual survey years (Figures 10.15 – 10.17). Figure 10.14 shows that consistent high larval abundances of between 28,500.1 – 93,250 per m <sup>2</sup> occur offshore from Flamborough head, (northwest of the project site), whilst lower larval abundances ranging from 6,000.1 – 12,750 /m <sup>2</sup> occur south of Flamborough Head, extending over a portion of the project array area and secondary zone of influence. In some years (2011-2012, 2016-2017 and 2019-2020) higher larval densities occurred within the array site, demonstrating the continued importance of this area as a herring spawning ground, and the local importance of the southern extent of the Central North Sea (CNS) herring spawning grounds to maintain overall stock resilience for the North Sea herring stock. The MMO welcomes this.	This is welcomed by the Applicant.
147	Marine Management Organisation	P2_18	Given the presence of herring spawning grounds within the project study area, the specific spawning habitat requirements of herring, and their sensitivity to underwater noise, the MMO requests that ODOW models and presents (in mapped form) additional noise modelling for the received levels of single strike sound exposure levels (SELs) at the Banks herring spawning grounds based on the 135 decibel (dB) (SELs) startle response (as per Hawkins et al. (2014)) in order to predict the range of effect for behavioural responses in herring. This is particularly important as Under Water Noise (UWN) generated	The Applicant maintains that the 135dB threshold is overly precautionary, and that as stated by Popper et al (2014) it is not appropriate to determine the potential for behavioural effects quantitatively due to the range of behavioural responses, and external stimuli and life events that can influence them. Notwithstanding this, the Applicant has presented potential behavioural impact ranges as 5dB increments from the piling source and undertaken a literature review to inform the potential range and magnitude of effects on spawning herring. This is presented in Chapter 10 Fish and Shellfish Ecology. Due consideration of the migration of herring has also been

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard
			by piling at Outer Dowsing has the potential to create an acoustic 'barrier' to herring as they follow their migration southwards through the central North Sea (Cushing, 2001).	incorporated into Appendix 10.1 Fish and Shellfish Ecology Technical Baseline and Impact 1 Chapter 10.
148	Marine Management Organisation	P2_18	It is recommended that for the ES the maps in Figures 10.24 – 10.34 should also state the pile diameter used in the modelling. Modelling should be based on the maximum pile diameter (14m for monopiles and 5m for pin piles).	This is noted, and Figure 10.23 to 10.37 have been updated accordingly
149	Marine Management Organisation	P2_18	It is noted that underwater noise modelling for UXO clearance has been carried out using the appropriate unweighted peak sound pressure (SPL <sub>peak</sub> ) explosions threshold for fish of 229 - 234 dB peak (as per Popper et al., 2014) for charge weights of 0.5 kilogram (kg) – 800kg (+donor charge weight of 0.5kg). The maximum predicted impact range for an 800kg charge at 229dB is 930m.	This is noted, the Applicant confirms that a detailed assessment on the impacts to fish from UXO clearance will be included in an UXO marine licence application post-consent, identifying receptors within the study area with specific habitat requirements for part or all of their life cycles and their sensitive spawning periods. A high-level assessment, as informed by the underwater noise modelling has been undertaken in Chapter 10 Fish and Shellfish Ecology
150	Marine Management Organisation	P2_18	The MMO understands a separate UXO marine licence application will be submitted and recommends a more detailed assessment on the impacts to fish from UXO clearance to be presented for the UXO clearance within this application that identifies those fish within the study area with specific habitat requirements for part or all of their life cycles (e.g., herring, sandeel and oviparous elasmobranchs) and their sensitive spawning periods.	This is noted, the Applicant confirms that a detailed assessment on the impacts to fish from UXO clearance will be included in an UXO marine licence application post-consent, identifying receptors within the study area with specific habitat requirements for part or all of their life cycles and their sensitive spawning periods. A high-level assessment, as informed by the underwater noise modelling has been undertaken in Chapter 10 Fish and Shellfish Ecology.
151	Marine Management Organisation	P2_18	The Applicant has proposed 'best practise' embedded mitigation measures, such as the use of soft-start techniques on commencement of piling, the implementation of a Project Environmental Management Plan (PEMP) and the burial of cables wherever possible, all of which is supported.	This is welcomed by the Applicant, and embedded mitigation measures as relevant to fish and shellfish ecology are summarised in Chapter 10 Fish and Shellfish Ecology
152	Marine Management Organisation	P2_18	<p>However, no additional fisheries-specific mitigation has been proposed because no impacts were assessed above 'minor adverse' (not significant in EIA terms). Even with the additional monitoring requested the MMO may recommend a temporal piling restriction during the Banks herring spawning season, because the results of the UWN modelling already show an overlap of noise with the southern portion of the Banks spawning ground, in an area which continues to be utilised by herring in some years.</p> <p>However, this restriction is subject to the review of the final modelling in the ES. Please note any restriction, may be comparable to the piling restrictions for Triton Knoll OWF, located to the east of Outer Dowsing and within the project study area.</p>	This is noted by the Applicant. The assessment of underwater noise impacts on fish and shellfish receptors is presented in Chapter 10 Fish and Shellfish Ecology. The Applicant notes that as informed by the IHLS data (presented as a heatmap to identify areas of actively spawning herring), the main spawning of Banks herring stock consistently occurs to the north of the Project, off Flamborough Head. The modelled underwater noise contours do not interact with any areas of high intensity spawning activity (Volume 2, Figures 10.23 to 10.37), and therefore the spawning herring stock that would be impacted is minimal when compared to areas of peak herring spawning off of Flamborough Head. The Applicant maintains their position that there will be no significant population level effects on herring.
153	Marine Management Organisation	P2_18	Concerning the effects of electro-magnetic fields (EMF) on electro-sensitive fish receptors such as elasmobranchs, eels and lampreys, it is noted that the intended average cable burial depth for array, interconnector and export cables will be between 0 - 3m. In line with the National Policy Statement EN3 (Department of Energy & Climate Change, 2011) the MMO recommends that where possible, cables are buried to a minimum depth of 1.5m (subject to local geology or seabed obstructions) as this will further increase the distance between electro sensitive fish receptors and EMF, as well as reduce the risk of snagging and damage to cables by other marine vessels e.g., anchors, bottom-towed gear. It is also noted that a CBRA has been undertaken in respect of the sections of export cables which cross through Annex 1 sandbanks.	This is noted by the Applicant.
154	Marine Management Organisation	P2_18	<p>The approach to the assessment of cumulative and inter-related impacts outlined in the Appendix 5.1: Offshore Cumulative Effects Assessment is appropriate and follows a standard approach of identifying the impacts which have potential to cause an effect. The study area for the range of effect is 12km around the array area and 15km around the ECC (for sedimentary impacts, based on physical processes). For underwater noise the range of effect is 100km due to the larger range of effect from noise generating activities such as piling. The MMO believes that all other offshore operations (OWFs, subsea cables and aggregate areas) within the study area in the planning, consented, construction and operational activities have been identified.</p> <p>It should be recognised that the range of effect for cumulative and inter-related effects may</p>	This is noted by the Applicant, the cumulative assessment of the fish and shellfish ES chapter has been updated in accordance with the latest underwater noise modelling. The cumulative effects of underwater noise are assessed in Chapter 10 Fish and Shellfish Ecology.

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard
			increase if the modelling shows an impact range exceeding 100km. With this in mind, there may be other offshore developments further afield that will require scoping into the assessment, should the UWN modelling show a range of effect of >100km.	
155	Marine Management Organisation	P2_18	The MMO notes the relevant impacts that have been scoped in for assessment. The MMO, would expect the impact of UXO Clearance and TTS to be considered, alongside Permanent Threshold Shift (PTS) and disturbance. The MMO notes that a separate Marine licence application will be submitted for UXO, however disposal of UXO is included in the impact assessment and other impacts should also be assessed. Noting that a detailed UXO survey will be completed prior to construction and that the type, size and number of possible detonations and duration of UXO clearance operations is not known at this stage, but disposal of UXO is included in the impact assessment.	The impact of UXO clearance and associated TTS impact ranges have been presented in Chapter 11 Marine Mammals (document reference 9.1.11). Full details of the underwater noise modelling and the resulting PTS-onset impact areas and ranges are detailed in the UWN Assessment (document reference 6.3.3.2). In view of the uncertain size of possible detonations required, an estimation of the source level and predicted PTS- and TTS-onset impact ranges were calculated for a range of expected UXO sizes.
156	Marine Management Organisation	P2_18	For assessing disturbance from pile driving, a species-specific dose-response approach has been adopted, which is appropriate. Noise contours at 5dB intervals were generated by noise modelling and were overlain on species density surfaces to predict the number of animals potentially disturbed. This allowed for the quantification of the number of animals that will potentially respond (Paragraph 11.6.18). The report refers to appropriate literature, e.g., Graham et al. (2017) for harbour porpoise, and Whyte et al. (2020).	A dose-response curve has been adopted as detailed in Chapter 11 Marine Mammals including a list of the species-specific numbers of behaviourally disturbed individuals by pile driving
157	Marine Management Organisation	P2_18	As per section 11.6.24, the MMO agrees that there is no disturbance threshold (effective disturbance range or dose-response function) for any other cetacean species included in this assessment. Therefore, in the complete absence of an alternative, the assessment for all cetacean species has used the porpoise dose-response function. This is considered highly precautionary and as such the number of animals predicted to experience behavioural disturbance is considered to be an overestimate and should be interpreted with a large degree of caution. The MMO welcomes this approach.  Further, as per section 11.6.27, there are no corresponding data for grey seals and, as such, the harbour seal dose-response function is applied to the grey seal disturbance assessment. The MMO agrees with this approach and that this is considered to be an appropriate proxy for grey seals, since both species are categorised within the same functional hearing group.	A dose-response curve has been adopted as detailed in Chapter 11 Marine Mammals which also describes the adoption of porpoise dose-response function for other cetacean species and harbour seal dose-response function for grey seal
158	Marine Management Organisation	P2_18	UXO - For UXO clearance, the MMO welcomes that the 26 km Effective Deterrence Range (EDR) for assessing disturbance has been applied to harbour porpoise and other marine mammal species. While the MMO recognises the lack of data for other marine mammal species, the harbour porpoise EDRs are likely to be conservative (as porpoise are so sensitive to underwater noise) and believes these are a reasonable option in the absence of other data.  For low order UXO clearance, it is noted that a 5 km EDR has been assumed, although there is currently no advised EDR in the Statutory Nature Conservation Bodies (SNCB) guidance (Joint Nature Conservation Committee, 2020). The MMO notes it was requested that justification was provided to support the 5 km EDR, and Section 11.6.34 states the following: “In the absence of empirical data with which to set a threshold, the Sofia Offshore Windfarm Marine Licence Application for UXO detonation assumed a 5km EDR for low-order detonations. This assumed EDR was based on the fact that data has shown that low-order deflagration detonations produce underwater noise that is over 20dB lower than high-order detonation (Robinson et al., 2020). Note, the Sofia Offshore Windfarm Limited committed to undertaking noise monitoring of low-order detonations to confirm this proportionally lower noise level however, the data are not yet available. Until such time as empirical data are available to inform the EDR for low-order detonations, the 5km EDR suggested by Sofia Offshore Windfarm has been assumed”.	The adoption of a 5km EDR has been further discussed in Chapter 11 Marine Mammals (document reference 6.1.11). A 5km EDR has been assumed for low-order UXO clearance for all species (as per the Sofia Offshore Windfarm Marine Licence application for UXO detonation ) and based on the difference between the expected sound levels of low-order and high-order UXO clearance, rather than the sensitivity of different species. The JNCC MNR disturbance tool (JNCC, 2023) provides default and worst-case EDRs for various noise sources, and lists default low-order UXO clearance EDR as 5 km. The 26km EDR has been adopted alongside the presentation of TTS-onset as a proxy for disturbance from UXO clearance.



Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard
			<p>The MMO recommends that further evidence is provided to justify the 5 km EDR.</p> <p>The MMO advises that it is not appropriate to use TTS-onset thresholds as a proxy for disturbance from UXOs. TTS occurs at much higher sound exposures, and so will underestimate the risk of disturbance. In this instance, TTS-onset as a proxy for disturbance has been presented alongside the 26 km EDR approach in acknowledgement that there is no empirically based threshold to assess disturbance from high-order UXO clearance currently available.</p>	
159	Marine Management Organisation	P2_18	<p>Table 11.7 states the maximum design scenario assessed is 93 WTG foundations with a maximum 8 hours per pile. The piling profile in the underwater noise assessment in Appendix 3.2: Underwater Noise Assessment, assumes 4 hours per monopile. Furthermore, it is stated that there will be a maximum of 12 hours piling per day, but a maximum of two monopiles could be installed in 24-hours. The MMO requests clarification regarding these inconsistencies.</p>	<p>The total piling duration is stated in Chapter 3 Project Description (document reference 6.1.3) is the duration of piling works at each piling location, including set-up and retrieval works or any breaks in piling, rather than reflecting the period of continuous noise generation. The UWN Assessment (document reference 6.3.3.2) has been updated to reflect the ES Project parameters of 100 WTG foundations with a maximum of 8 hours per pile.</p>
160	Marine Management Organisation	P2_18	<p>It is noted that within Section 11.7.101 it states “For all non-piling construction activities assessed (Table 11.32), the PTS-onset impact ranges are &lt;100 m. Therefore, non-piling construction noise sources will have a local spatial extent and are transient and intermittent. This means that, with the most precautionary estimates, a marine mammal would have to remain within proximity (&lt; 100 m) for a 24-hour period for PTS-onset to occur”.</p> <p>The MMO believes that this statement / conclusion is incorrect. The modelling is based on a fleeing receptor, and, therefore, the receptor is simply at risk if they are within 100 m of the source when they start to move away (fleeing is about the receptor starting position). The MMO recommends that this is corrected here, and throughout the report.</p>	<p>The statement has been updated. The UWN Assessment presents the PTS and TTS impact ranges for both fleeing and static receptors.</p>
161	Marine Management Organisation	P2_18	<p>The MMO notes that a Southern North Sea SAC (SNS) Site Integrity Plan (SIP) will be developed to manage in-combination effects. An Outline SIP will be submitted alongside DCO application and outlines the proposed mitigation measures which could be utilised for the Project. The MMO welcomes early engagement and review of this document.</p>	<p>The Applicant has noted this response.</p>
162	Marine Management Organisation	P2_18	<p>Given the availability of effective alternatives to unmitigated piling – i.e., measures to reduce noise at source, also known as noise abatement – it will be difficult for unmitigated pile driving to be justified on the basis that there are no realistic alternatives. It is therefore clear that noise abatement measures will likely be required for this development, in order to reduce the risk of potential impact on marine receptors.</p>	<p>The Project will follow best practice guidance during the construction phase regarding noise abatement systems (NAS) if these are established mitigation measures for piling in the UK at the time of construction. Potential NAS that could be considered are detailed in the Outline MMMP for Piling Activities (Document reference: 8.6.1) and the Outline MMMP for UXO Clearance (document reference:8.6.2). The details of the final MMMP will be agreed once the final project design is known. Compliance with the MMMP is secured in the DCO.</p>
163	Marine Management Organisation	P2_18	<p>The MMO would highlight that given the wider context of the current ramp up of offshore wind development at unprecedented scale in the North Sea it is vital that these discussions begin as soon as possible. To ensure adequate preparations are made and potential delays avoided, it is therefore in the applicant’s interest to plan for noise abatement measures at the earliest opportunity and to incorporate such measures into any future Marine Mammal Mitigation Plans (MMMP).</p>	<p>The Project will follow best practice guidance during the construction phase regarding NAS) if these are established mitigation measures for piling in the UK at the time of construction. Potential NAS that could be considered are detailed in the Outline MMMP for Piling Activities (Document reference: 8.6.1) and Outline MMMP for UXO Clearance (Document reference: 8.6.2). The details of the final MMMP will be agreed once the final project design is known.</p>
164	Marine Management Organisation	P2_18	<p>Overall, with the assumed source levels (SLs) (which are not particularly large, considering a hammer energy of 6,600 kJ, and a 14 m diameter monopile), the predictions look plausible / reasonable. It is important to note that measured data for large diameter (mono)piles and high hammer energies, such as those reported here, are lacking. Thus, there are associated uncertainties with the SLs and the subsequent modelling predictions.</p>	<p>This is noted by the Applicant. The modelling confidence is detailed in the Appendix 11.2 Under Water Noise Assessment (document reference 6.3.11.2).</p>
165	Marine Management Organisation	P2_18	<p>The general approach / methodology to the underwater noise modelling is largely appropriate, and effort has been undertaken to produce an informative report, along with details of the input parameters used in the modelling. The assessment refers to appropriate noise exposure criteria for marine receptors. The MMO agrees with the report that at the</p>	<p>The Applicant has noted this response.</p>



Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard
			time of writing, Southall et al. (2019) and Popper et al. (2014) represent the most up-to-date and authoritative criteria for marine mammals and fish respectively.	
166	Marine Management Organisation	P2_18	<p>For the assessment of the cumulative sound exposure (SELcum), a fleeing animal receptor has been assumed for marine mammals, with 'fleeing' speeds of 3.25 metres per second (m/s) for low-frequency cetaceans and 1.5 m/s for all other receptors. For fish receptors, both a fleeing and stationary animal model has been assumed. The MMO is not aware of empirical evidence to support fleeing in fish, and therefore the predictions based on a stationary receptor is the most appropriate/relevant.</p> <p>Fleeing assumptions can have a significant effect on the assessment outcomes. For example, as per Table 4-5 in the report, maximum TTS ranges of 14 km are predicted for a stationary (fish) receptor, whereas for a fleeing (fish) receptor, this range is reduced to 4.8 km.</p>	Stationary fish modelling has been included within Chapter 10 Fish and Shellfish Ecology.
167	Marine Management Organisation	P2_18	<p>Section 3 states: "The current version of INSPIRE (version 5.1) is the product of re-analysing all the impact piling noise measurements in Subacoustech Environmental's measurement database and cross-referencing it with blow energy data from piling logs... the current version of INSPIRE attempts to calculate closer to the average fit of the measured noise levels at all ranges".</p> <p>The MMO welcomes this clarification, and we acknowledge the drive for reducing unnecessary conservatism in modelling. Allegedly, the current version of INSPIRE should produce more realistic predictions.</p>	The Applicant has noted this response.
168	Marine Management Organisation	P2_18	<p>Figure 3-1 in Appendix 3.2 presents a comparison between example measured impact piling data and modelled data using INSPIRE version 5.1. However, this comparison is lacking context.</p> <p>Firstly, the MMO notes that the pile sizes used in this comparison are much smaller (i.e., 1.8 m, 9.5 m, 6.1 m and 6.0 m) than the proposed 14 m diameter monopiles for Outer Dowsing. It is not clear how INSPIRE scales up the smaller piles. Additionally, the MMO requests clarification on whether other factors, such as the penetration depth and the water depth, have been considered in the modelling of the source levels.</p> <p>Secondly, the comparison should make clear the hammer energies used and whether they are relevant for this application. (It is very unlikely that these hammer energies are close to the proposed 6,600 kJ hammer energy for Outer Dowsing).</p> <p>Furthermore, the comparisons presented in Figure 3-1 are for the SPLpeak only, while for the vast majority of the predictions in this appendix, which are derived from SELcum calculations, the relevant metric is the single strike SELs, and not SPLpeak.</p> <p>There is a lack of transparency in the modelling of these parameters which are crucial for determining the model predictions is not acceptable, and these details must be transparent within the ES.</p> <p>Three locations have been modelled inside the Project boundary and a further two positions located in the offshore reactor station search area of the ECC have been modelled (section 3.2.1, Table 3-1 and Figure 3-2).</p> <p>The report confirms that in a 24-hour period, there may be up to two monopile foundations or four jacket pile foundations driven; it is appropriate that this is considered in the modelling as a worst case. It should be noted that, for the ECC locations only a single</p>	This response is noted by The Applicant. The Applicant has considered this response and expanded on this in Appendix 11.2 Under Water Noise Assessment (document reference 6.3.11.2).

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard
			monopile installed in a 24-hour period has been considered; both a single and four sequentially installed jacket piles have been assumed for these locations.	
169	Marine Management Organisation	P2_18	Table 4-2 to Table 4-13 present the modelling results for the monopile foundation modelling scenarios, assuming two sequential pile installations. The MMO notes that the headings for these tables (i.e., Table 4-3, 4-5, 4-7 and 4-9 etc.) state that the results are based on a single monopile foundation. The MMO requests that this is clarified and amended in the report.	This response is noted by the Applicant. The tables in the Appendix 11.2 Under Water Noise Assessment (document reference 6.3.11.2) have been amended to show the results for both single pile and two sequential pile installations.
170	Marine Management Organisation	P2_18	The MMO notes that additional modelling has been carried out to investigate the potential impacts of two piling installations occurring simultaneously at separated foundation locations. Using the monopile and jacket pile foundation piling scenarios, modelling has been carried out for simultaneous piling at the Southwest (SW) and Northeast (NE) locations, representing a worst case spread of locations. The MMO requests that further information be provided to explain why some of the in-combination areas in Table 4-49 are smaller than expected. For example, based on the TTS threshold of 186 dB SELcum, the SW area is 420 km <sup>2</sup> and the NE area is 1300 km <sup>2</sup> but the total in-combination area is only 1700 km <sup>2</sup> (yet Figure 4-5 shows no overlap of areas).	This is noted by the Applicant. Updated noise modelling is presented in the Under Water Noise Assessment (document reference 6.3.11.2).
171	Marine Management Organisation	P2_18	This formula represents a statistical model that was used to assess the correlation between SPL and various parameters (distance, wind speed, turbine size) for the data in the Tougaard study. The MMO considers is that this is not suitable for estimation of the sound levels at 1m in a bespoke model, or as substitute for modelling the propagation loss to the far field. In particular, in terms of estimating propagation, the use of the formula would imply a loss of 23.7 log R, which is unrealistically large, and thus will lead to underestimation of the levels in the far field.	The Applicant has provided further information in relation to this in the Under Water Noise Assessment (document reference 6.3.11.2).
172	Marine Management Organisation	P2_18	It is appropriate that the estimation of the noise source level for each charge weight has been carried out in accordance with the methodology of Soloway and Dahl (2014). It is noted that an attenuation correction has been added to the Soloway and Dahl (2014) equations for the absorption over long ranges (i.e., of the order of thousands of metres), based on measurements of high intensity noise propagation taken in the North Sea and Irish Sea.	The Applicant has noted this response.
173	Marine Management Organisation	P2_18	The maximum PTS range calculated (based on the worst-case UXO) is 14 km for VHF cetaceans (SPL <sub>peak</sub> criteria) (with a TTS range of 26 km). For fish, the maximum range is 930m. The MMO has conducted a spot check of the worst-case predictions which look reasonable (a PTS prediction of ~14 km for VHF cetaceans assuming the methodology from Soloway and Dahl and no attenuation correction).	The Applicant has noted this response.
174	Marine Management Organisation	P2_18	The MMO defers to Natural England regarding the potential impacts to offshore ornithology and will maintain a watching brief on anything that may fall within the MMO's remit – such as DML conditions.	The Applicant has noted this response.
175	Marine Management Organisation	P2_18	The MMO defers to Historic England regarding the potential impacts to offshore archaeology that may occur. The MMO will maintain a watching brief on anything that may fall within the MMO's remit – such as DML conditions.	The Applicant has noted this response.
176	Marine Management Organisation	P2_18	The MMO would like to encourage continued consultation and engagement with commercial fishers within the International Council for the Exploration of the Seas (ICES) area IVc. The MMO recommends early engagement with National Federation of Fishermen's Organisations (NFFO) and local harbour authorities, including the early appointment of a Fisheries Liaison Officer. The MMO will maintain a watching brief on anything that may fall within the MMO's remit – such as DML conditions.	The Applicant is committed to ongoing consultation and engagement, including with the NFFO. Consultation and engagement outcomes are summarised in Chapter 14 Commercial Fisheries (document reference 6.1.14).

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard
177	Marine Management Organisation	P2_18	<p>The MMO defers to the Maritime and Coastguard Agency and Trinity House and relevant Harbour Authority's regarding the potential impacts on shipping and navigation that may occur because of the Projects.</p> <p>The MMO will maintain a watching brief on anything that may fall within the MMO's remit – such as DML conditions.</p>	The Applicant has noted this response.
178	Marine Management Organisation	P2_18	<p>The MMO defers to the Civil Aviation Authority and Ministry of Defence regarding the potential impacts on shipping and navigation that may occur because of the Projects.</p>	The Applicant has noted this response.
179	Marine Management Organisation	P2_18	<p>The MMO defers to the statutory advice provided by the Natural England or Local Planning Authority regarding the potential impacts to the seascape that may occur because of the Projects.</p> <p>The MMO will maintain a watching brief on anything that may fall within the MMO's remit – such as DML conditions.</p>	The Applicant has noted this response.
180	Marine Management Organisation	P2_18	<p>The MMO defers to the statutory advice provided by the relevant Statutory Nature Conservation Body's regarding the potential impacts to the protected features of the identified nature conservation areas that may occur because of the Projects.</p> <p>The MMO will maintain a watching brief on anything that may fall within the MMO's remit – such as DML conditions.</p>	The Applicant has noted this response.
181	Marine Management Organisation	P2_18	<p>The MMO welcomes this outline plan and will continue to engage on what is included within this document.</p>	The Applicant has noted this response.
182	Marine Management Organisation	P2_18	<p>The MMO welcomes this outline plan and will continue to engage on what is included within this document.</p>	The Applicant has noted this response.
183	Marine Management Organisation	P2_18	<p>The MMO welcomes this outline crossing schedule and will continue to engage on what is included within this document and any updates required.</p>	The Applicant has noted this response.
184	Marine Management Organisation	P2_18	<p>The MMO welcomes this outline plan and will continue to engage on what is included within this document.</p>	The Applicant has noted this response.
185	Marine Management Organisation	P2_18	<p>The MMO defers to Historic England regarding the potential impacts to offshore archaeology that may occur.</p> <p>The MMO will maintain a watching brief on anything that may fall within the MMO's remit – such as DML conditions.</p>	The Applicant has noted this response.
186	Marine Management Organisation	P2_18	<p>The MMO understands that Article 6 – Transfer of Benefit is drafted in a similar way to previous consents granted by the Secretary of State (SoS), however the MMO has major concerns over the wording Article 6(1)-(2) gives the right to permanently transfer the benefits of the DCO including the deemed marine licences (DML) in Schedule 11,12&amp; 13 to a third party with the consent of the SoS.</p> <p>Part 2: Article 6(1)-(2) “6.—(1) Subject to this article, the provisions of this Order have effect solely for the benefit of the undertaker.</p> <p>(2) Subject to paragraph (3), the undertaker may with the written consent of the Secretary of State— (a) transfer to another person (“the transferee”) any or all of the benefit of the provisions of this Order (including the deemed marine licences) and such related statutory rights as may be agreed between the undertaker and the transferee;”</p> <p>The MMO considers that this is a clear departure from the 2009 Act, which would normally</p>	<p>This is noted by the Applicant. The Applicant has considered the points raised by the MMO. This is a standard DCO provision that the MMO has not raised as a matter of concern on previous recent offshore wind projects and that has been accepted by the Secretary of State in numerous offshore wind DCOs to date.</p> <p>In the context of a DCO, it is considered appropriate that where consent is required under Article 6, that it is the Secretary of State that is required to provide it as there may be considerations that go beyond the DMLs (for example, interactions with articles, requirements or other Schedules which relate to offshore matters).</p> <p>The article includes an obligation on the Secretary of State to consult with the MMO before giving consent to a transfer or grant of the benefit of the provisions of any of the deemed marine licences and so the MMO will be involved in the process.</p>

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard
			<p>require the licence holder (here ‘the undertaker’) to make an application to the MMO for a licence to be transferred. Instead, this provision operates to make the decision that of the undertaker, with the Secretary of State (SoS) providing consent to the transfer, rather than the MMO as the regulatory authority for marine licences considering the merits of any application for a transfer.</p> <p>Parliament has already created a statutory regime for such a process and it is unclear what purpose the written consent of the SoS actually serves. If the intention is for the undertaker to be able to transfer the benefits under the terms of the DCO outside the established procedures under 2009 Act, the MMO queries why is it considered necessary or appropriate for the SoS to ‘approve’ the transfer of the DML.</p> <p>It is also unclear what criteria the SoS would be taking in determining whether to approve any transfer, and how this would differ from a consent granted by the MMO under the existing 2009 Act regime.</p> <p>Because of this confusion and potential duplication, it is the position of the MMO that these provisions are removed and that any transfer should be subject to the existing regime under the 2009 Act, with the decision maker remaining the MMO.</p> <p>24.4. This Article 6(2)(b) gives the right to temporarily transfer the benefits of the DCO (including DML) to a third party.</p> <p>Article 6(2)(b)  “6(2)(b) grant to another person (“the lessee”) for a period agreed between the undertaker and the lessee any or all of the benefit of the provisions of this Order (including the deemed marine licences) and such related statutory rights as may be so agreed, except where paragraph (6) applies, in which case the consent of the Secretary of State is not required.”  The MMO resists the inclusion of this article. Here the written consent of the SoS is not required. The MMO does not recognise that this would create a more streamlined system. Rather it simply operates to create an additional administrative procedure for marine licences (and one not envisaged by Parliament) and with no clarity in how it will operate.</p> <p>24.5. The MMO has concerns regarding Article 6(3)</p> <p>Article 6(3)  “6(3) The Secretary of State must consult the MMO before giving consent to the transfer or grant to another person of the benefit of any or all of the provisions of any of the deemed marine licences.”</p> <p>24.6. The MMO notes that there is no obligation for the SoS to take into account the views of the MMO when providing its consent. Furthermore, there is no obligation for the MMO to be informed of the decision of the SoS, notwithstanding its impact on the MMO as the licencing authority. From a regulatory perspective it is highly irregular that a decision to transfer a licence should not be the decision of the regulatory authority in that area (the MMO) but instead should be subject to such a cursory process as is set out in Article 6(1)-(3). The MMO thus resists this change as unworkable.</p> <p>As explained above, Articles 6 (1)-(3) sets out what is effectively a new non-legislative regime for the variation and transfers of marine licences. In support of these provisions, Article 6(12) explicitly disapplies sections 72(7) and (8) of the 2009 Act, which would otherwise govern these procedures.</p> <p>24.7. Article 6(12)  “(12) Section 72(7) and (8) of the 2009 Act do not apply to a transfer or grant of the whole or part of the benefit of the provisions of any of the deemed marine licences to another person by the undertaker pursuant to an agreement under this article 6 (benefit of the</p>	<p>The Applicant notes that during the SEP and DEP Examination where the MMO raised similar points, the Examining Authority commented that:  “The ExA finds it reasonable that where a transfer of a DML would be proposed, the SoS would be required to look at the proposed transfer in the context of all the provisions of the draft DCO, including some Articles and Requirements relating to offshore matters which overlap with the DMLs. In that context, the ExA finds it is reasonable that the SoS would have the ability to approve the transfer of a dML, in consultation with MMO.”</p> <p>The Applicant notes that given the regulatory context in which the offshore wind industry sits, for most transfers, paragraph (6) will apply (i.e. the transfer will be to a person who holds a licence under the Electricity Act 1989) and so consent of the Secretary of State will not be required. In such circumstances, the provisions of Article 6 are essential in facilitating the OFTO transfer process.</p>



Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard
			<p>Order) save that the MMO may amend any deemed marine licence granted under Schedule 11, Schedule 12 or Schedule 13 of the Order to correct the name of the undertaker to the name of a transferee or lessee under this article 6 (benefit of the Order).” This conflicts with the MMO’s stated position that the DML granted under a DCO should be regulated by the provisions of 2009 Act, and specifically by all provisions of section 72. 24.8. Section 72(7)(a) of 2009 Act permits a licence holder to make an application for a marine licence to be transferred, and where such an application is approved for the MMO to then vary the licence accordingly (s. 72(7)(b)). This power that should be retained and used in relation to the DML granted under the DCO and the MMO therefore resists the inclusion of this article 6(12) to disapply these provisions.</p> <p>24.9. The key concern held by the MMO is that Article 6 operates to override and/or unsatisfactorily duplicate provision that already exist within MCAA 2009 for dealing with variations to marine licences. Such provisions are also inconsistent with the PINS Guidance on how DMLs should operate within a DCO. Advice Note Eleven, Annex B – Marine Management Organisation   National Infrastructure Planning (<a href="https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/legislation-and-advice/advice-notes/an11-annex-b/">https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/legislation-and-advice/advice-notes/an11-annex-b/</a>) provides that where the undertaker choses to have a marine licence deemed by a DCO, the MMO, “will seek to ensure wherever possible that any deemed licence is generally consistent with those issued independently by the MMO.” Article 6 as drafted is not in compliance with this guidance.</p>	
187	Marine Management Organisation	P2_18	There is a typographical error “SAC”. The MMO advises this to be on a separate line.	The Applicant has noted this response and updated any typographical errors.
188	Marine Management Organisation	P2_18	<p>MMO Lowestoft            CEFAS Building            Pakefield Road            Lowestoft            NR33 0HT            Tel: 0208 026 6094</p> <p>The MMO advises that this address is checked with Natural England.</p>	The Applicant has noted this response.
189	Marine Management Organisation	P2_18	The coordinates are missing from this provision. The MMO presumes that these will be included in a later draft.	Coordinates are included within the draft DCO (and DMLs) submitted alongside the DCO application.
190	Marine Management Organisation	P2_18	Please see detailed comments above in relation to the disapplication of Section 72(7) and (8) 2009 Act. The MMO’s position is that Section 72 2009 Act should apply in its entirety.	The Applicant considers that the transfer of DMLs should be governed by the benefit of the order provision in the DCO and that this article is entirely appropriate and in accordance with DCO precedent. This specific paragraph is necessary to avoid any confusion or conflict in relation to the provisions will apply.
191	Marine Management Organisation	P2_18	MSL is not a defined term at Part 1 1(1). The MMO advises that this is defined.	This is noted by the Applicant. The Applicant does not consider it necessary to define MSL. The approach taken by the Applicant is consistent with other deemed marine licence granted under Section 149A of the Planning Act 2008.
192	Marine Management Organisation	P2_18	The MMO advises that “(“ should be deleted from the beginning of this provision.	The Applicant has noted this response and updated any typographical errors.
193	Marine Management Organisation	P2_18	The MMO recommends replacing “any subsequent amendments or revisions” with “variations” to reflect the language in MCAA 2009, on the basis that you can only vary a licence there is no provision for either amendment or revision.	The Applicant agrees and has updated the dMLs accordingly.

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard
194	Marine Management Organisation	P2_18	The MMO advises that a semi colon is required after “condition 16”.	This is noted by the Applicant.
195	Marine Management Organisation	P2_18	The MMO requests that the term “transport manager” is defined.	The Applicant has considered the use of the term “transport manager” and has updated it to “offshore operations manager” which is considered to be a more accurate description of the person referred to here. The offshore operations manager will be responsible for marine coordination and licensing activities on behalf of the undertaker. This reflects the approach taken in the recent Hornsea Four dMLs.
196	Marine Management Organisation	P2_18	Use of the term “MMO Coastal Office” – this office is referred to as the “Local office” in 1(4)(b) – the MMO recommends consistency of terms throughout the DCO.	The Applicant has updated the DCO (including dMLs) accordingly.
197	Marine Management Organisation	P2_18	The MMO requests that the term “offshore activities” is defined and for clarity on when the “commencement of offshore activities” is.	The Applicant considers that the term “offshore activities” is sufficiently clear and that it is not necessary for it to be defined. “Offshore activities” refers to activities carried out below MHWS and included within the scope of the dMLs. The term is used in almost all offshore wind dMLs to date and is not defined in any dMLs.
198	Marine Management Organisation	P2_18	The MMO advises that operative text should not be in brackets.	The Applicant notes that this is a standard condition that appears in numerous DCOs however the text has been updated in the draft DCO so that the time periods are no longer in brackets.
199	Marine Management Organisation	P2_18	The MMO notes that the term “working days” is only used in this provision (and the same provision in Schedule 12). To ensure consistency through the DCO the MMO request that the term “days” is used instead.	The Applicant has updated the DCO (including dMLs) accordingly.
200	Marine Management Organisation	P2_18	Use of the term “District Marine Office” is inconsistent with the term “local office” in 1(4)(b) and above at 7(6). This should be consistent throughout the DCO. The MMO advises that the phrase “(dependent on the size and nature of the material)” should be removed. The MMO recommends “reasonable” to be inserted before “endeavour” on the final line as “endeavour” alone is ambiguous. At the end of the line after “recover it” the MMO recommends “at their own expense” is inserted to provide clarity that any associated costs are for the undertaker.	The Applicant has updated the DCO (including dMLs) accordingly.
201	Marine Management Organisation	P2_18	There are recent examples of more detailed ‘dropped object’ provisions which the MMO recommends adopting – an example are the provisions in the Sizewell C DCO: - “29.—(1) The undertaker must report all dropped objects to the MMO using the dropped object procedure form as soon as reasonably practicable and in any event within 24 hours of becoming aware of an incident. (2) On receipt of the Dropped Object Procedure Form, the MMO may require, acting reasonably, the undertaker to carry out relevant surveys. The undertaker must carry out surveys in accordance with the MMO’s reasonable requirements and must report the results of such surveys to the MMO. (3) On receipt of such survey results, the MMO may, acting reasonably, require the undertaker to remove specific obstructions from the seabed. The undertaker must carry out removals of specific obstructions from the seabed in accordance with the MMO’s reasonable requirements and at its own expense.”	The Applicant has updated the DCO (including dMLs) accordingly.

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard
202	Marine Management Organisation	P2_18	<p>“2008 Act” means the Planning Act 2008 - The MMO advises that this definition needs to be included as is referenced later in 3 (below).</p> <p>“authorised scheme” - This is defined as meaning Works Nos. 1 to 9 and 11 described in paragraph 3 of Part 1 of this licence, however paragraph 3 does not contain Works No. 1 (it starts at 2). The MMO advises that Works No. 1 should be included here.</p>	The Applicant has updated the DCO (including dMLs) accordingly. The Applicant notes that Work No. 1 should not be included in the definition of “authorised scheme” in this DML.
203	Marine Management Organisation	P2_18	<p>The appropriate local office is MMO Lowestoft CEFAS Building Pakefield Road Lowestoft NR33 0HT Tel: 0208 026 6094 The MMO advises that this address is checked with Natural England.</p>	The Applicant has updated the DCO (including dMLs) accordingly.
204	Marine Management Organisation	P2_18	<p>Here there is reference to “Works Nos 1” which the MMO advises to be included. The MMO advises that reference to Works No. 12 is not included since there is none. See new definition above – the MMO recommends including reference to the Planning Act 2008.</p>	The Applicant notes that Work No. 1 should not be included in the definition of “authorised scheme” in this DML.
205	Marine Management Organisation	P2_18	<p>The MMO considers that the definition for ‘other chemicals’ is extremely broad and query whether there is any mechanism whereby these can be restricted or controlled.</p>	This Applicant does not consider this necessary. This is standard text used in all recent offshore wind DMLs. The chemicals that can be used are controlled through condition 11 of the DML and therefore ODOW do not consider it to be necessary for any further restrictions or controls.
206	Marine Management Organisation	P2_18	<p>The coordinates are missing from this provision – the MMO presumes that these will be included in a later draft.</p>	The Applicant has noted this comment. The draft DCO has been updated accordingly.
207	Marine Management Organisation	P2_18	<p>Please see detailed comments above in relation to the disapplication of Section 72(7) and (8) 2009 Act. The MMO’s position is that Section 72 2009 Act should apply in its entirety.</p>	The Applicant considers that the transfer of DMLs should be governed by the benefit of the order provision in the DCO and that this article is entirely appropriate and in accordance with DCO precedent. This specific paragraph is necessary to avoid any confusion or conflict in relation to the provisions will apply.
208	Marine Management Organisation	P2_18	<p>There is a reference to Work No. 1(b) here which the MMO advise needs to be added or the reference removed.</p>	The Applicant has noted this comment and the draft DCO has been updated accordingly.
209	Marine Management Organisation	P2_18	<p>The MMO recommend replacing “any subsequent amendments or revisions” with “variations” to reflect the language in 2009 Act, on the basis that you can only vary a licence there is no provision for either amendment or revision. The MMO advises that a semi colon is required after “condition 16”. The MMO requests that the term “transport manager” is defined.</p>	The Applicant has noted this comment and the draft DCO has been updated accordingly.
210	Marine Management Organisation	P2_18	<p>Use of the term “MMO Coastal Office” – this office is referred to as the “local office” in 1(4)(b) – the MMO advises consistency of terms throughout the DCO.</p>	The Applicant has noted this comment and the draft DCO has been updated accordingly.
211	Marine Management Organisation	P2_18	<p>The MMO requests that the term “offshore activities” is defined and for clarity on when the “commencement of offshore activities” is. 7(8) links notice to mariners to “commencement of the licensed activities” – could this be adopted for 7(7)?</p>	The Applicant considers that the term “offshore activities” is sufficiently clear and that it is not necessary for it to be defined. “Offshore activities” refers to activities carried out below MHWS and included within the scope of the DMLs. The term is used in almost all offshore wind DMLs to date and is not defined in any.
212	Marine Management Organisation	P2_18	<p>The term “planned operations and maintenance works” has been used. It is unclear if these are different works or could also be covered by ‘licenced activities’ definition19. The MMO</p>	The Applicant has noted this response. The Applicant considers that it is clear what is meant by “planned operations and maintenance works” in this context and note that this is standard text

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard
			requests that this is clarified.	found in numerous recent offshore wind DMLs. The Applicant does not consider that any amendment to this provision is required.
213	Marine Management Organisation	P2_18	The MMO advises that operative text should not be in brackets.	The Applicant notes that this is a standard condition that appears in numerous DCOs however the text has been updated in the draft DCO so that the time periods are no longer in brackets.
214	Marine Management Organisation	P2_18	The MMO notes that the term “working days” is only used in this provision (and the same provision in Schedule 11). To ensure consistency through the DCO the MMO requests that the term “days” is used instead.	The Applicant has noted this comment and the draft DCO has been updated accordingly.
215	Marine Management Organisation	P2_18	<p>Use of the term “District Marine Office” is inconsistent with the term “local office” in 1(4)(b) and above at 7(6). This should be consistent throughout the DCO.</p> <p>The phrase “(dependent on the size and nature of the material)” should be removed – it is not appropriate to limit the MMO’s decision making on this issue. The MMO recommends “reasonable” to be inserted before “endeavour” on the final line as “endeavour” alone has no clear legal meaning. At the end of the line after “recover it” insert “at their own expense” to provide clarity that any associated costs are for the undertaker.</p> <p>There are recent examples of more detailed ‘dropped object’ provision which the MMO recommends adopting – an example are the provisions in the Sizewell C DCO: -</p> <p>“29.—(1) The undertaker must report all dropped objects to the MMO using the dropped object procedure form as soon as reasonably practicable and in any event within 24 hours of becoming aware of an incident.</p> <p>(2) On receipt of the Dropped Object Procedure Form, the MMO may require, acting reasonably, the undertaker to carry out relevant surveys. The undertaker must carry out surveys in accordance with the MMO’s reasonable requirements and must report the results of such surveys to the MMO.</p> <p>(3) On receipt of such survey results, the MMO may, acting reasonably, require the undertaker to remove specific obstructions from the seabed. The undertaker must carry out removals of specific obstructions from the seabed in accordance with the MMO’s reasonable requirements and at its own expense.”</p>	<p>The Applicant has noted this comment. The terminology ‘local office’ as defined has been used throughout the drafting.</p> <p>The Applicant notes this is a standard condition and drafting appears in all recent offshore wind DMLs. The Applicant therefore does not consider it necessary to amend the level of detail set out within the condition.</p>
216	Marine Management Organisation	P2_18	There is no definition of ‘Annex 1 reef habitats’ in the DML. The MMO recommends that this is included.	The Applicant has noted this comment and the draft DCO has been updated accordingly.
217	Marine Management Organisation	P2_18	The MMO notes that ‘Marine Noise Registry’ and ‘Forward Look’ and ‘Close Out’ are defined at the end of this condition. For consistency, the MMO recommends that these definitions are added to the other definitions.	This Applicant notes that where a specific term is used in only one provision of the DCO it is usual practice to define the term in that one provision rather than in the interpretation section at the start. This is a standard condition which has been included in numerous DCOs to date. The Applicant consider that its interpretation is made easier by having the definitions within the condition.
218	Marine Management Organisation	P2_18	The MMO has noted that there is a proposed additional DML on artificial nesting structures. The MMO will be happy to review this, once completed, at a later stage if required.	The Applicant has noted this response.
219	Maritime & Coastguard Agency	P2_19	A full marine traffic survey of 28 days duration has been undertaken as per MGN 654 requirements for winter and summer 2022 for the shipping and navigation study area. We note regarding the Offshore Reactive Compensation Platform (ORCP) search area that a 14 day winter survey has been completed. Table 5.1 states a second 14-day vessel traffic survey of the ORCP search area is planned post PEIR to bring the total up to 28 days, and this is stated again in paragraph 285. It is also noted that the Export Cable Corridor (ECC) traffic survey is based on AIS data only. We expect the NRA to be updated with the additional summer traffic data regarding the ORCP. The MCA will provide further comments once this	<p>The Applicant has updated the NRA with the additional ORCP survey data, bringing the total up to 28 days of MGN 654 compliant data for both the array and ORCP.</p> <p>The Applicant has continued to engagement with the MCA, Trinity House, Chamber of Shipping and other relevant stakeholders. This included holding a second hazard workshop on 23<sup>rd</sup> November 2023.</p> <p>The Applicant has undertaken future case in line with what was detailed at PEIR.</p>



Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard
			<p>is completed.</p> <p>The addition of 12 months AIS data (April 2021 – March 2022) and Anatec’s ship route database is noted and will be useful in further informing the traffic analysis. The MCA also welcome the inclusion of commercial route identification and predicted displacements of these routes post windfarm in Sections 10 and 13. It is noted however that the future traffic case will be incorporated into the NRA post PEIR. As stated in paragraph 385: “The final NRA will additionally consider future case traffic growth scenarios within the modelling processes. The scenarios considered will include cases of 10% and 20% commercial traffic increases.”</p> <p>The level of engagement with stakeholders to date is encouraging and the MCA expects this to continue. Navigation safety concerns raised during stakeholder consultations as summarised in chapter 4, will require continued comprehensive consultation as the project progresses.</p>	
220	Maritime & Coastguard Agency	P2_19	<p>We appreciate that the layout as presented currently is indicative of a ‘worst case’ as described in table 6.5 of the NRA. The turbine layout design will require MCA agreement prior to construction to minimise the risks to surface vessels, including rescue boats, and Search and Rescue aircraft operating within the site. As such, MCA will seek to ensure all structures are aligned in straight rows and columns, including any platforms. Any additional navigation safety and/or Search and Rescue requirements, as per MGN 654 Annex 5, will be agreed at the approval stage.</p>	<p>The Applicant has noted this response. The Applicant will continue to engage with MCA and will agree the layout with MCA and Trinity House. The layout of turbines will also require approval by the MMO under the conditions set out in the DMLs.</p>
221	Maritime & Coastguard Agency	P2_19	<p>Section 14 gives a cumulative overview with the inclusion of 6 developments in addition to the baseline case as presented in table 14.1. Section 18 expands on this and presents a Cumulative Risk Assessment. 5 scenarios are considered covering the main identified Hazards. The MCA welcome this approach and note that under keel clearance and subsea cable interaction have been screened out of the cumulative assessment “given they are localised to the area around individual cables.” We would expect that these localised hazards are also risk assessed in due course.</p>	<p>The Applicant has noted this response.</p>
222	Maritime & Coastguard Agency	P2_19	<p>Various stakeholders have raised concerns with other project interactions in the area. Of note are Hornsea Three due its potential impact with the Immingham to Cuxhaven route (Route 7, Figure 10.2) the loss of the optional shallow track post construction with current boundaries (Route 9, Figure 10.2) east of the Outer Dowsing Shoal and the Dudgeon North extension with its protentional ‘line up’ with the western extent of the current Outer Dowsing array area as presented.</p>	<p>The Applicant has noted this response and has engaged with the owners and operators of other offshore infrastructure in the vicinity as outlined in the Consultation Report. The Applicant has also amended the boundaries of the array area to reduce potential impacts in this regard, as set out in Chapter 4 Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference 6.1.4).</p>
223	Maritime & Coastguard Agency	P2_19	<p>PEIR Chapter 1 paragraph 1.1.32, Chapter 15 Paragraph 15.5.2, and Paragraph 587 of the NRA state it is intended that a reduction of the array boundary from 500km2 to 300km2 will be presented for DCO Application. We understand that the cumulative impacts will be re-assessed post PEIR, where we will provide further comments following an additional assessment of the updated NRA.</p> <p>Considering the intended array boundary change, Para 588 asks: “Do you have any feedback on the array area boundaries from a shipping and navigation perspective?” An initial preference would be for a reduction to the western boundary to the extent that the optional shallow route (route 9, Figure 10.2) would remain viable and the lining up of the potential western edge of Dudgeon North Extension and the Outer Dowsing array area is avoided. A reduction to this western boundary would also increase the safety clearance of the traffic using the Outer Dowsing Channel.</p>	<p>The Applicant has considered this response and has reduced the western and northern boundary of the array area as detailed in Chapter 4 Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference 6.1.4). Further detail is also presented in Appendix 15.1 Navigational Risk Assessment (document reference 6.3.15.1).</p>
224	Maritime & Coastguard Agency	P2_19	<p>MGN 654 requires that hydrographic surveys should fulfil the requirements of the International Hydrographic Organisation (IHO) Order 1a standard, with the final data supplied as a digital full density data set, and survey report to the MCA Hydrography</p>	<p>This is noted by the Applicant. The requirement to undertaken surveys to IHO Order 1a standard and compliance with MGN 654 and its annexes is secured within the draft DCO.</p>

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard
			Manager and the UKHO. Further information can be found in MGN 654 Annex 4 supporting document titled 'Hydrographic Guidelines for Offshore Developers', available on our website: <a href="https://www.gov.uk/guidance/offshorerenewable-energy-installations-impact-on-shipping">https://www.gov.uk/guidance/offshorerenewable-energy-installations-impact-on-shipping</a> . This includes surveys during the pre-construction, post-construction and post-decommissioning stages.	
225	Maritime & Coastguard Agency	P2_19	It is noted that in 6.1, Non-Technical Summary paragraph 3.1.18 that the project has confirmed that only a single transmission technology type - High Voltage Alternating Current (HVAC) transmission technology will be used. Particular attention should be paid to cabling routes and where appropriate burial depth for which a Burial Protection Index study should be completed and, subject to the traffic volumes, an anchor penetration study may be necessary. It is noted that the CBRA and CSIP will be carried out to inform this. If cable protection measures are required e.g. rock bags or concrete mattresses, the MCA would be willing to accept a 5% reduction in surrounding depths referenced to Chart Datum. This will be particularly relevant where depths are decreasing towards shore and potential impacts on navigable water increase, such as at the HDD location.	This is noted by the Applicant. As set out in Chapter 15 Shipping and Navigation (document reference 6.1.15) the Applicant will engage with the MCA and Trinity House in any instances where water depths are likely to be reduced by more than 5% as a result of cable protection to determine whether additional mitigation is necessary to ensure the safety of passing vessels and compliance with MGN 654.
226	Maritime & Coastguard Agency	P2_19	Safety zones during the construction, maintenance and decommissioning phases as described in para 15.7.32 in the Shipping and Navigation chapter and paragraph 419 of the NRA (summarised with in embedded mitigation, Table 16.1) are supported. However, it should be noted that operational safety zones may have a maximum 50m radius from the individual turbines. A detailed justification would be required for a 50m operational safety zone, with significant evidence from the construction phase in addition to the baseline NRA required supporting the case.	The Applicant has noted this response. The Applicant has provided a Safety Zone Statement (document reference 9.3) alongside the application which sets out the Applicant's intention in relation to applications for Safety Zones. The Applicant does not intend to apply for a 50m operational safety zone.
227	Maritime & Coastguard Agency	P2_19	An Emergency Response Cooperation Plan (ERCoP) is required to meet the requirements of MGN 654 Annex 5 and will need to be in place prior to construction. The ERCoP is an active operational document and must remain current at all stages of the project including during construction, operations & maintenance and decommissioning. A SAR checklist will be discussed as the project progresses to track all requirements detailed in MGN 654 Annex 5.	The Applicant will agree an Emergency Response and Cooperation Plan (ERCoP) with the MCA to ensure appropriate procedures are in place in the event of an emergency incident. A SAR Checklist will also be agreed to ensure any SAR mitigations required by the MCA are implemented for the Project. This requirement is included within the draft DCO.
228	Maritime & Coastguard Agency	P2_19	Chapter 21.8, paragraph 586 lists next steps identified in order to present the final NRA to which the MCA agree. To reiterate we expect continued, comprehensive engagement with stakeholders as the project progresses as concerns on cumulative effects on established routes and proximately to active oil and gas/aggregate operations have been raised. In this regard, we look forward to the promulgation of information on the intended reduced array area boundary for further comment. We believe this response addresses the questions relevant to the MCA in paragraph 588. The comments detailed above are considered appropriate and necessary for the safety of navigation and Search and Rescue purposes. We hope you find them useful at this stage and MCA are happy to discuss further as the project progresses. We are content at this stage with regards to the process you have undertaken to comply with MGN 654 and its annexes, and we welcome the work undertaken for addressing the guidance and recommendations so far.	The Applicant welcomes further engagement with the MCA and has continued to engage with the MCA as set out in the Consultation Report (document reference 5.1) and where relevant, Chapter 15 Shipping and Navigation (document reference 6.1.15).
229	MOD	P2_20	Unexploded Ordnance (UXO) The potential for unexploded ordnance (UXO) to be present within the study area and the necessity for clearance is acknowledged within the Project Description at paragraphs 3.6.73 to 3.6.75. The potential presence of UXO and disposal sites should be a consideration during the installation and decommissioning of turbines, cables, and any other infrastructure, or where other intrusive works are necessary.	The Applicant has noted this response.
230	MOD	P2_20	The applicant should be advised to take account of the current published MOD Practice and Exercise Areas (PEXA) in preparation of their development proposal. The MOD has highly surveyed routes in the locality which may be relevant to the installation of the array & associated infrastructure. Preparation of any cable route undertaken will need to be	The Applicant has noted this response. The Applicant notes that the ECC is now outside the Air Weapons Ranges.

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard
			compatible with the operation of the Air Weapon Ranges. The MOD would need to be consulted at the next stage of this application when further information in respect of the agreed export cable route is available.	
231	NATS	P2_24	Predicted Impact on Claxby RADAR: the terrain screening available will not adequately attenuate the signal, and therefore this development is likely to cause false primary plots to be generated. A reduction in the RADAR's probability of detection, for real aircraft, is also anticipated.	The Applicant has noted this response. Potential impacts on Claxby RADAR are presented in Chapter 16 Aviation, Radar, Military and Communication (document reference 6.1.16).
232	NATS	P2_24	Predicted Impact on Cromer RADAR: the terrain screening available will not adequately attenuate the signal, and therefore this development is likely to cause false primary plots to be generated. A reduction in the RADAR's probability of detection, for real aircraft, is also anticipated.	The Applicant has noted this response. Potential impacts on Cromer RADAR are presented in Chapter 16 Aviation, Radar, Military and Communication (document reference 6.1.16).
233	NATS	P2_24	Where an assessment reveals a technical impact on a specific NATS' RADAR, the users of that RADAR are consulted to ascertain whether the anticipated impact is acceptable to their operations or not.	The Applicant has noted this comment.
234	NATS	P2_24	Predicted Impact on Navigation Aids No impact is anticipated on NATS' navigation aids.	The Applicant has noted this comment.
235	NATS	P2_24	Predicted Impact on the Radio Communications Infrastructure No impact is anticipated on NATS' radio communications infrastructure.	The Applicant has noted this comment.
236	Natural England	P2_25	Potential cable protection measures in shallow/nearshore areas could modify waves and flows and in turn interrupt sediment transport pathways.	An assessment of potential impacts of cable protection measures on coastal receptors, including sediment transport pathways, is provided in Chapter 7 Marine Physical Processes (document reference 6.1.7). Details will be confirmed as part of the Cable Specification and Installation Plan (CSIP), which will follow the principles of the Outline CSIP (document reference 8.5). Details of embedded mitigation measures are provided in Chapter 7 Marine Physical Processes.
237	Natural England	P2_25	Natural England advises that the ES is updated to include relevant data and address ambiguity. Natural England notes that further evidence and clarification is required before Natural England can provide further advice on the significance of predicted impacts and proposed mitigation measures to address them.	Evidence and data provided within Chapter 6.1.7 as well as document reference 6.3.7.1, have been reviewed and updated where necessary.
238	Natural England	P2_25	Rationale behind Worst Case Scenario (WCS) is not always clear. Provide clarification and/or rationale for all WCS.	All project details presented in Chapter 3, Project Description and Chapter 7 Marine Physical Processes have been reviewed and updated where required with further details provided regarding the rationale.
239	Natural England	P2_25	MDS foundation structure dimensions have not been provided. Include MDS parameters for foundation structures.	All project details presented in Chapter 3, Project Description and Chapter 7 Marine Physical Processes have been reviewed and updated where required with further details provided regarding the rationale.
240	Natural England	P2_25	The rationale for spoil/drill volume for foundation installation is not clear. Provide rationale for foundation installation spoil/drill volumes i.e. breakdown of calculations.	All project details presented in Chapter 3, Project Description and Chapter 7 Marine Physical Processes have been reviewed and updated where required with further details provided regarding the rationale.
241	Natural England	P2_25	Include up to date project/designated site/location specific data in the ES. We note for several aspects of the baseline, data sources are considered old and more up to date data should be used, for example, the project specific geophysical and benthic surveys. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Holocene sediment layer thickness across the export cable corridor (ECC) has been obtained from Dove et al. (2017) and Tappin et al. (2011 Beach recharge material analysis results have been based on Blott and Pye (2004).</li> <li>• The bedload transport pathways are assessed using Kenyon and Cooper (2005).</li> <li>• Coastal erosion rate (HADA, 2012a and TKOWFL, 2015).</li> <li>• Characterisation of the coastal frontage (HADA, 2012a).</li> <li>• Three years of beach profile data provided (EA, 2011, 2013a).</li> </ul>	Further data has been provided as part of Chapter 7 Marine Physical Processes and Appendix 1 Physical Processes Technical Baseline. This includes data from the Project-specific geophysical surveys, including along the Offshore ECC. Updated characterisation of the coastal frontage, including an assessment of change between 2016 and 2020, has now been provided. The Applicant has undertaken to search for more recent reports, however, notes that several of the listed sources are the most up to date available in the public domain for specific aspects, or are otherwise considered to give an appropriate characterisation given the nature of the processes in question (e.g. Kenyon and Cooper, 2005). The Applicant further notes that these publicly available datasets are complemented by the site-specific surveys



Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard
242	Natural England	P2_25	Please provide documents. We note that in Appendix E (Particle Size Distribution), PSA documents have been embedded in Appendix 9.2 (Benthic Ecology) Technical Report (ECC), but we have not been able to open them.	Appendix E (PSA Documents) have been provided as part of the Benthic Ecology Technical Report for the Array and ECC.
243	Natural England	P2_25	We note that metocean measurements are being collected within the array area, including the use of a floating lidar system and Seaguard Seabed Frame. Will the latter also include turbidity/SSC measurements? Please clarify.	The Applicant can confirm that Project-specific turbidity measurements were collected as part of the Project campaign. A summary of this turbidity data is provided in the Physical Processes Technical Baseline
244	Natural England	P2_25	The numerical hydrodynamic and wave modelling show good levels of fit, with the exception of the inshore Race Bank model data which overpredicts current speeds. Are there any other data that could be used to validate the inshore data? We also note that only one wave direction (NE) has been modelled. This correlates with prevailing wave conditions along the western part of the ECC and closer to the shore. How will the modelling take account of different prevailing wave directions across the study area? Please clarify.	The Project notes that, based on the categories used in Pye <i>et al.</i> (2017), the calibration and validation of the numerical model provides an 'excellent fit'. Updated numerical modelling has been undertaken, including the northern and north-eastern wave directions as identified as those of relevance to the identified Marine Physical Processes receptors.
245	Natural England	P2_25	We note that Project's site-specific measurements of current and water level used to calibrate and validate the hydrodynamic model, cover the period 17 April 2022 to 04 August 2022. We note that Section 7.3.4 (Chapter 7) refers to the Seawatch Wind Lidar Buoy (SWLB) but not the Seaguard Seabed Frame (Table 4.1, Appendix 7.2). We also note that in Section 7.3.4, it states that monthly datasets are available from April 2022-November 2022, and further data will be submitted as part of the ES. Please clarify.	The Applicant can confirm that site-specific measurements have been collected in order to calibrate the numerical modelling and provide a baseline characterisation of the site. Metocean measurements have continued to be collected past the commencement of modelling, and a summary of these datasets is provided as part of the baseline characterisation in the Physical Processes Technical Baseline.
246	Natural England	P2_25	Tidal ellipse excursions across the study area have not been provided. Provide a map showing the tidal ellipse excursion across the study area.	Tidal Ellipses are provided in Figure 7.4
247	Natural England	P2_25	The Cable Burial Risk Assessment (CBRA) refers to 'Outer Dowsing Offshore Windfarm Seabed Mobility Study' (East Point Geo., 2023). This may be useful for understanding seabed mobility across the ECC that overlaps Annex I sandbanks. Can this report be shared please?	Relevant output from the 'Outer Dowsing Offshore Windfarm Seabed Mobility Study' (East Point Geo., 2023) has been provided within the Physical Processes Technical Baseline as part of the characterisation of the baseline environment. Annexes A and B have been provided as part of the Physical Processes Modelling Report.
248	Natural England	P2_25	Annexes A and B are referenced in Appendix 7.2: Marine Physical Processes Modelling Report, but have not been included. These relate to determination of Marine Processes Realistic WCS and assessment of spoil mounds. Please provide Annexes A and B.	Annexes A and B have been provided as part of document reference 6.3.7.2.
249	Natural England	P2_25	We advise that there are a number of other marine process receptors which should be considered. These include offshore sandbanks not located within a designated site, The Wash, North Norfolk Coast (including relevant nationally or internationally important sites) and the sand dunes backing Wolla Bank Beach. The Wash and North Norfolk Coast could be affected by modifications to sandbank systems offshore due to the project alone and in combination with other projects/plans. Furthermore, the dunes backing the beach at landfall (Wolla Bank) are key morphological features that play a significant role in natural coastal defence at the shoreline and have important environmental and often geoscience value. We advise the following receptors should be included for consideration in the EIA: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Offshore sandbanks</li> <li>• The Wash (and associated designated sites)</li> <li>• North Norfolk Coast (and associated designated sites)</li> <li>• Wolla Bank Beach dunes</li> </ul>	Consideration of the relevant receptors is provided within this chapter. Offshore sandbanks not located within a designated site, and the Wolla Bank beach dunes have been included as receptors within the relevant impact pathways. The Marine Physical Processes study area is based on the Zone of Influence (Zoi), derived from the numerical modelling of sediment plumes and tidal flows. Based on this approach, the Applicant does not consider that an inclusion of The Wash and the North Norfolk Coast as receptors is appropriate and in-keeping with best practice, given their location out with the Zoi.
250	Natural England	P2_25	The significance of effect for multiple impacts have been combined. For example, Construction Impact 2: Potential impacts to seabed morphology. This assessment considers separately the potential for impacts associated with five different activities. However, the magnitude of impacts, sensitivity of receptors, and significance of effect have been combined for all impacts. Furthermore, the magnitude of each impact assessed will differ, as will the receptors and, in turn, the significance of effect will vary too. We advise that each impact should be assessed separately and its effect significance determined separately too.	This approach has been taken in order to reduce the need for repetition within the assessment, as the same evidence and argument have been considered appropriate for multiple activities. While the Applicant acknowledges that impact magnitude, receptor sensitivity, and effect significance will differ for different activities, the worst case scenario for effect significance has been considered for all receptors.



Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard
251	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Remedial and maintenance activities relevant to operations that cause additional impacts to the marine physical environment during the operational lifetime of the project can include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cable repair and replacement</li> <li>• Cable remedial burial</li> <li>• Maintenance of external cable protection</li> <li>• New external cable protection.</li> </ul> <p>These impacts should be considered and assessed in the EIA. Where MPAs are likely to be affected, the WCS for each MPA needs to be established (extent of impact, frequency, maximum number of events etc). Similarly, affected features, pressures and sensitivity should be identified and the WCS of impact assessed.</p>	<p>Remedial and maintenance activities during the operational lifetime of the Project are short-lived in both duration and extent when compared to construction activities, and as such are not considered to represent the worst-case scenario as outlined in Chapter 7 Marine Physical Processes (6.1.7). Therefore in line with best practice, they have not been assessed as a separate impact within this chapter, but instead are considered to be fully encapsulated within the conclusions of impact magnitude, receptor sensitivity, and significance of effect as presented within the assessment of construction activities.</p>
252	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Impacts on coastal processes and geomorphology above MHWS have been scoped out. However, the beach at Wolla Bank is backed by sand dunes and the beach subject to erosion. We advise that this impact should remain scoped into the EIA until it can be demonstrated that morphological change along the coastal frontage is unlikely. This should be based on analysis of recent data on dune frontage and beach profile change.</p>	<p>Potential impacts on coastal behaviour at the landfall site, including below MHWS and certain features above MHWS (specifically dune features behind the landfall beach), have been assessed in Chapter 7 Marine Physical Processes. This assessment is based on analysis of coastal change between 2016 and 2020, as provided within the Physical Processes Technical Baseline.</p>
253	Natural England	P2_25	<p>For foundation installation, it states that site preparation for monopiles and piled jacket foundation types, is usually minimal. Seabed preparation may include levelling, dredging, removing surface and subsurface debris, boulder clearance etc. How would minimal be described or evaluated here? Please clarify and provide a WCS for boulder clearance for foundation installation. Please also consider whether impacts arising from UXO clearance/detonation should be considered. If so then please support judgements with empirical data gathered from other OWF developments</p>	<p>The MDS for seabed preparation prior to foundation installation has been updated where necessary and is provided within Chapter 7 Marine Physical Processes</p> <p>As the Applicant does not currently intend to licence UXO clearance in the DCO, an assessment of the potential impacts has not been provided. The Applicant will apply to the MMO separately in due course for a marine licence for any necessary UXO investigation and clearance works, who will be able to impose necessary conditions at that time.</p>
254	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Boulders greater than 0.3m in any dimension, which are located within the footprint of any infrastructure, may necessitate removal. Where would the boulders be removed to? Will boulders be relocated close to their source location? Please clarify.</p>	<p>Details of proposed boulder clearance are included as part of the CSIP, which will follow the principles of the Outline CSIP (document reference 8.5). The Applicant can confirm that boulders will be relocated in close proximity to their original location.</p>
255	Natural England	P2_25	<p>The WCS for boulder clearance is currently 100%, owing to the lack of high resolution geotechnical / geophysical information. It is stated that geophysical surveys will be undertaken within the Project array and offshore export cable corridor (OECC) and used to inform boulder clearance requirements. Will these data be included in the ES? Refine maximum design scenario (MDS) for boulder clearance when high resolution geophysical / geotechnical data are available and identify any areas of MPA affected. Include in ES, if available.</p> <p>Following refinement of the boulder clearance MDS, areas of MPA affected should be identified, including extent and location. Affected features, pressures and sensitivity should also be identified as a result of changes to physical processes.</p>	<p>Details of proposed boulder clearance are included as part of the CSIP, which will follow the principles of the Outline CSIP (document reference 8.5).</p>
256	Natural England	P2_25	<p>The rationale for MDS sandwave clearance is unclear. The anticipated depth of sandwave crest lowering / levelling has also not been included. Table 3.24 includes sandwave clearance for export cables within array area and also along the OECC. Please clarify within a project specific sandwave levelling assessment, for example that undertaken for Norfolk Boreas.</p>	<p>All project details presented in Chapter 3: Project Description (document reference 6.1.3) and Chapter 7 Marine Physical Processes (document reference 6.1.7) have been reviewed and updated where required. This includes the MDS for sandwave clearance/levelling, with details provided of the volumes within the IDRBNR SAC. An assessment of the potential impacts of sandwave levelling is provided in Chapter 7 Marine Physical Processes (document reference 6.1.7). Further evidence will be provided as part of a separate Project-specific Sandwave Levelling Assessment that will be submitted into the Examination.</p>
257	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Beach access may be required for emergency access and some improvement works to the access points may also be necessary. It is not yet known if this feature will be located below MHWS or the duration that it will be in place. A more detailed plan of landfall construction methodology will be defined and any refinement to the Project Description assessed in the ES. We look forward to reviewing the updated information in the ES. Any potential impacts on coastal processes and morphology to be identified and assessed in the ES.</p>	<p>Potential impacts on coastal behaviour at the landfall site, including below MHWS and certain features above MHWS, (specifically dune features behind the landfall), have been assessed in Chapter 7 Marine Physical Processes (document reference 6.1.7).</p>
258	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Preferred shoreline management strategy over the next 100 years is to implement a combination of rock structures and beach nourishment. This will be a phased approach with</p>	<p>Information is not currently available on the location or form of the hard structures proposed along this area of coastline. The Applicant will liaise with the Environment Agency where</p>

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard
			beach nourishment continuing until 2024 in its current form, and then structures are to be implemented between 2025-2030. Need to consider buried asset integrity and the feasibility of HDD/trenchless techniques in the presence of hard structures at the coast.	appropriate post-application and prior to construction. The Project has already committed to a subtidal HDD exit pit, which will inherently reduce the likelihood for any interaction with hard structures established at the landfall for shoreline management purposes.
259	Natural England	P2_25	It is not stated whether there may be a requirement for temporary cofferdams at the HDD exit pits. However, if used, they may lead to local blockage effects in the landfall area, interrupting local flows and waves which may lead to scouring around their base, subject to the erodibility of the seabed. If cofferdams are closely spaced, this may also lead to interaction of wakes and group scour development. If cofferdams are to be used, consider potential impacts to local flows, waves and sediment transport processes. Consider potential for scouring around bases too. If necessary, include cofferdams in the MDS assessment for Impact 3.	Cofferdams at the landfall are not part of the Project design, as indicated in Chapter 3 Project Description (document reference 6.1.3).
260	Natural England	P2_25	Embedded Mitigation We note that permanent rock protection will not be installed in the intertidal, and any rock protection in the subtidal will not exceed LAT. However, rock protection in the shallow nearshore zone, could modify the nearshore hydrodynamic regime and affect the sediment transport regime. We advise that rock protection should be avoided in shallow nearshore water where it could interrupt sediment transport paths.	An assessment of potential impacts of cable protection measures on coastal receptors, including sediment transport pathways, is provided in Chapter 7 Marine Physical Processes (document reference 6.1.7). Details will be confirmed as part of the CSIP, which will follow the principles of the outline CSIP (document reference 8.5). Details of embedded mitigation measures are provided in Chapter 7. The Project has committed to the HDD exit pit being located in the subtidal zone, designed to be 500m seaward from MLWS, therefore inherently reducing the need for cable protection in the shallow nearshore.
261	Natural England	P2_25	Approx 4 million cubic metres of sediment are likely to be removed through seabed levelling within the array area, which is characterised by a number of ecologically and morphologically important sandbank-channel systems. We are concerned that substantial sediment removal through sandwave levelling / lowering could affect the form and function of the sandbank systems. We need to better understand sandwave (and sandbank) morphology, migration rates and patterns of change. We advise considering micro-siting and / or avoiding siting GBS foundations on important sandbanks / sandwave systems to minimise impacts. Undertake sandwave migration analysis to establish recoverability of sandwaves within the array.	All project details presented in Chapter 3 Project Description and Chapter 7 Marine Physical Processes have been reviewed and updated where required. This includes the MDS for sandwave clearance/levelling, with details provided of the volumes assessed within the IDRBNR SAC. An assessment of the potential impacts of sandwave levelling is provided in Chapter .
262	Natural England	P2_25	Based on post-construction monitoring results from Lincs, Lynn and Inner Dowsing OWFs, we are concerned that drill arising mounds could not only persist longer than anticipated, but also spread out laterally, reduce in height slowly, and alter the sediment distribution and benthic communities across the array area. We would advise monitoring to determine the nature of the mounds, rate of change, and requirements for potential mitigation actions. Potential impacts on the hydrodynamic and wave regimes should also be considered where mounds may be located in shallow water.	Post-construction monitoring results from the Lynn and Inner Dowsing OWFs have been considered within the assessment in Chapter 7 Marine Physical Processes. These results indicate that after four months, mounds had been reduced from 3m from 1.2m due to natural processes, although some remained discernible (approximately 1.0m above the seabed) for more than four years after disposal. Drill arising mounds will form discrete, highly localised features, with a change in potential topography comparable to the presence of scour protection in size. They are not considered to exceed any potential impacts to the hydrodynamic and wave regimes caused by MDS as defined in Chapter 7 and therefore have not been assessed.  On the basis of the highly localised nature of these mounds, monitoring has not been considered necessary.
263	Natural England	P2_25	Conservation advice for Inner Dowsing, Race Bank and North Ridge SAC (IDRBNR SAC) identifies features / subfeatures that are sensitive to heavy deposition. Moreover, the offshore sandbanks located within the ODOW array provide important nursery and spawning grounds for commercially important fish species such as herring, which could be affected (at the larval stage) by smothering due to heavy sediment deposition. The array sandbanks are, therefore, supporting habitats which could be affected by construction-related changes to bed level. Therefore, we do not agree that the magnitude of impact is low, or that all marine process receptors are insensitive to this impact. We advise that the magnitude of impact is not low and not all marine processes receptors are insensitive to bed level changes.	Offshore sandbanks are considered within this chapter with respect to their form and function and their influence on the physical environment, with consideration of habitat suitability, including designated features/subfeatures, provided in Chapter 9 Benthic and Intertidal Ecology and Chapter 10 Fish and Shellfish Ecology. Potential inter-relationships relevant to the assessment of Marine Physical Processes are presented in Chapter 7 Marine and Physical Processes. Consideration of spawning habitat suitability for commercially important fish species provided in Chapter 10. The reasoning for the definition of the magnitude and sensitivity of the sandbanks for the purposes of the assessment is outlined in Chapter 7 focusing on the physical attributes of the features. Furthermore, it is noted that the array area does not overlap with the Inner Dowsing, Race Bank and North Ridge SAC.
264	Natural England	P2_25	The supporting evidence for sandwave recovery at ODOW has been based on evidence collected at Race Bank OWF. We would not advise using this evidence as an analogue for	Project details, including the MDS for sandwave clearance/levelling, have been reviewed and updated where required. Details are presented in Chapter 3 Project Description and Chapter 7

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard
			<p>ODOW sandwave recovery at IDRBNR SAC.</p> <p>We expressed our uncertainty (NE Relevant Representations to Norfolk Boreas, 2019) as to whether or not full recovery of Annex I sandbanks was achievable from Race Bank OWF sandwave sweeping. We continue to have reasonable scientific doubt and our advice remains unchanged.</p> <p>We also advise that the process of method selection and final route refinement within the cable corridor is undertaken using the avoid, reduce, mitigate hierarchy.</p> <p>Where sandwave levelling is considered necessary to provide protection to the cable or enable burial machines to operate, consideration should be given to the relative merit of using sandwave clearance / lowering to reduce the need for external cable protection versus the potential impacts of sandwave clearance on the conservation objectives of the MPA.</p>	<p>Marine Physical Processes including the volumes assessed within the IDRBNR SAC. An assessment of the potential impacts of sandwave levelling is provided in Chapter 7. This is based on evidence collected at Race Bank OWF in addition to monitoring data from other sites in order to assess the potential for recovery.</p> <p>Due consideration has been given to the relative benefits of sandwave clearance during refinements to the Project Design.</p>
265	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Anticipated maximum volume sandwave clearance within the array is 13,672,800m<sup>2</sup> and 7,413,120m<sup>2</sup> within the ECC. These are significant amounts. We understand that the exact locations requiring sandwave clearance are presently not known. Therefore, project-specific acoustic/ground condition data should be used to establish a realistic WCS for sandwave clearance/lowering.</p> <p>Project-specific geophysical data should be used to refine the MDS for sandwave clearance and thus reduce the impact to sandbank / sandwave systems. The area of MPAs/features affected (extent and location) should be provided, along with a map to show locations requiring sandwave clearance. This should be provided in a sandwave levelling assessment as per Norfolk Boreas OWF's.</p>	<p>All project details presented in Chapter 3 Project Description and Chapter 7 Marine Physical Processes have been reviewed and updated where required. This includes the MDS for sandwave clearance/levelling, with details provided of the volumes assessed within the IDRBNR SAC. Due consideration has been given to the relative benefits of sandwave clearance during refinements to the Project Design. An assessment of the potential impacts of sandwave levelling is provided in Chapter 7. Further evidence will be provided as part of a separate Sandwave Levelling Assessment that will be submitted into the Examination.</p>
266	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Spoil deposition in the shallow nearshore environment could affect sediment transport processes. Need to consider and assess the potential hydrodynamic, wave and sediment transport impacts of spoil deposition in the shallow nearshore zone.</p>	<p>Spoil deposition as a result of bentonite release is assessed within Chapter 7 Marine Physical Processes, with deposition considered to be small-scale and highly localised. These spoil mounds are likely to be rapidly redistributed by wave action and impacts on the hydrodynamic and wave regime are therefore not considered a project consequence. Potential impacts on coastal behaviour, including Project activities within the shallow nearshore zone, have been assessed in Chapter 7.</p>
267	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Up to 25% laid cables are estimated to require cable protection, including 20 sites with cable crossings and comprises a total area of 1,899,000m<sup>2</sup> for the inter-array cables and 2,059,200m<sup>2</sup> for the export cable. This is a considerable cable protection allowance. Natural England advise that cable protection should be avoided in MPAs, sensitive habitats, and the shallow nearshore zone. The CBRA should allow refinement of mobile seabed areas as well as ground conditions where full burial may be problematic.</p> <p>A cable crossing map should be provided in the ES. Specific locations requiring cable protection (informed by acoustic data) should also be provided. In addition, the following should be provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• total volumes of cable protection,</li> <li>• total area of impact, habitats impacted,</li> <li>• presence of sensitive habitats,</li> <li>• methods likely to be used.</li> <li>• Consideration of the impact of cable protection throughout its lifetime and across more than one cable at the same location.</li> </ul>	<p>All project details presented in Chapter 3 Project Description and Chapter 7 Marine Physical Processes have been reviewed and updated where required. This includes the MDS for sandwave clearance/levelling, with details provided of the volumes assessed within the IDRBNR SAC. The potential impacts of cable protection are assessed in Chapter 7. Potential impacts on sensitive habitats are considered within Chapter 9 Benthic and Intertidal Ecology and the RIAA.</p>
268	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Where cable protection and/or cable crossing locations are anticipated in the nearshore zone and/or shallow water depths they may have the potential to interfere with wave energy transformation. Therefore, these areas should be identified and potential modification to wave propagation and interruption to sediment pathways assessed. Highlight anticipated areas of cable protection/crossings within the nearshore and/or shallow water depths. Assess potential impacts to wave energy transformation and sediment pathways.</p>	<p>An assessment of potential impacts of cable protection measures on coastal receptors, including sediment transport pathways, is provided in Chapter 7 Marine Physical Processes. Details will be confirmed as part of the CSIP, which will follow the principles of the Outline CSIP (document reference 8.5). Details of embedded mitigation measures are provided in Chapter 7.</p>



Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard
269	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Impacts to seabed morphology due to construction activities have been assessed for IDRBNR SAC and undesignated areas of seabed. We consider the IDRBNR SAC to have high ecological importance, but also to be vulnerable to morphological change. The SNCBs consider site integrity to have been hindered by impacts due to Race Bank OWF infrastructure. This has also compromised the ability of the site to meet its conservation objectives. The SAC sandbank features currently have a restore target for their extent and distribution and maintain target for topography and volume attributes. Consequently, we are unable to agree that SAC sensitivity is medium. We would also advise that the magnitude of impact is greater than low, for the reasons already discussed.</p> <p>We also note that undesignated areas of seabed have been assessed as having negligible sensitivity to morphological change due to construction activities. We advise that the sandbank systems across and adjacent to the array are important ecologically, morphologically and hydrodynamically. Insufficient information has been provided upon which to assess impacts to these features for construction-related changes. Nevertheless, we advise that their sensitivity should be greater than negligible and magnitude greater than low.</p> <p>We advise that magnitude of impact may be greater than low, the sensitivity of IDRBNR SAC is likely to be greater than medium, and undesignated sandbanks should be greater than negligible. Further evidence should be provided to support the conclusion that effect significance on these receptors will be minor adverse for EIA impacts to Marine Processes. Please also see Benthic advice on features of the IDRBNR SAC.</p>	<p>Annex I Sandbank features within the IDRBNR SAC have been considered as a receptor within the assessment provided in Chapter 7 Marine Physical Processes and a full assessment of potential impacts to the IDRBNR SAC is provided in the RIAA.</p> <p>The conservation advice package published in May 2023 has been taken into account within the assessment and further evidence provided to support the assessment, both set out in Chapter 7.</p>
270	Natural England	P2_25	<p>It is stated that the presence of annual beach nourishment means that the choice of location for onshore HDD works and jointing bay is unaffected by the possibility of coastal retreat, for as long as the 'hold the line' strategy is in place. However, we advise that future approaches to flood and coastal erosion risk management at landfall cannot be assured. Rather, it is the Applicant's responsibility to ensure that there is sufficient coverage of their buried assets in the intertidal through the lifetime of the project (and decommissioning). We advise close liaison with the EA.</p>	<p>Consideration of long-term coverage of assets at landfall is dependent on an understanding of the future approaches to coastal protection. The Applicant will continue to engage with the Environment Agency throughout the post-application and pre-construction phases of the Project.</p>
271	Natural England	P2_25	<p>We welcome the proposed use of trenchless installation techniques by the Project. However, we advise that this is an eroding coastline which has experienced high rates of erosion; the beach mid-section shows an erosional trend and annual beach recharge is currently undertaken. The beach and dunes that back the beach provide important protection to the low-lying hinterland of East Lincolnshire. Therefore, we would advise that the sensitivity of the coastline at landfall is greater than low. We also advise that the placement cable protection within the shallow nearshore could interrupt nearshore sediment pathways that supply sediment to receptors south and along the adjacent coastline at landfall. Therefore, we advise that the magnitude of impact is greater than low, and effect significance is greater than minor adverse.</p> <p>We advise, as against the use of cable protection inshore of the depth of closure. We also advise that the coastline at landfall has greater than low sensitivity and effect significance is greater than minor adverse.</p>	<p>Potential impacts on coastal behaviour at the landfall site, including below MHWS and certain features above MHWS (specifically dune features behind the landfall beach), have been assessed in Chapter 7 Marine Physical Processes. This assessment is based on analysis of coastal change between 2016 and 2020, as provided within the Physical Processes Technical Baseline. An assessment of potential impacts of cable protection measures on coastal receptors, including sediment transport pathways, is provided in Chapter 7. Details will be confirmed as part of the CSIP, which will follow the principles of the Outline CSIP (document reference 8.5). Details of embedded mitigation measures are set out in Chapter 7 with no permanent rock protection to be employed within the intertidal zone. The Applicant has committed to the HDD exit pit being located in the subtidal zone approximately 500m from MLWS therefore inherently reducing the need for cable protection in the shallow nearshore.</p>
272	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Impacts on the wave and tidal regime due to the two ORCPs have not been assessed. Given their proximity to Inner Dowsing sandbank, IDRBNR SAC, we advise that they should be considered in this impact assessment. Consider and assess the potential impact of the two ORCPs on the wave-climate regime. Include these two structures in the wave blockage modelling.</p>	<p>The ORCPs and ANSs have been included within updated Marine <u>Physical</u> Processes numerical modelling, with potential impacts to the wave and tidal regime, including within the IDRBNR SAC, discussed in Chapter 7, Marine Physical Processes</p>
273	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Receptors considered in the assessment of modifications to the wave and tidal regime include IDRBNR SAC and areas of undesignated seabed. This latter term is not useful. It</p>	<p>Offshore sandbanks not located within a designated site has been included as a receptor for this impact, with an assessment provided in Chapter 7, Marine Physical Processes</p>



Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard
			would be more useful to identify the sandbank-sandwave systems within and near the array, as receptors. Include offshore sandbank-sandwave systems as receptors.	
274	Natural England	P2_25	Numerical modelling results show maximum reductions in current speed of 0.05-0.1m/s within 200m of a small number of foundations and 0.02-0.05m/s forming wakes up to 1km downstream of the majority of foundations. Changes in wave height of 0.1-1.0m were found to occur within 1km of foundations. A concomitant change in wave direction of 90-180 degrees south of the array, and -90 to -2 degrees to the west. These results present potentially significant changes to the waves, hydrodynamics and sediment transport within and around the array. We wish to understand how these reductions in wave energy and tidal flow might affect the sandbank systems within the array. Further consideration should be given to the impact of reduced wave energy and direction, and tidal flow on sandbanks within the array. This will help inform understanding of potential changes to physical and biological conditions such as grain size distribution and exposure levels across important sandbank habitats.	A full assessment of the impact of reduced wave energy and direction and tidal flow is provided in Chapter 7, Marine Physical Processes, including consideration of potential effects on sandbanks within the array. This is supported by sediment mobility analysis using results from numerical modelling, the results of which are provided within the Marine Physical Processes Technical Baseline and considered within the assessment throughout Chapter 7.
275	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Small percentage significant wave height reductions (-2.7%) due to the presence of the array may reach IDRBNR SAC. It is considered unlikely that this will lead to any meaningful change to sandbank crest height. Whilst it is recognised that tidal currents maintain the sandbank system, waves also play a key role in shaping them. We wish to understand potential cumulative wave regime impacts of ODOW and other nearby OWFs on the SAC over the lifetime of the project. It is also stated that IDRBNR SAC has a high capacity to accommodate change to the wave regime. However, how would the SAC respond to this change over the lifetime of the project?</p> <p>With regards to the 'areas of undesignated seabed around and within the array,' we would like to see further consideration of potential changes to the sandwave-sandbank systems within and near the array due to modification of the tidal and wave regimes over the lifetime of the project. Therefore, we advise that their sensitivity is likely to be greater than negligible.</p> <p>Consequently, for both receptors assessed, we advise that the significance of effect is greater than minor adverse.</p> <p>We advise it would be useful to consider the potential cumulative impact on IDRBNR SAC due to the presence of ODOW and other nearby OWFs. We would also advise further additional assessment is needed regarding the capacity of the SAC to accommodate change to the wave regime over the lifetime of the project. We also advise assessment of the likely morphological response of the sandbank systems within and near the array, to change in the wave and tidal regimes over the lifetime of the project.</p>	Assessment of the impact of reduced wave energy and direction and tidal flow and potential cumulative modifications to the wave and tidal regime are provided in Chapter 7 Marine Physical Processes. Numerical modelling indicates that changes to wave height although they may reach up to 35m from the array area, dissipate with distance southwest of the Project infrastructure and are therefore unlikely to contribute meaningfully to any array-scale wave blockage caused by other offshore wind infrastructure. Assessment of potential changes to the wave regime within the IDRBNR SAC is supported by sediment mobility analysis using results from numerical modelling, the results of which are provided in Marine Physical Processes Technical Baseline. A full assessment of potential impacts to the IDRBNR SAC is provided in the RIAA. A full assessment of the impact of reduced wave energy and direction and tidal flow is provided in Chapter 7 including consideration of potential effects on sandbanks within the array.
276	Natural England	P2_25	Triton Knoll OWF landfall may be in close proximity to the ODOW landfall. If there is the potential for overlapping works, these should be considered. Consider the potential for overlapping works between Triton Knoll OWF and ODOW at landfall.	An assessment of the potential for cumulative effects with other projects, including Triton Knoll OWF, is provided in Chapter 7, Marine Physical Processes. It is noted that current project programmes indicate that Triton Knoll OWF is now constructed and only operational and maintenance and decommissioning activities have the potential to temporally overlap with Project activities. Furthermore, the landfall for Triton Knoll OWF is geographically distinct from that of the Project, and overlapping works are therefore unlikely to interact with one another.
277	Natural England	P2_25	Currently there is limited information to adequately inform the EIA for cumulative effect assessments (increases in SSC and seabed level changes and impacts to seabed morphology). If / when further information becomes available, it should be included in an updated cumulative impact assessment in the ES.	Information to support the cumulative effects assessment provided in Chapter 7 has been reviewed and updated where necessary.
278	Natural England	P2_25	We note that cumulative impacts to the wave regime due to project and Triton Knoll OWF have been considered. However, DEPN / DOW are located south of the ODOW array and have the potential to create cumulative blockage effects. We advise that cumulative impacts due to the project and DEPN/DOW should be considered in the EIA.	An assessment of the potential for cumulative effects with other projects is provided in Chapter 7 Marine Physical Processes.

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard
279	Natural England	P2_25	Consider phase of proposed development i.e. construction, operation, decommissioning. Definition of impact magnitude should consider temporal scale (i.e. length/duration) and project development phase. Consider timescale and phase of development when deriving magnitude of impact	Project phase and temporal scale have been integrated into the derivation of impact magnitude, as outlined in Chapter 7 Marine Physical Processes.
280	Natural England	P2_25	MDS for sandwave clearance is up to 60% of the array/interlink cable route and 30% of the export cable route. This MDS should be refined using project-specific geophysical/geotechnical data. We advise that the MDS for sandwave clearance should be refined using project-specific geophysical / geotechnical data and included in a sandwave levelling assessment. Further, the total area of impact (both direct and indirect) and location of any affected MPA and Annex I sandbanks affected should be assessed. Affected features, pressures and sensitivities should be identified.	All project details presented in Chapter 3 Project Description and Chapter 7 Marine Physical Processes have been reviewed and updated where required. This includes the MDS for sandwave clearance/levelling, with details provided of the volumes assessed within the IDRBNR SAC. An assessment of the potential impacts of sandwave levelling is provided in Chapter 7. Further evidence will be provided as part of a separate Project-specific Sandwave Levelling Assessment that will be submitted into the Examination
281	Natural England	P2_25	Appendix 3.1 Cable Burial Risk Assessment (CBRA) relates to a relatively limited section of the cable corridor crossing the Annex I Sandbanks and clustered within the SAC. The Reference Seabed Level (RSBL) at Sandbank 1 (Inner Dowsing) is expected to be 5-6m below current seabed elevation and at Sandbank 2 (North Ridge/Outer Dowsing), is expected to be 2-3m below current seabed elevation. Yet, in Table 7.3, sandwave clearance dredged corridor is 30m per cable circuit and the dredged depth is 2m. Is this 2m below RSBL? Please clarify.	All project details presented in Chapter 3 Project Description and Chapter 7 Marine Physical Processes have been reviewed and updated where required. This includes the MDS for sandwave clearance/levelling, with details provided of the volumes assessed within the IDRBNR SAC. Details of the RSBL has been provided within the CSIP, which will follow the principles of the Outline CSIP (document reference 8.5).
282	Natural England	P2_25	Natural England wishes to highlight the importance of marine physical processes in maintaining balanced coastal and marine ecosystems. Therefore, we advise that changes in marine physical processes are highly likely to have critical cross-cutting impacts across all thematic areas, with potential changes in marine physical processes impacting on benthic SAC interest features and supporting habitats and prey availability for mobile Marine Protected Area interest features.  We advise that the applicant provides robust project and site-specific modelling validated where possible from empirical evidence from adjacent windfarms and cables.	The Applicant acknowledges the concerns raised by Natural England and can confirm that revised Marine <u>Physical</u> Processes modelling has been undertaken for the Project, supported by empirical evidence from nearby infrastructure, where available. The results of the project specific modelling have been used to inform the assessment conclusions for Marine Physical Processes as well as other topic assessments, as appropriate. Potential impacts of the Project on Marine Physical Processes are considered in terms of indirect effects (including pathways) on other receptors, including designated sites and habitats, elsewhere in the ES, in particular within document reference 6.1.9 and Document Reference 7.1. Potential inter-relationships relevant to the assessment of Marine Physical Processes are presented in Table 7.14.
283	Natural England	P2_25	The mitigation hierarchy should be applied and in the first instance every effort should be made to avoid an adverse effect on site integrity altogether; but if this is not possible impact reduction measures should be applied. Inner Dowsing, Race Bank and North Ridge Special Area of Conservation (IDRBNR SAC) – Annex I Sandbanks A number of pressures are already being exerted on IDRBNR SAC, including Race Bank OWF. We consider that the extent, distribution, structure and function attributes of the Annex I sandbank feature have already been affected by the installation of Race Bank OWF. We are, therefore, concerned that construction and operational impacts due to ODOW may further hinder site integrity and further compromise the ability of the site to meet its conservation objectives.	The Project notes Natural England’s concerns and can confirm that refinement to the Project Design has taken place in accordance with the mitigation hierarchy. The mitigation options considered by the Project, and any reasoning regarding the implementation of the measure are discussed in Chapter 9 Benthic and Intertidal Ecology. Annex I Sandbank features within the IDRBNR SAC have been considered as a receptor within the assessment provided in Section 7.12 of Chapter 7 Marine Physical Processes, and a full assessment of potential impacts to the IDRBNR SAC is provided in the RIAA (Document Reference 7.1.)
284	Natural England	P2_25	Potential cable protection measures in shallow/nearshore areas could modify waves and flows and in turn interrupt sediment transport pathways. We advise that cable protection should be avoided in shallow nearshore areas which would cause disruption to longshore sediment transport	An assessment of potential impacts of cable protection measures on coastal receptors, including sediment transport pathways, is provided in document reference 6.1.7. Details will be confirmed as part of the Cable Specification and Installation Plan (CSIP), which will follow the principles of the Outline CSIP (document reference 8.5).
285	Natural England	P2_25	The downplaying of impact magnitude has led to the downgrading of effect significance which, in turn, means that effects are considered not significant in EIA terms. We advise that it is important to make a clear distinction between evidence-based and value-based judgements so as to establish the level of subjective evaluation that has been used.	The assessments made in Chapter 7 Marine Physical Processes have been supported by empirical evidence from nearby infrastructure, project specific numerical modelling, as well as scientific literature from other offshore industries. Supporting evidence and data has been provided as appropriate throughout the assessment within Section 7.12 of this chapter.
286	Natural England	P2_25	There is a significant maximum design scenario (MDS) for the amount of sandwave clearance/levelling required for the project including within IDRBNR SAC. We encourage the Project to refine the MDS as much as possible using project-specific geophysical/ground	All project details presented in -Chapter 3, Project Description (document reference 6.1.3) and Table 7.3 have been reviewed and updated where required. This includes the MDS for sandwave clearance/levelling, with details provided of the volumes assessed within the IDRBNR SAC. Due

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard
			condition data, to reduce impacts. Where sandwave levelling is considered necessary, consideration should be given to the benefit of sandwave clearance in reducing the need for external cable protection versus potential impacts of the sandwave clearance on the conservation objectives of the MPA and/or form and function of sandbank-sandwave systems.	consideration has been given to the relative benefits of sandwave clearance during refinements to the Project Design. An assessment of the potential impacts of sandwave levelling is provided in Chapter 7 Marine Physical Processes. Further evidence will be provided as part of a separate Project-specific Sandwave Levelling Assessment that will be submitted into the Examination.
287	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Natural England advise that the existing pressures on the interest features of Inner Dowsing Race Bank North Ridge (IDRBNR SAC) are likely to be hindering the conservation objectives for the site resulting in an Adverse Effect on Integrity (AEoI) arising. Every effort must therefore be made to mitigate project impacts to not only reduce the Project's alone effects but also ensure that it doesn't materially contribute to existing pressures/cumulative impacts. Otherwise, the site is likely to be taken further away from meeting those conservation objectives, and compensation measures are likely to be required to address the adverse effects.</p> <p>Whilst it is stated that the Outer Dowsing Offshore Wind (ODOW) project's export cable corridor (ECC) would overlap with 0.55% of the site, we draw the Project's attention to the many anthropogenic pressures already occurring within IDRBNR SAC and highlight that more than the extent conservation target will need to be considered within any Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment.</p> <p>We advise that these pressures should be fully considered in the cumulative impacts assessment. Please see Annex A to this document for our advice on small scale losses.</p>	<p>Project mitigation has been developed with measures in relation to benthic habitats detailed in Chapter 9 Benthic and Intertidal Ecology . The Applicant notes that the comment raised here by Natural England appears to be focused on the RIAA, rather than the EIA, and considers that the reference to "cumulative impacts assessment" should be to the "in-combination assessment". Notwithstanding, and in line with the assessment at PEIR cumulative impacts arising from the Project to the benthic features of the SAC (and other benthic receptors) have been considered as part of the cumulative impact assessment and are presented in Chapter 9.</p>
288	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Natural England has concerns with the available baseline data used to assess the presence and extent of Annex I Biogenic reef within the IDRBNR SAC. We also have concerns with the use of the data sets and the reliance upon additional Annex I pre-construction surveys and as yet undiscussed potential mitigation measures to draw conclusions on the impacts of this project on Annex I reef.</p> <p>We would further note that there is a need have due regard to <i>S. spinulosa</i> reef outside of the designated site under Section 41 of the NERC Act 2006.</p> <p>We advise that the assumptions made by the Applicant to draw the conclusion of No AEoI on Annex I reef features within IDRBNR and negligible impacts in EIA terms are not scientifically robust and require revisiting.</p>	<p>Well established <i>S. spinulosa</i> 'reef' is often evident as irregular ridges within geophysical data, whilst low grade <i>S. spinulosa</i> within mixed sediment is increasingly difficult to delineate in geophysical data.</p> <p>The Project undertook a high sampling strategy for the baseline characterisation ground-truth campaign. <i>S. spinulosa</i> that was found during surveys was low-grade and patchy in nature, supporting the geophysical results. Furthermore, a reanalysis of the geophysical and benthic characterisation data along the offshore ECC has been undertaken by Envision Ltd with the results of this reanalysis used to inform the assessment. The Project has committed to pre-construction surveys to identify the quality and extent of any <i>S. spinulosa</i> reef and enable robust micro-siting of infrastructure to occur.</p> <p>Due regard has also been given to <i>S. spinulosa</i> reef outside the SAC within the description of baseline environment and the assessment set out in Chapter 9 Benthic and Intertidal Ecology.</p>
289	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Natural England notes that the plan level HRA for Round 4 OWF identified that Adverse Effects on Integrity of the IDRBNR SAC could be avoided by routing the export cable around the SAC. Therefore, plan-level compensation measures were not considered necessary for this project.</p> <p>While we note through discussions at the ETGs that avoiding the SAC is not technically possible; it was intimated that where possible, the interest features of IDRBNR SAC would be micro routed around'. However, we advise that, as presented, the current evidence is not sufficient to determine if this primary mitigation measure can be successfully implemented through all sections of the ECC which pass through the IDRBNR SAC in order to exclude an AEoI.</p> <p>We draw your attention to the recent Secretary of State decisions for Norfolk Boreas and Norfolk Vanguard where it was determined that it would not be possible to microsite around all Annex I Reef with a likely combined installation impact of 5.9ha. It was concluded that this would be an AEoI and compensation measures were required prior to cable installation.</p> <p>We advise that a cable burial risk assessment and Site Integrity Plan similar to that submitted by Norfolk Boreas should be provided within the Application submission documents.</p>	<p>The Applicant has noted this response and has provided a Cable Burial Risk Assessment (confidential) (document reference 6.3.3.1).</p>



Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard
290	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Based on the conclusions of The Crown Estate (TCE) plan-level HRA, there is an expectation that there will be no AEol from the installation of ODOW cables through IDRBNR SAC. Given the restore conservation objective for Annex I Sandbank and Reef features of IDRBNR SAC (and as reflected in the updated draft conservation advice package) Natural England is concerned about the lasting impacts of any future cable protection and the potential AEol. The recent Secretary of State’s decision for Hornsea Project 3 supports our advice. For that project it was concluded that an AEol could be excluded from the placement of cable projection on Annex I Sandbank feature equating to 2.77ha within 0.0026% of The Wash and North Norfolk Coast SAC; Based on the scale of that projects impacts relative to ODOW, we advise that the lasting habitat change/loss of Annex I sandbank from the placement of cable protection within IDRBNR SAC is likely to have an AEol both Alone and in-combination unless robust justification can be provided to the contrary.</p> <p>Equally, we advise that the same conclusions in relation to the lasting impact of cable protection can be drawn for Annex I reef given the Secretary of State’s decision for Norfolk Boreas and Norfolk Vanguard where it was concluded that cable installation through Annex I reef (with no cable protection) would have an Adverse Effect on Integrity.</p> <p>We note that, dependent on the parameters of the TCE seabed lease, it seems unlikely that any external cable protection which impacts upon the interest features of the SAC (in areas other than at cable/pipeline crossing points) will be permitted both as part of the consent and within subsequent phases (without triggering a requirement for compensatory measures). Therefore, we advise that as part of the required consideration of alternative solutions, the Applicant will need to consider alternative options for cable protection during the construction and operational phases as part of the Application.</p> <p>We advise that the likelihood of cable protection being required within IDRBNR SAC is thoroughly assessed in a submitted cable burial risk assessment and that a commitment to not install cable protection with IDRBNR SAC, with the exception of cable crossing points (where these assets are ‘live’), is secured in the DCO/dML.</p> <p>If the above can’t be committed to, then we advise that further discussions with the Crown Estate in relation to the outcome of the planned level HRA and strategic compensation are required.</p>	<p>The Applicant has noted this response. Please refer to the RIAA (document reference 7.1).</p> <p>The Applicant notes that plan-level HRA undertaken by The Crown Estate concluded that it was not possible to undertake a reasonable and meaningful assessment of transmission assets (export cables) related to the Project. It also clearly states in the Appropriate Assessment that the plan-level HRA does not replace the information requirements of project level HRAs and does not attempt to pre-empt their conclusions.</p>
291	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Temporary impacts to Annex I Sandbanks</p> <p>Natural England advises that at the time of Application further evidence and commitments to mitigation measures will need to be included to demonstrate that impacts from cable installation have been minimised as much as possible and are temporary i.e., full recovery of the Structure and function of the sandbank feature will occur within appropriate time frames.</p> <p>As with Norfolk Boreas OWF. we advise that a sandwave levelling assessment and more thorough cable burial risk assessment is provided at the time of Application in order to provide the necessary confidence that impacts are temporary, and that recovery will occur in the short term.</p>	<p>A CBRA has been undertaken and used to inform the Outline Cable Specification and Installation Plan (CSIP) (document reference 8.5) submitted alongside the Application. It is noted that there are no cable crossings within the SAC.</p> <p>Temporary impacts are discussed in full in Chapter 9 Benthic and Intertidal Ecology. Data from a sediment mobility study incorporating the geophysical and geotechnical data collected along the offshore ECC have been used to detail expected sediment movement rates and inform predicted recovery rates for the sandbanks and is presented within the Marine Physical Processes Technical Baseline.</p>
292	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Natural England welcomes the inclusion of embedded mitigation but advises that further detail is provided on other mitigation measures that the project will seek to deploy. Examples of mitigation measures applied to offshore wind farm developments to date are presented in Annex B of this document.</p> <p>The project should consider each of the benthic mitigation measures to reduce impacts on MPAs (included in Annex B of this response), which have been applied to offshore wind developments to date.</p>	<p>The Applicant welcomes the advice from Natural England. Project mitigation has been developed with measures in relation to benthic habitats detailed in Chapter 9 Benthic and Intertidal Ecology.</p>
293	Natural England	P2_25	<p>We welcome the proposal to microsite around potential Annex I habitat, however current proposals do not present enough evidence as to whether this would be achievable. Furthermore, the statement includes caveats of “where practicable” and “where possible”</p>	<p>The Applicant has committed to avoid all known <i>S. spinulosa</i> reef within the IDRBNR SAC, with this firm commitment possible due to the extensive site investigations and analyses undertaken to inform the DCO application, combined with a consideration of the formation of <i>S. spinulosa</i> reef</p>



Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard
			which causes concern. Given that the project has considered extension of the IDRBNR SAC in its without prejudice compensation document, the project should give greater consideration to the impacts it may have on suitable features located outside the IDRBNR SAC. We advise that a stronger commitment to avoid impacting these features where they exist outside of designated sites is required.	within the SAC from previous surveys. The Applicant undertook a high sampling strategy for the baseline characterisation ground-truth campaign. <i>S. spinulosa</i> that was found during surveys was low-grade and patchy in nature, supporting the geophysical results. Furthermore, a reanalysis of the geophysical and benthic characterisation data along the offshore ECC has been undertaken by Envision Ltd with the results of this reanalysis used to inform the assessment. A pre-construction Annex I habitat survey will be undertaken and will subsequently be used to help inform any micro-siting of windfarm infrastructure as detailed within the In Principle Monitoring Plan (Document Reference 8.3) and Outline Biogenic Reef Mitigation Plan (document reference 8.22).
294	Natural England	P2_25	Natural England have concerns on the impacts the project may have on identified herring spawning and preferable sand eel habitat as supporting habitat for the Greater Wash SPA. We defer our response at PEIR stage to the technical expertise of CEFAS and reserve the right to provide further response as an addendum should we deem it necessary.	The Applicant has noted this.
295	Natural England	P2_25	We notice that the MMO fisheries closure byelaw areas within Inner Dowsing, Race Bank and North Ridge SAC have not been included as consideration for the project. These areas have been established to allow for feature recovery within the site and should be avoided. From the data presented it is unclear which of these byelaw areas might be impacted by this development. We advise that fisheries closure byelaw areas are included within the maps to clearly show how the project will avoid them and/or not hinder the habitat restoration purposes of the byelaws. Where the project cannot avoid them, they will need to show how they will mitigate the impact that operations may have on features contained within them or that have developed since the implementation of the closure.	The byelaw areas were considered in Chapter 4: Site Selection and Assessment of Alternatives. Whilst the ECC partially overlaps with an area to be managed as reef (as per the JNCC dataset), no construction works will be undertaken within this area (as detailed within the Outline Biogenic Reef Mitigation Plan (document reference 8.22)), thereby avoiding any impacts to the management of that area. Notwithstanding, it is notable that this area was surveyed during the characterisation surveys and no reef was identified.
296	Natural England	P2_25	Natural England notes that gravity-based foundations have a comparably large seabed footprint to those of other foundations. And have not been used and/or considered necessary for any other English North Sea projects. We suggest that the foundation which would have the next largest footprint is used for the WCS and that the use of GBS is excluded from consideration as an embedded mitigation measure.	The foundation type selected will ultimately be dependent on the final detailed site investigations, engineering design studies and the procurement process. A range of foundation types is being considered, based on the information the Applicant currently has about the prevailing site conditions and key design considerations, and is summarised in Chapter 3 Project Description. The Applicant has committed to only 50% of WTG foundations being GBS but is unable to exclude this foundation type fully from the Project design.
297	Natural England	P2_25	Natural England have identified several inconsistencies in the values presented between documents, and these should be checked. Where differences occur which aren't calculation errors, contributing values and rationale should be shown for transparency. Please ensure that values presented in the maximum design scenario are consistent with values presented in section 3.6 of Chapter 3 - Project Design document.	The Applicant has noted this response and the documents have been updated to align accordingly.
298	Natural England	P2_25	The realistic worst-case scenario does not present a worst-case scenario for the scale of impacts that the development will have within the designated sites that it crosses. Natural England would expect further detailed commentary on expected installations operations and footprints of development specific to the designated sites that the ECC crosses in order to evaluate the impacts.	An assessment of direct impacts and indirect impacts (e.g., changes in SSC and sediment deposition) on designated sites, informed by the physical processes modelling presented in the Physical Processes Modelling Report as been undertaken on relevant benthic subtidal and intertidal ecology features within sites that have the potential to be affected by the Project. The area for cable protection within the SAC has been broken down to enable a full assessment of the impacts on the individual features.
299	Natural England	P2_25	There is no clear justification of why WCS scenarios have been selected for temporary habitat disturbance both within the Array area and the ECC for construction impacts. Provide rationale as to why installation methods have been selected to represent the WCS.	An assessment of potential impacts associated with temporary habitat disturbance and the extent of temporary habitat disturbance are provided in Chapter 9 Benthic and Intertidal Ecology.
300	Natural England	P2_25	We note that whilst quantity of seabed disturbance is covered in Construction: Impact 2, this information alone cannot act as a proxy for contaminated sediment distributions where no information is provided on sediment contaminant concentrations. Natural England advises that data collected during the characterisation surveys of sediment contaminants for different sediment types should be used to give an indication for the WCS as far as possible.	Consideration of contaminants is provided in the assessment Impact 3 set out in Chapter 9 Benthic and Intertidal Ecology
301	Natural England	P2_25	Limited justification for Impact 1 - Operation and Maintenance (O&M) Natural England advises that further clarification on the following points. - What type of Scour prevention and cable protection would represent the worst-case	Chapter 9 Benthic and Intertidal Ecology provides the breakdown of the MDS for the total footprint for permanent seabed impacts, including scour protection. Loose rock would lead to the greatest footprint for scour and cable protection. Scour protection would be designed to avoid

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard
			<p>scenario and why.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Where scour protection has been accounted for in the footprint, does this take into account potential secondary scour and the need for further scour prevention?</li> <li>- Does footprint for offshore transformer stations include scour protection (we have previously advised against the use of GBS)</li> <li>- How was the assumption that 25% of all export and inter-array cabling will require cable protection has been calculated.</li> <li>- In a worst-case scenario, what percentage of this cable protection will be deployed within the designated sites and therefore would potentially impact on designated features?</li> </ul>	<p>further scouring. The cable protection requirements have been updated as part of the design refinement process incorporating the geotechnical data along the ECC and in the array area and the CBRA and sediment mobility studies undertaken. Details of the cable protection requirements within the SAC and particularly over the sandbank features are provided in Chapter 9 and Chapter 3 Project Description</p>
302	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Within the impact assessment and the Maximum Design Scenario (MDS) there is no indication that UXO detonation has been considered as a cause of temporary habitat disturbance during the construction phase.</p> <p>A UXO assessment and plan needs to be produced to establish how UXO impacts to the seabed will be managed, both inside and outside of the designated sites.</p>	<p>The Applicant is not looking to consent UXO detonation within the DCO. It is expected that a Marine Licence will be applied for in the post consent phase. There is insufficient certainty at this stage to undertake a realistic assessment regarding total numbers and crater sizes. Based on data from Triton Knoll, the Project is expecting low density UXO and has committed to low order techniques as the primary method for detonation (where required). A qualitative assessment to benthic features has been undertaken within the ES. The Project, where practicable and safe, will detonate UXO outside of the SAC.</p>
303	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Limited justification for O&amp;M Impact 2 – Temporary Habitat Disturbance.</p> <p>Further explanation of how values of all seabed disturbance have been derived is required.</p>	<p>Further details are provided in Chapter 9 Benthic and Intertidal Ecology</p>
304	Natural England	P2_25	<p>We welcome the consideration of measures included as mitigation for the proposed project. However, we do not believe it is sufficiently comprehensive.</p> <p>We advise that the proposed scour prevention management plan and cable specification and installation plan should be included at the time of submission as an outline plan and make specific reference to where the ECC crosses areas identified as designated features from characterisation surveys within MPAs.</p> <p>We also advise that all benthic mitigation measures listed in Annex B are considered in the ES.</p>	<p>An Outline SCPMP and Outline CSIP have been submitted as part of the application.</p>
305	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Natural England welcomes the inclusion of the embedded mitigation. However, we note that more specific detail on the sandwave levelling and deposition of dredged material to ensure that it is deposited in a way that doesn't impact on any existing habitat is required. This should be considered in a Sandwave Levelling Assessment and an Outline Cable Specification and Installation Management plan for both inside and outside of designated site boundaries.</p>	<p>An Outline CSIP (document reference 8.5) has been provided alongside the ES. Data from a sediment mobility study incorporating the geophysical and geotechnical data collected along the ECC, has been used to detail expected sediment movement rates and inform predicted recovery rates for the sandbanks, and is presented within Marine Physical Processes Technical Baseline. The Applicant is proposing to licence disposal within the full array area and ECC, however, final disposal locations will be approved by the MMO (in consultation with their advisors) and will be selected to ensure avoidance of impacts to <i>S. spinulosa</i> reef.</p>
306	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Phase I intertidal survey has used relevant references for survey methodology.</p> <p>No action.</p>	<p>The Applicant has noted this response.</p>
307	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Conclusion on the presence of Annex I stony reef within the Array area has used the correct assessment method for ground truthed data. However, whilst we agree with the conclusion that it's unlikely that additional areas of dense hard substrate identified from acoustic data are unlikely to be considered as Annex I reef.</p> <p>Extrapolating this conclusion from a lack of representative species at the single site investigated is not appropriate.</p> <p>Natural England advise that be able to conclude that the sites with hard substrate do not constitute Annex I reef/NERC Priority Habitats further ground truthing investigation to confirm the absence of the characteristic species would be required.</p> <p>As this data is unlikely to be available until pre-construction, we query what commitments the Applicant can make now to minimise the impacts should Stony reef be found.</p>	<p>The Applicant is committed to micro-siting infrastructure around Annex I habitat as far as practicable, to avoid direct significant impacts on these sensitive habitats where possible (as detailed within the Outline Biogenic Reef Mitigation Plan (document reference 8.22) and Outline Cable Specification and Installation Plan (document reference 8.5)). A pre-construction Annex I habitat survey will be undertaken and will subsequently be used to help inform any micro-siting of Project infrastructure as outlined in Chapter 9 Benthic and Intertidal Ecology including for the ANS locations, which will be informed following completion of pre-construction surveys and microsited to avoid any potential Annex I habitats.</p>
308	Natural England	P2_25	<p>EUNIS habitat codes provided in 2022 version only</p> <p>To ease transition between 2012 and 2022 codes, Natural England requests that, where EUNIS 2022 codes are used, their 2012 equivalent, is also provided in brackets to aid review throughout the document.</p>	<p>The Applicant can confirm that EUNIS 2012 habitat codes have been provided alongside the 2022 codes to aid review.</p>

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard
309	Natural England	P2_25	<p>The benthic characterisation surveys were unable to delineate Annex I biogenic reef features from the acquired acoustic data within the array area or within the export cable corridor.</p> <p>Natural England advises that the project needs to be able to draw conclusions on the impacts that it may have on this sensitive habitat and assess whether proposed mitigation measures would be feasible and effective. Information on extent and distribution of this habitat within the project red line boundary and, where applicable, the wider zone of impact is required to inform these assessments.</p>	<p>The Applicant undertook a high sampling strategy for the baseline characterisation ground-truth campaign. <i>S. spinulosa</i> that was found during these surveys was low-grade and patchy in nature, supporting the geophysical results. Furthermore, a reanalysis of the geophysical and benthic characterisation data along the offshore ECC has been undertaken by Envision with the results of this reanalysis having been used to inform the assessment. The Applicant has committed to pre-construction surveys to identify the quality and extent of <i>S. spinulosa</i> and enable robust micro-siting of infrastructure to occur.</p> <p>Discussion in relation to <i>S. spinulosa</i> recorded during site specific surveys and associated reef features are set out in Chapter 9 Benthic and Intertidal Ecology.</p>
310	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Natural England is concerned with the proposed method of assessing <i>Sabellaria</i> reef by averaging height and patchiness scores recorded at every data point along each transect. Survey design for ground truthing reef with seabed imagery should target the full extent of identified potential reef including a run-in area where no reef would be observed. Patchiness and elevation values have been averaged across the length of the transect rather than the subsections of the transect where reef has been delineated. This gives the effect of downweighing potential reefiness scores. Reefiness values should be averaged over the segment along the transect where reef has been observed rather than the entire length of the transect which is likely to underrepresent the reef quality. Further methodology on assessing patchiness of biogenic reef is presented in Jenkins et. al. (2018) which was referenced by the technical report.</p>	<p>The Applicant notes that <i>Sabellaria</i> was only found intermittently along a single camera transect. Single data points showing Low/Medium/High reef structure do not cover sufficient area (25m<sup>2</sup>) (as per the guidance for defining reef, Gubbay, 2007) to be able to determine the presence of Annex I reef. Excluding these single reef structure data points, there were three sections of the transect where two or more adjacent data points showed Low/Medium/High reef structure. The three segments of Low/Medium/High reef structure were assessed as potentially separate reefs. For this assessment, the same reefiness assessment method has been used as in the technical report and so has not been repeated here. However, this assessment calculates average (mean) reefiness levels and the corresponding reef 'structure' for each segment, which is then assessed against the estimated area of the patch. It is not possible to accurately assess the areas of the reef from the available geophysical data, so the patch has been assumed to be circular with the diameter of the circle taken, on a precautionary basis, to be the straight-line distance between adjacent non-reef data points either side of the potential reef segment. This 'circular' patch assessment method has been used by Benthic Solutions Limited. for a number of <i>Sabellaria</i> and stony reef assessments over the past decade with no negative feedback from clients, regulators or SNCBs. The results of this analysis show that two of the patches would achieve overall reefiness levels (incorporating patchiness, elevation and area measures) of 'Not a Reef'. The third patch would be classified as 'Low Reef', for which strong justification would be needed for this to be considered Annex I reef. The Jenkins et al. (2018) paper includes some useful guidance for commercial pre-development surveys, specifically the combination of <i>Sabellaria</i> patchiness and tube elevation to calculate <i>Sabellaria</i> reef structure, which was taken from a method developed in 2010 by Benthic Solutions Limited BSL., staff in conjunction with the JNCC. Splitting of footage into segments to provide more quantitative data is a good idea but, in reality, this method is still subjective as it requires the reviewer to assign a single reefiness level to a generally variable length of seabed; for this reason, Benthic Solutions Limited BSL instead assess reefiness from still photographs or video snapshots which can be classified in a non-subjective, quantitative manner. However, calculation of 'true patchiness' is complicated, particularly with regard to permutation and significance assessment of 'true patchiness' data. This measure, while interesting and of direct relevance to MPA condition monitoring (having been initially developed for this purpose), has no relevance to standard commercial habitat assessment surveys as it is not utilised in the assessment of 'reefiness'. Note: Benthic Solutions Limited discussed the above concerns with Joey O'Connor at the JNCC (co-author of the Jenkins paper) over email in 2020 and no disagreement to the above concerns were raised. A reanalysis of the geophysical and benthic characterisation data along the offshore ECC has also been undertaken by Envision Ltd with the results of this reanalysis having been used to inform the assessment.</p>
311	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Natural England are concerned with the statement "the lack of unique SSS/MBES features associated with the <i>S. spinulosa</i> aggregations made it impossible to delineate the extent of the <i>Sabellaria</i> habitat within the ECC area." Ground truthing alone is not a sufficient method of understanding reef extent. To mitigate the risk to the Annex I biogenic reef from the project, particularly within the IDRBNR SAC, a thorough understanding of the extent of reef which may be impacted is</p>	<p>The Applicant found that the geophysical data have shown that well established 'reef' is often evident as irregular ridges within the data. It was found that low grade <i>S. spinulosa</i> within mixed sediment is increasingly difficult to delineate within this data.</p> <p>The Applicant undertook a high sampling strategy for the baseline characterisation ground-truth campaign. <i>S. spinulosa</i> that was found during these surveys was low-grade and patchy in nature, supporting the geophysical results. Furthermore, a reanalysis of the geophysical and benthic</p>



Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard
			required before any conclusions can be drawn and/or ensure mitigation measures such as micro-siting will be effective in avoiding impacts to Annex I reef.	characterisation data along the offshore ECC has been undertaken by Envision Ltd with the results of this reanalysis used to inform the assessment. The Applicant is committed to micro-siting infrastructure around Annex I habitat as far as practicable, to avoid where possible direct significant impacts on these sensitive habitats. A pre-construction Annex I habitat survey will be undertaken and will subsequently be used to help inform any micro-siting of Project infrastructure as outlined in Chapter 9 Benthic and Intertidal Ecology.
312	Natural England	P2_25	No detail has been provided on how tube height for Annex I reef has been estimated. Given that seabed imagery was acquired with a top-down camera, understanding how tube height has been consistently estimated is vital to understanding the final reef classification scores. Provide details on how reef height was estimated.	The Applicant can confirm that the assessment of tube height is based on expert judgement. While the photographs are 'top-down', they are taken at an oblique camera angle, rather than plan view, which provide improved depth perception. The photographs are reviewed in conjunction with available SD and HD video footage, which further supports accurate assessment of tube heights on the stills. Assessment of scale is informed by a combination of the laser scale dots and reference to nearby visible fauna of a predictable size range as shown in the Benthic Ecology Technical Report (Array) and the Benthic Ecology Technical Report (ECC).
313	Natural England	P2_25	Natural England defer to the technical expertise of the EA and CEFAS on the impacts of changes to Marine water and sediment quality. No Action.	The Applicant has noted this.
314	Natural England	P2_25	We have concerns about the impacts to herring spawning and favourable grounds for sand eel habitat primarily as a prey source for designated features of the Greater Wash SPA, Flamborough and Filey Coast SPA and the Southern North Sea SAC. However, we defer our response on impacts on fish populations and habitat to the technical expertise of CEFAS at this stage. We may provide further response on this matter once we have reviewed the outcomes of the Section 42 consultation. No Action.	This is noted by the Project. Responses to comments received from Cefas via the MMO regarding fish and shellfish are provided in Chapter 10 Fish and Shellfish Ecology.
315	Natural England	P2_25	We notice that MMO fishery byelaws have not been presented as a consideration within the PEIR. Please note that these areas are closed to benthic trawling and therefore potentially present areas where a designated feature might be present. The project will need to demonstrate that, where ECC transects fisheries closure areas that habitat feature restoration will not be hindered by cable installation, noting that there is an expectation that the extent of Annex I reef will increase as a result of the byelaw.	Whilst the ECC partially overlaps with an area to be managed as reef (as per the JNCC dataset), no construction works will be undertaken within this area (as detailed within the Outline Biogenic Reef Mitigation Plan (document reference 8.22)), thereby avoiding any impacts to the management of that area. Notwithstanding, it is notable that this area was surveyed during the characterisation surveys and no reef was identified. A pre-construction Annex I habitat survey will be undertaken and will subsequently be used to help inform any micro-siting of Project infrastructure as set out in Chapter 9 Benthic and Intertidal Ecology.
316	Natural England	P2_25	The use of the term "sub tidal benthic ecology" as an impact receptor to draw conclusions on for EIA assessment's is too broad. The Applicant should be clear the as to which specific habitat receptors are relevant to the conclusions it is making on the impacts of the project. (See Para. 9.7.31 for an example)	References to subtidal benthic ecology as an impact receptor have been updated to state the relevant habitat receptors.
317	Natural England	P2_25	Operation and Maintenance Impact 2 – Permanent habitat loss/change We advise that this impact should be described as 'lasting' habitat loss/change (acknowledging the need to remove infrastructure at decommissioning) as it has been referred to in Para 9.7.79.	This is noted by the Project and the terminology has been amended to 'permanent' where infrastructure may remain after decommissioning (subject to agreements at that stage) or 'long-term' where infrastructure will be removed at the end of the lifetime of the Project.
318	Natural England	P2_25	Natural England notes that "importance" of the ecological feature is included as a factor for assessing sensitivity. However, it is not clear from Table 9.13 how ecological importance for each receptor is being considered within the matrix. Natural England advises that how receptor importance is defined and incorporated into assessing sensitivity is included within Table 9.13. Please also see more general point on value and evidence-based judgements for assessing impacts in the cover letter.	This is fully outlined in Table 9.13 of Chapter 9 Benthic and Intertidal Ecology.
319	Natural England	P2_25	Natural England notes that "importance" of the ecological feature is included as a factor for assessing sensitivity. However, it is not clear from Table 9.13 how ecological importance for each receptor is being considered within the matrix. Natural England advises that how receptor importance is defined and incorporated into assessing sensitivity is included within Table 9.13. Please also see more general point on value and evidence-based judgements for assessing impacts in the cover letter.	This is noted by the Applicant and updated accordingly.



Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard
320	Natural England	P2_25	Natural England welcomes the provision to return material dredged from within the SAC back within the site. However, we would like to note that this will need to be done carefully to avoid impacting Annex I biogenic reef habitat. The deposition site should be located in an area of similar particle size and upstream of the original deposition site at a time with suitable hydrological conditions to ensure that deposited sediment falls at least 50m from Annex I biogenic reef features. This should be considered in an Outline Cable Specification and Installation Management plan for inside and outside of designated sites and a Sandwave Levelling Assessment	This is noted by the Applicant and has been considered within the Outline CSIP (document reference 8.5). The final location will be determined in consultation with the MMO and Natural England post-consent and will be informed by further site specific surveys and studies, including the sediment mobility study and relevant updates to that document as further site specific data becomes available.
321	Natural England	P2_25	This is a speculative broad statement which is not referenced and does not equally apply to all habitats listed in Table 9.15. Remove statement or amend	Conditions assessment and the conservation advice package are referred to in Chapter 9 Benthic and Intertidal Ecology
322	Natural England	P2_25	We note that the most recent assessment of condition for the designated features has not been incorporated into the assessment. As a minimum we advise that inclusion of latest feature condition (2019) for the designated features as well as that included in the updated Conservation Advice Package (May 2023)	This is noted by the Applicant.
323	Natural England	P2_25	It is unclear how the impacts of temporary disturbance associated with construction activity on Annex I sandbanks feature within the IDRBNR SAC and the Greater Wash SPA have been assessed. Is this included within the impacts on subtidal benthic ecology? If so, this approach is not appropriate and the impact of temporary habitat disturbance on this feature should be covered separately. Please review and clarify/amend as appropriate.	The features of the SPA and SAC are appraised for sensitivity and magnitude in relation to temporary habitat disturbance within Chapter 9 Benthic and Intertidal Ecology.
324	Natural England	P2_25	Please see our general comment on the adoption of what the project is calling a “precautionary” approach. We advise that, in this instance, a “precautionary” approach is required due to not being able to delineate extent of reef within the PEIR boundary. To mitigate the risk to Biogenic reef from the project, particularly within the IDRBNR SAC, a thorough understanding of the extent of reef which may be impacted is required before any conclusions can be drawn and/or ensure mitigation measures such as micro-siting will be effective in avoiding impacts to Annex I reef.	The Project found that the geophysical data has shown that well established ‘reef’ is often evident as irregular ridges within the data. It was found that low grade <i>S. spinulosa</i> within mixed sediment is increasingly difficult to delineate within this data. The Project undertook a high sampling strategy for the baseline characterisation ground-truth campaign. <i>S. spinulosa</i> that was found during these surveys was low-grade and patchy in nature, supporting the geophysical results. Furthermore, a reanalysis of the geophysical and benthic characterisation data along the offshore ECC has been undertaken by Envision Ltd with the results of this reanalysis used to inform the assessment. The Project confirm they have committed to pre-construction surveys to identify the quality and extent of <i>S. spinulosa</i> and enable robust micrositing of infrastructure to occur.
325	Natural England	P2_25	Medium Sensitivity and Medium magnitude should be considered as Moderate Adverse and Significant in EIA terms rather than Minor. Given that the conclusion drawn that impact of smothering on the Annex I biogenic reef features is significant in EIA terms. We advise that further information is provided by the project on how the impact will be reduced. Please amend and clarify	This is noted by the Applicant and the impact assessment has been revised based on the refined project parameters.
326	Natural England	P2_25	Natural England does not consider the potential shift in baseline conditions with the result of increasing biodiversity through the introduction of hard substrates to be a beneficial effect where species colonising hard substrates have different functions to the sediment dwelling species being displaced. Amend statement	This is noted and acknowledged within Chapter 9 Benthic and Intertidal Ecology when considering the impacts of colonisation of WTGs.
327	Natural England	P2_25	The report details the % of the ECC that traverses the designated sites but this is not broken down into habitat/feature Please update accordingly	A breakdown of the overlap with different features of the site is provided in Chapter 9 Benthic and Intertidal Ecology
328	Natural England	P2_25	The current assessment, as stated in Para. 9.7.83, is unclear. As per the EIA assessment methodology, the designation (i.e., the importance of the habitat) should not change the magnitude of the impact but rather the sensitivity. Natural England would also disagree with the assessment that the magnitude of the impact of permanent loss of habitat on the benthic features is low based on the EIA assessment criteria presented.	The Applicant has assessed sensitivity and magnitude in line with the criteria presented within Section 9.7. In the ‘Minor’ magnitude category it also states ‘and/or limited but discernible alteration to key characteristics or features of the particular receptors character or distinctiveness’. For example, whilst permanent habitat loss from cable protection is regarded long-term/permanent, in relation to the availability of broadscale habitats the impact magnitude is regarded as non-material or de

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard
			<p>We advise that this impact is reassessed with sensitivity/importance included after our comments on the EIA assessment methodology have also been addressed.</p> <p>We would further advise that the IDRBNR SAC is of high importance. We advise against the placement of external cable protection within the site. Any Rock protection within the SAC is likely to hinder the conservation objectives. We draw your attention to the recent Hornsea Project 3, Norfolk Vanguard and Norfolk Boreas decisions and our generic position on cable protection submitted to the Norfolk Boreas Project. Appendix 2.5 of PINS - Natural England's Relevant Representations to the Norfolk Boreas Project</p>	<p>minimis and therefore should not be classified as a major/moderate impact on account of the limited alteration.</p> <p>Sensitive features of the IDRBNR SAC have additional mitigation applied to reduce the magnitude of the impact. On this basis the Applicant does not propose to update the magnitudes presented within the ES.</p>
329	Natural England	P2_25	<p>The project has assigned differing sensitivities to Annex I Sandbank features located outside and inside the IDRBNR SAC based purely on the conservation status of the features when located within the site. However, the project has also proposed, in its without prejudice benthic compensation document, that a suitable compensation measure would be to extend the IDRBNR SAC to cover areas of as yet unprotected Annex I Sandbank habitat.</p> <p>We advise that these two statements are in conflict. If there is any potential that the project is to utilise this method of compensation. Sandbanks outside of the SAC, which may be included in any future extension, should be treated in the same way as those currently inside it.</p>	<p>This is noted by the Applicant however the Applicant does not consider that these statements conflict as the assessment has taken into consideration currently designated site features. Were the sandbanks outside the SAC to be designated, they would be considered appropriately at that stage by other relevant projects; however, the decision to designate the sandbanks would in part consider the status of the sandbanks at the time of designation and if/how they will contribute to the National Site Network. It is also important to note that the possible extension areas identified within the 'Without Prejudice Benthic Compensation Plan' (document reference 7.6) sit outside the Project order limits and therefore are not assessed or assigned a sensitivity within the assessment.</p>
330	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Our comment above on the impact of cable protection in the IDRBNR SAC also applies to the impact of cable protection on the supporting habitats of the Greater Wash SAC</p> <p>Please see comment above and address this paragraph appropriately</p>	<p>The supporting habitats of the Greater Wash SPA have been assessed within Chapter 9 Benthic and Intertidal Ecology. Sandbanks of the IDRBNR SAC are the same as those protected within the Greater Wash SPA where they overlap with the offshore ECC and are therefore given additional consideration and mitigation as detailed within Chapter 9 and the Benthic Ecology Technical Report (Array)</p>
331	Natural England	P2_25	<p>We welcome the Project's commitment to ensuring no permanent habitat loss within the intertidal area of the offshore ECC. We would also welcome a commitment to extend this commitment in subtidal areas where long-shore sediment transport is known to occur</p> <p>Please undertake an assessment to support any additional commitments</p>	<p>The Applicant has committed to a sub-tidal punch out for the HDD at landfall, with the exit pits designed to a target of 500m below MLWS. Cable protection requirements close to shore will be designed to minimise changes to sediment transport pathways where practicable.</p>
332	Natural England	P2_25	<p>We note that this paragraph states that a limited number of repair activities will occur within any one year.</p> <p>Natural England advises that anticipated numbers based upon current repair requirements for existing projects in similar environmental conditions should be added here, particularly with reference to activities occurring within designated sites along the ECC.</p>	<p>Further details are provided in Chapter 9 Benthic and Intertidal Ecology</p>
333	Natural England	P2_25	<p>We note that whilst the project has included a rationale for why impacts have been ruled out for assessment as a cumulative impact, it is unclear which project impacts have been ruled out for which reasons.</p> <p>Include a justification of each impact pathway which has been screened out as per best practice guidance. There is also a requirement to review those impacts which have been screened out based for cumulative impacts based upon the advice presented to this consultation.</p>	<p>This has been noted by the Applicant and the cumulative assessment has been revisited, including the justifications for ruling out impacts from consideration in the cumulative assessment.</p>
334	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Screening has included all likely impacts and designated features for benthic receptors.</p>	<p>The Applicant has noted this response.</p>
335	Natural England	P2_25	<p>The impacts of temporary increases of suspended sediment are described to disturb benthic habitats in the immediate vicinity of the works. However, 10.2.18 then suggests that there is no potential for AEoI on the conservation objectives for the IDRBNR SAC. Natural England's advice on operations for power cable laying, burial and protection for this site suggests that the constituent broadscale habitats which contribute to Annex I sandbank habitat are sensitive to light smothering and siltation rate changes. We therefore disagree with this assessment, given that the cable route passes through Annex I sandbank habitat and will therefore be within the suggested 0-50m immediate vicinity range.</p> <p>Natural England advise that further consideration is required for this impact to be considered as not AEoI on Annex I sandbank habitat within the IDRBNR SAC.</p>	<p>The Applicant has noted this response.</p>

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard
336	Natural England	P2_25	<p>The assessment of the impact of physical habitat loss/disturbance due to construction and decommissioning on Annex I sandbank features focuses on the recovery of the physical structure of the habitat with limited justification on the impacts that the removal of the habitat would have on the biological communities present within the sandbanks.</p> <p>We would also like to draw your attention to post-construction monitoring surveys conducted at Dudgeon OWF which suggested that there was a marked decrease in sand wave height and an increase in migration rate since construction.</p> <p>Natural England is unable to agree with any conclusions until sufficient evidence has been provided that the impacts of the project will not hinder the conservation objectives for the designated feature and suggest that the best way to demonstrate this is to ensure that impacts which may impinge on feature attributes for the designated feature are considered and we required mitigation measures adopted.</p>	<p>The impact assessment within the RIAA (document 7.1) and the Benthic Subtidal and Intertidal Ecology chapter (document 6.1.9) have been updated to provide further information on this point, and also consider the results of Dudgeon OWF monitoring.</p>
337	Natural England	P2_25	<p>The Project has drawn the conclusion of No AEoI for the impact of temporary physical habitat loss/disturbance and long-term habitat loss on Annex I biogenic reef within IDRBNR SAC. Natural England notes that these conclusions are based upon an as yet conducted pre-construction surveys and appropriate mitigation measures which cannot be agreed until the extent of the reef is known. We advise that the conclusion of No AEoI needs to be drawn from evidence in hand, and mitigation measures that can be reasonably considered, based upon empirical evidence, to conclude no impact to the designated feature. If the project cannot provide this then AEoI can't be excluded beyond reasonable scientific doubt.</p>	<p>As described within the ES (document 6.1.9) and RIAA (document 7.1), the Applicant has supplemented the evidence base regarding the presence/absence of <i>S. spinulosa</i> within the offshore ECC where it passes through the IDRBNR SAC with a secondary analysis by Envision (document 6.3.9.5) which confirms the absence of biogenic reef within this area. Considering the lack of any extant reef and the formation of reef within the local region of the SAC, the Applicant remains confident that micro-siting of the cables will be successful to avoid any reef which may form prior to the construction of the project, thereby avoiding an AEoI, as set out within the RIAA (document 7.1).</p>
338	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Subject to suitable mitigation measures being implemented within the PEMP, Natural England agrees with the conclusion of No AEoI due to the impacts of INNS introduction from the impact of vessel movement during construction, O&amp;M and Decommissioning phases of the project. However, we question how vessel closest approach has been calculated given that no construction port has been agreed yet.</p> <p>Please clarify how closest vessel approach to designated sites calculations were made.</p>	<p>A programme of performance and monitoring will be established for the site which will be documented in the final PEMP. The final PEMP will also contain details of vessel inspections, audits and where relevant vessel routing procedures. Calculations have been made using assumptions until a final site is selected.</p>
339	Natural England	P2_25	<p>This report should focus on the impact that the project will have to the designated features of the site. The likely increase of biodiversity and biomass due to the new hard substrate habitat would be considered as a negative if it impacts on any of the designated features of the site. As per our latest supplementary advice on the conservation objectives for the site (9th May 2023), we consider that the installation of hard structure installed within the IDRBNR SAC is likely hindering site integrity and compromising the ability of the site to meet conservation objectives.</p> <p>Please amend statement so that it focuses on the impacts to designated features only.</p>	<p>The RIAA (document reference 7.1) has been updated as requested by Natural England.</p>
340	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Natural England welcomes the provision to discuss alternative, feasible options for cable installation. We would like to draw your attention to the latest supplementary advice on the conservation objectives for the site. We consider that the installation of hard structure installed within the IDRBNR SAC is likely hindering site integrity and compromising the ability of the site to meet conservation objectives.</p> <p>We advise that the statement made by the project to seek options that demonstrably avoid adverse effects on site integrity does not necessarily align with our position as provided in our supplementary advice for the site.</p>	<p>The Applicant notes Natural England's comment regarding feasible options for cable installation. The Applicant has committed to only the use of removable cable protection within the sandbank features of the SAC, if it is required. The Applicant has provided consideration of the impacts of the Project in light of the Supplementary Advice within the RIAA as relevant (document 7.1).</p>
341	Natural England	P2_25	<p>The use of the word significant should only be used for statistical qualification and be associated with a confidence value. The phrase "significant enough" is not a suitable qualifier.</p> <p>Please amend wording.</p>	<p>The Applicant notes Natural England's comment and wording has been amended accordingly.</p>
342	Natural England	P2_25	<p>In light of the statement within Natural England's supplementary advice on conservation objectives regarding the impacts of developments consented as the result of lawful decisions by the competent authority on site integrity, we disagree with the conclusion that that there is no potential for AEoI in relation to changes to the physical process. Further, the</p>	<p>The Applicant has revisited the assessment with consideration of the latest conservation advice from Natural England and considers that a conclusion of no AEoI remains valid.</p>



Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard
			<p>proportion of the site IDRBNR SAC impacted by possible changes to physical processes is not a suitable measure to rule out AEol on its own.</p> <p>The project needs to demonstrate that development will not impact on the sediment transportation pathways that already exist within the Annex I Sandbank features within the IDRBNR SAC. Further information on the current physical processes which maintain the Annex I sandbank feature specific to the IDRBNR SAC can be found in our supplementary advice to conservation objectives.</p> <p>Please amend conclusion based upon our latest conservation advice for the site and demonstrate that sediment transportation pathways which maintain the feature will not be disrupted.</p>	
343	Natural England	P2_25	<p>There is no clear rationale why Sheringham Shoal OWF has been excluded from the in-combination assessment.</p> <p>Natural England advises that Sheringham shoal is included within the in-combination assessment or rationale for its exclusion is included.</p>	<p>Sheringham Shoal has been excluded due to its distance from the relevant SACs, being outside the screening range used, as set out within the RIAA (document 7.1).</p>
344	Natural England	P2_25	<p>We note that the applicant's assessment of No AEol for the impact of physical habitat loss/disturbance for in-combination effects focusses on the impact of the developments, primarily on Race bank sandbank, whilst the project is due to also impact on the North Ridge sandbank.</p> <p>We advise that the in-combination effects of the development should consider the impacts of the designated features within the IDRBNR SAC as a whole as well as on individual elements of one feature.</p>	<p>The Applicant notes that the draft RIAA assessment was not intended to appear to focus the assessment on the Race Bank specifically. The overall impact of the Project on the IDRBNR has been considered within the RIAA (document 7.1). The assessment within the in-combination section of the RIAA (document 7.1) has been clarified so that it is clear how the assessment has considered the impacts to the sandbank feature of the site as a whole, whilst retaining consideration of the difference between the expected impacts from Race Bank OWF and the Project.</p>
345	Natural England	P2_25	<p>We note that the inclusion of the provision to take note of the pre-construction survey when planning O&amp;M works is presented as a mitigation measure for in-combination effects of physical habitat loss/disturbance.</p> <p>Natural England would like to note that this provision wasn't included within the mitigating factors for alone effects of the same impact. Additionally, we would advise that given the O&amp;M phase may last for several decades, there is a need for maintenance to be informed by more than solely pre-construction surveys. The required monitoring schedule and any associated need for maintenance activity to be informed by these surveys should be secured within the DCO.</p>	<p>Maintenance schedules will be provided within the Operations and Maintenance Plan produced post-consent which has been included as a requirement of the relevant draft dMLs, rather than being individually secured within the draft DCO.</p>
346	Natural England	P2_25	<p>All features and key potential impact pathways have been adequately identified for the MCZs in the region.</p>	<p>The Applicant has noted this response.</p>
347	Natural England	P2_25	<p>We agree that there will be no direct impacts to an MCZ</p> <p>Whilst we do not necessarily agree with the methods and conclusions used to assess the impacts of temporary increase in SSC used in the PEIR. Natural England does agree that impacts of the development can be screened out.</p>	<p>The Applicant has noted this response.</p>
348	Natural England	P2_25	<p>We agree with the screening report conclusion that the site will not adversely impact on the features of the identified MCZs.</p>	<p>The Applicant has noted this response.</p>
349	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Based on Natural England's knowledge of designated site features and experience from other projects within the wider region, we welcome the Applicant's acknowledgement that, should the placement of cable protection be required on Annex I sandbanks, its highly likely that it wouldn't be possible to exclude an AEol. Therefore, as per our previous advice within ETGs, Natural England' advises the consideration of Without Prejudice Compensation is appropriate in such instances.</p> <p>Natural England notes, and welcomes, The Crown Estate's (TCEs) Round 4 Plan level HRA concluded no AEol of the IDRBNR SAC on the basis that all OWF cables could avoid the designated site. However, subsequent to the publication of the R4 Plan Level HRA, the Applicant has identified, that due to technical reasons the complete avoidance of IDRBNR SAC is not possible.</p>	<p>The Applicant notes that the Plan-Level HRA does not prejudge the consenting process, nor does it specify specific cable routes for project or consequently provide a conclusion on the potential of the impacts from cable installation for the Round 4 projects.</p> <p>The Applicant has detailed the basis for its conclusions of no significant effects or AEol in the relevant application documents (e.g. Marine Physical Processes 6.1.7, Benthic and Intertidal Ecology 6.1.9, and the RIAA 7.1).</p> <p>Notwithstanding the conclusions of no AEol on either sand bank or reef features of the IDRBNR SAC, the Applicant has put forward a number of without prejudice measures which are detailed within documents 7.6.1 (Without Prejudice Sandbank Compensation Plan), 7.6.2 (Without Prejudice Biogenic Reef Compensation Plan) and 7.6.3 (Without Prejudice Benthic Compensation Evidence Base and Roadmap).</p>



Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard
			<p>Where the site cannot be avoided, Natural England advises for an no AEoI conclusion to be upheld with any degree of certainty, there would need to be a commitment to no additional cable protection within the site and complete avoidance of cable installation within areas of Annex I Reef.</p> <p>We are unclear what, if any, agreement has been reach between TCE and the Applicant with regards to the ODOW seabed lease and any requirements to ensure that the conclusions of the Plan Level HRA can be upheld.</p> <p>We also query whether, if the risk of AEoI is taken forward into the Application phase, there is an opportunity, like with Annex I bird compensation, for this project to be incorporated into Round 4 Plan Level Annex I Sandbank Strategic compensation which is already progressing.</p> <p>We would welcome further clarification from the Applicant and TCE as to the requirement to either progress compensation measures for this project or find alternative less impactful options to protecting sub-optimally buried cables which remove the risk of an AEoI occurring.</p> <p>If compensation measures are progressed we also welcome consideration from TCE and the Applicant of how this project could be incorporated in Round 4 Plan Level strategic compensation measures.</p>	<p>Since the publication of the PEIR the Applicant notes that the Defra Secretary of State has confirmed the availability of MPA/SAC extensions as potential strategic measure for the delivery of compensation for benthic impacts to Round 4 projects. The Applicant has included detail of this measure in the cited documents and notes that this would be the preferred method of delivering compensation if it is required.</p>
350	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Natural England notes that there are no compensation measures proposed for a potential AEoI on IDRBNR SAC Annex I reef features.</p> <p>Natural England highlights that the Applicant will need to provide certainty within the Application that micro-routing can be adopted to avoid any areas of identified Annex I biogenic reef regardless of the quality assigned to the area of reef. We advise that reef of all quality is equally protected.</p> <p>We also highlight that if this is not possible then compensation measures are likely to be required based on the decisions made on the Norfolk Boreas and Norfolk Vanguard projects.</p>	<p>The Applicant has provided without prejudice compensation measures for the biogenic reef feature of the IDRBNR SAC within documents 7.6.2 (Without Prejudice Biogenic Reef Compensation Plan) and 7.6.3 (Without Prejudice Benthic Compensation Evidence Base and Roadmap).</p>
351	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Natural England highlights that the conservation package for IDRBNR SAC has been updated (May 2023) and will need to be reflected in the without prejudice compensation package Please amend.</p>	<p>This has been reflected in the compensation documents where relevant.</p>
352	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Natural England notes that reference has been made to strategic compensation and Marine Recovery Fund to provide benthic compensation.</p> <p>Whilst we anticipate strategic compensation measures and the Marine Recovery Fund being available post consent for ODOW, we draw you to our most recent Norfolk Projects advice to the Secretary of State which provides our current position.</p>	<p>The Applicant has noted this response</p>
353	Natural England	P2_25	<p>We note that within Table 1.3 a quote provided by the MMO and CEFAS has been used as partial justification for the inclusion of marine debris clearance as an option for consideration as compensation.</p> <p>We advise that this partial quote removes context of what the MMO and CEFAS said. Their full quote corroborates our position on marine debris clearance and should be clearly referenced.</p> <p>We also refer you to our most recent project specific advice to the Secretary of State in relation to the effectiveness of marine debris removal as compensation.</p>	<p>This has been amended in the relevant documents.</p> <p>The Applicant has acknowledged Natural England's position on debris removal within document 7.6.3 (Without Prejudice Benthic Compensation Evidence Base and Roadmap).</p>
354	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Extend the IDRBNR SAC.</p> <p>Whilst Natural England is in support of the designation of additional areas of Sandbank within the SAC, we are currently unclear of the role that ODOW will play in the designation process and how the additional area will be calculated to be considered compensation specific to the ODOW project.</p>	<p>Further detail on the proposed extension of the IDRBNR SAC as a compensation measure is provided within document 7.6.3 (Without Prejudice Benthic Compensation Evidence Base and Roadmap).</p>

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard
			The project needs to commit to providing additional specific detail on how it will commit to contributing towards the designation process beyond providing monitoring data and how area of suitable compensation will be calculated.	
355	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Applicant to provide more detail.</p> <p>Natural England notes that whilst removal of redundant infrastructure can be considered as being appropriate from an ecological perspective, further detail is required on the locations of proposed infrastructure to understand what features are likely to be compensated for. We also advise that the availability of redundant Oil and Gas infrastructure is unlikely to be an option for OWF compensation going forwards as the onus is for carbon capture and underground storage projects to use existing infrastructure. This is in addition to operation and maintenance works on live pipelines which are also likely to require the adoption of compensation measures to be provided by the Oil and Gas industry.</p>	Further detail on the removal of redundant infrastructure as a compensation measure is provided within document 7.6.3 (Without Prejudice Benthic Compensation Evidence Base and Roadmap).
356	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Re-creation of Biogenic Reef.</p> <p>A key concern for the re-creation of non-designated biogenic reef would be that it doesn't impact on the conservation objectives of the site as it already exists. The site is already considered to be in a state of requiring recovery due to pressures on the existing available suitable habitat.</p> <p>Natural England highlights that like for like guidance from DTA has identified that compensation must be for the Annex I feature impacted, but that could be at another location which equally ensures the coherence of the network under Article 6.4. Therefore, we disagree with the Applicant that this is a suitable option for Sandbank compensation; but acknowledge that it may be for Annex I reef.</p>	The Applicant has provided further detail on the creation and re-creation of biogenic reef within document 7.6.3 (Without Prejudice Benthic Compensation Evidence Base and Roadmap). A key component of the site selection work for this measure was the avoidance of the current features of the SAC and therefore is not considered to impact on the conservation objectives of the site. The Applicant notes Natural England's position regarding the appropriateness of the measure for compensation of the sandbank feature of the IDRBNR SAC. However, the Applicant presents its position for the measure as appropriate for sandbanks within document 7.6.3 (Without Prejudice Benthic Compensation Evidence Base and Roadmap).
357	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Sabellaria Spinulosa reef. As per our comments on the characterisation survey, Natural England is concerned that extent and distribution of reef was not able to be delineated within the PEIR boundary from acoustic data. We also have residual concerns on the imagery analysis conducted on the ground truthed data.</p> <p>We note that as part of the proposed mitigation for impacts on Annex I reef within the IDRBNR SAC an Annex I pre-construction survey has been proposed. We advise that this survey should be extended across the entire red line boundary to encompass potential areas of <i>S. spinulosa</i> reef outside of designated areas given precedence under the NERC Act 2006.</p>	<p>As discussed within the ETGs, the lack of a clear signal in the geophysical data supports the absence of high quality <i>S. spinulosa</i> reef (with it being only high quality reef which shows the characteristic acoustic reflection). Notwithstanding this, to provide greater confidence in the interpretation of the geophysical data and benthic survey scope (including the results of the grab and DDV), the Applicant procured an independent analysis of the data by Envision (document 6.3.9.5) which confirms the absence of any <i>S. spinulosa</i> reef within the offshore ECC where it passes through the IDRBNR SAC.</p> <p>The final scope of the pre-construction biogenic reef survey will be agreed with the MMO post-consent.</p>
358	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Statement that the Humber Estuary SAC is designated for Harbour seals but is designated for Grey seals.</p> <p>Correct this in the submitted RIAA.</p>	The Applicant has noted this response and updated the statement in the submitted RIAA.
359	Natural England	P2_25	<p>The conclusion that the Project alone does not have an AEoI (Adverse Effect on Integrity) on the viability of Harbour porpoise, Grey and Harbour seal as a result of mortality or injury resulting from percussive piling references the mitigation detailed in the piling MMMP.</p> <p>Natural England have made comments on the piling MMMP and therefore cannot agree to this conclusion at this stage.</p> <p>Additionally Natural England have not had sight of the UXO MMMP so cannot agree that the mitigation referred to will be suitable to sufficiently reduce the risk of auditory injury. Therefore, Natural England cannot agree with the conclusion that the Project alone does not have an AEoI on the viability of these species as a result of mortality or injury resulting from UXO clearance.</p> <p>Address Natural England's comments regarding the piling MMMP and provide a UXO MMMP as part of the submitted ES.</p>	The Applicant has submitted an updated piling MMMP and a UXO MMMP as part of the application.

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard
360	Natural England	P2_25	Natural England cannot yet agree on the stage 2 conclusions presented within the draft Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment (RIAA) for both projects alone and in combination impacts. This is because it has been informed by PEIR Chapter 11: Marine mammals of the PEIR for which we have currently have considerable number of comments. The Draft RIAA needs to be revised upon consideration of our detailed comments (see below) on the PEIR Chapter 11: Marine mammals.	The Marine Mammals chapter (document 6.1.11) has been updated having taken account of the detailed comments from Natural England. The final RIAA (document 7.1) has been subsequently updated accordingly, including the revised noise modelling which has been undertaken.
361	Natural England	P2_25	Only 1 year of baseline characterisation has been presented at PEIR stage. Therefore, we cannot agree with the density estimates derived from the digital aerial surveys presented. We anticipate that the density and abundance estimates will be updated in the ES.  It will be necessary to present a baseline characterisation based on at least 2 years data in the submitted ES.	The full 2 years site specific data of digital aerial surveys have been presented in Chapter 11 Marine Mammals.
362	Natural England	P2_25	The observation of 15 mother-juvenile Harbour porpoise pairs during the baseline survey, and conclusions that the area may be used as a nursery ground for Harbour porpoise, are important. Consequently, Natural England request that the presence of mother – juvenile pairs is presented clearly in the full survey results. Evidence from literature on impacts of disturbance during these sensitive life stages should be presented. Furthermore, Natural England recommends extra consideration is given to impact assessment and mitigation to account for higher sensitivity during this life stage.  Clearly present information related to mother-juvenile pairs within the full 2-years survey results.  Clearly state findings from literature related to impacts of disturbance during sensitive life stages.  Take a precautionary approach to impact assessment and mitigation.  Ensure the HRA incorporates consideration of impacts on potential nursery grounds within the Southern North Sea SAC and investigate whether this warrants further avoidance or mitigation measures to rule out adverse effects.	The presence of mother and calves has been discussed in Chapter 11 Marine Mammals with information on sensitive life stages included. The impact assessment has account the sensitive life stages and considered the potential for calves in the area. The RIAA considers the potential nursery grounds within the Southern North Sea SAC (SNS SAC).
363	Natural England	P2_25	There is no information on the number of unidentified species recorded, or how they are apportioned into the results presented in the technical baseline annex.  The submitted ES should provide information on the number of unidentified species recorded and apportion species in discussion with Natural England in line with Phase 1 of the Natural England best practice advice.	The baseline technical report has been updated by supplementing the requested information regarding unidentified species recorded in discussion with Natural England in line with Phase 1 of the Natural England best practice advice.
364	Natural England	P2_25	Many statements in the Marine Mammals PEIR chapter do not contain references to literature. As some of these statements are used to justify the projects' impact assessment, they should be directly referenced to scientific evidence.  For example: "There appears to be little fitness cost to exposure to vessel noise and any local scale responses taken to avoid vessels." (11.7.137). This statement is disputed in Wisniewska et al. (2018) ( <a href="http://dx.doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2017.2314">http://dx.doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2017.2314</a> )  Other statements are found in sections: 11.6.87, 11.7.83, 11.7.87, 11.7.26, 11.7.42, 11.7.45, 11.7.109, 11.7.111, 11.7.136, 11.7, 168.  The submitted ES should provide a reference to the source of these statements. Where	The Applicant notes that references were supplied within the PEIR as deemed appropriate though notes that frequently these were only mentioned once within a paragraph or section of text, rather than repeated throughout. Additional references have been added to aid cross referencing to the relevant sources. Where appropriate, further studies have been included, such as Benhemma La-Gall et al., 2021 and 2023. The text has been amended for the ES. Further references have been supplemented to support the statements in paragraphs 249, 254, 324, 343 and 517 of this ES. The Applicant considers that sufficient references were previously provided within paragraphs 286, 347 - 349 and 492.

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard
			references are not available, the ES chapter should be amended to align with peer-reviewed science where needed.	
365	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Natural England recommends genuine consideration of the findings from Wisniewska (2016), as some statements in this chapter are conflicting to the results of this paper. (<a href="https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2016.03.069">https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2016.03.069</a>)</p> <p>Review Wisniewska (2016) and amend any conflicting statements in text in the submitted ES.</p>	<p>The Applicant does not dispute the fact that disturbance can result in temporary reductions in foraging. However, the Applicant cautions against putting too much weight on the conclusions from the Wisniewska (2016) paper. The paper’s title makes conclusions about vulnerability to disturbance but the paper itself only reports on the foraging behaviour and success rate whilst foraging. The paper does not cover energetic requirements of animals or explore what the observed foraging rates mean in the context of life history – only making an assertion in the Discussion (and Abstract and Title).</p> <p>Additionally, there are concerns with the methodologies used in the Wisniewska (2016) paper that bring its conclusions into question. These are summarized in a rebuttal to the original paper by Hoekendijk et al., (2018) which calls for “a cautious, critical, and rational assessment of the results and interpretations”. One of the key issues highlighted is that the porpoise were trapped in a pound net for 24+ hours before tagging and were not allowed to recover from stress and starvation once released. The high levels of foraging observed don’t necessarily represent the typical foraging – i.e. they are not necessarily indicative of vulnerability to disturbance. Foraging behaviour after release may in part be a response to being captured and held. It is typical for the initial data recorded from tags to be excluded from analysis as it is not expected to be representative of typical behaviour (e.g. Wright et al., 2017). Given that the tags on the porpoise in Wisniewska (2016) only recorded for 15-23 hours after tagging, it could be considered that all of the data are impacted by the response to being caught and tagged, and thus none of it is representative of typical behaviour. Wisniewska et al., (2018) responded to the rebuttal by Hoekendijk et al., (2018) by highlighting that it was unknown whether or not the captured porpoise fed while in the pound nets or whether this would have led to elevated stress. They state that the hunger levels of the released porpoise were unknown and that there was no evidence of prolonged response to the tagging circumstances.</p> <p>Further to this, a subsequent paper by Booth (2019) used the Wisniewska (2016) data combined with additional information on porpoise diet and the energy derived from different prey to highlight that the tagged animals likely were able to consume significant amounts of energy (well in excess of energetic requirements – based on the data available). This paper disputes the conclusion that porpoise exist on an “energetic knife-edge” as Wisniewska (2016) claims but does not justify in his paper.</p>
366	Natural England	P2_25	<p>The text in section 4.1 of Appendix 3.2 states that table 4-2 to Table 4-13 presents the modelling results for the monopile foundation modelling scenarios ‘assuming two sequential monopile installations.’ However, Table 4-3, Table 4-7, 4-11 and 4--13, indicate Sound Exposure Level from cumulative exposure (SELCum) ranges that are just from modelling a single monopile.</p> <p>Natural England requires clarification on which scenarios are being presented in these tables. The impact ranges should be presented for a single pile and for sequential piles.</p> <p>The submitted ES should provide clarification and present the impact ranges for all piling scenarios. Ensure the Worst-Case Scenario (WCS) is clearly presented.</p>	<p>Updated modelling results have been presented in the UWN Assessment (document reference: 6.3.3.2). Chapter 11 Marine Mammals has been updated accordingly.</p>
367	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Natural England defer to Cefas as the underwater noise specialists on the plausibility of the piling Permanent Threshold Shift (PTS)/ Temporary Threshold Shift (TTS) impact ranges and the UXO clearance PTS/TTS impact ranges presented in this report.</p> <p>To note.</p>	<p>This has been noted by the Applicant. The impact ranges have been presented and discussed in Chapter 11 Marine Mammals .</p>



Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard
368	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Provide justification as to why a maximum 800kg UXO size has been estimated within the Underwater Noise assessment Appendix.</p> <p>The submitted ES should provide justification for the UXO size selected.</p>	The estimation of a maximum of 800kg UXO size has been detailed in Chapter 11 Marine Mammals.
369	Natural England	P2_25	<p>The text states 'Based on agreed density estimates for each species presented in Volume 2, Appendix 3.2: Underwater Noise Assessment, the number of animals expected within the PTS onset impact range has been calculated and presented as a proportion of the relevant (estimated) population size'. Should this say 'Volume 2 Appendix 11.1 Marine Mammals technical Baseline' as no density estimates are presented in Appendix 3.2.</p> <p>The submitted ES should clarify/amend this point.</p>	This cross reference has been amended.
370	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Natural England request to be consulted on any geophysical survey applications for the project.</p> <p>Please consult Natural England on any geophysical surveys for the project.</p>	This has been noted by the Applicant.
371	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Natural England notes that an indicative assessment has been provided for UXO clearance within this document and that a separate Marine Licence will be submitted when more information on the number and size of UXOs (Unexploded Ordnance) in the area become available. We agree with this approach.</p> <p>No further action needed</p>	This has been noted by the Applicant.
372	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Natural England have not had sight of a UXO marine mammal mitigation plan (MMMP); therefore, we cannot agree that the mitigation will be suitable to sufficiently reduce the risk of permanent threshold shift (PTS) and temporary threshold shift (TTS) injury at this stage.</p> <p>Please provide a draft UXO MMMP as part of the submitted ES.</p>	A draft UXO MMMP has been submitted as part of the application.
373	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Natural England does not agree with the assigned 'Negligible' magnitude for PTS from UXO clearance and piling. Considering that the PTS constitutes irreversible hearing damage, more appropriate magnitude would be 'Medium', as per the definition provided in Table 11.9. With the implementation of appropriate mitigation measures, we advise that the residual magnitude could be reduced to 'Low'.</p> <p>Amend the submitted ES accordingly.</p>	The Project's Outline MMMP for Piling Activities (document reference 8.6.1) and Outline MMMP for UXO Clearance (document reference 8.6.2) detail the potential mitigation measures which may be proposed in order to reduce the risk of PTS auditory injury to marine mammal from these operations to as low as reasonably practicable. The final MMMPs for the Project will be approved by the regulator and their advisors prior to the noisy activities occurring. Therefore, the Applicant is confident that this would equate to an impact of 'negligible' magnitude.
374	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Natural England considers that the assigned magnitude and sensitivity is downplayed throughout the assessment (for the project alone and the cumulative assessment) for all species and especially for Harbour porpoise. Thus, we recommend that the assigned scores are revised to consider the sensitivity of marine mammals to underwater noise, especially when it comes to impacts of UXO clearance and piling.</p> <p>Also, there does not seem to be a 'hierarchy' of assigned scores between high and low impact activities. For example, sensitivity score 'Low' is assigned for PTS from UXO clearance and piling as well as for disturbance from other construction activities, despite these impacts being substantially different.</p> <p>Review assigned magnitude and sensitivity scores for all species and update the submitted ES accordingly.</p>	<p>Magnitude scores have been presented both pre- and post-mitigation for clarity in Chapter 11 Marine Mammals. The definition text for the Project is the same as has been used by previous projects and agreed with Natural England, only the terminology ranking for magnitude differed. The magnitude scores have been renamed to align with other projects after discussions with Natural England and the levels of sensitivity are therefore the same.</p> <p>Whilst the impacts are different, this does not preclude the sensitivity of the receptor being assessed as the same as it is dependent on how the receptor reacts to the impact and what consequences may arise from the impact. Full justifications for the magnitude and sensitivity scores are provided within the assessment.</p>
375	Natural England	P2_25	<p>For impacts to bottlenose dolphin the texts states that the applicant is considering 'two different density estimates: 0.002 dolphins/km<sup>2</sup> (throughout entire impact range) and 0.110 dolphins/km<sup>2</sup> (2km from coast)' to account for the east coast Scottish population (associated with the Moray Firth SAC).</p> <p>However, throughout the impact assessment there only seems to be one density estimate used and only one figure for each assessed impact presented for bottlenose dolphin. If two density estimates are being used, then both should be presented within the impact</p>	<p>The relevant tables in Chapter 11 Marine Mammals have been updated to more clearly present the quantitative impact assessment using two different density estimates for bottlenose dolphins, which are 0.0419 dolphin/km<sup>2</sup> for Project study area and offshore region, and 0.110 dolphin/km<sup>2</sup> as a highly precautionary estimate of dolphins within 2km of the coast of northeast England in consideration of coastal dolphin population density estimates for the Coastal East Scotland MU.</p> <p>The Coastal East Scotland (CES) MU has been used for reference population for bottlenose dolphin associated with the Moray Firth SAC in the RIAA.</p>

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard
			assessment.  Furthermore, for bottlenose dolphin associated with the Moray Firth SAC, the Coastal East Scotland (CES) management unit (MU) should be used for the reference population.	
376	Natural England	P2_25	The Harbour porpoise dose response curve has been applied for all cetaceans. Whilst this is considered precautionary for dolphin species, there is no evidence that minke whale respond in the same way. Natural England advise that the applicant keeps the evidence base under review and utilise more appropriate methods should they become available.  Keep the literature based on disturbance under review and utilise more appropriate methods for the submitted ES should they	The level B harassment threshold, which appears to be a more applicable parameter, as was derived from grey whale responses to seismic surveys, has been considered for disturbance from piling for minke whales and explained in Chapter 11 Marine Mammals.
377	Natural England	P2_25	Natural England note that the applicant has presented multiple methods of assessing disturbance from UXO clearance including 26km EDR (Effective Deterrent Ranges) for high order (for all species), 5km EDR for low order (for all species) and TTS onset as a proxy for disturbance. As highlighted in the text (and in previous discussions). Natural England do not consider TTS as a suitable proxy for disturbance and therefore will be considering the worst-case scenario (26km EDR approach).  Consider using the 26km EDR for disturbance effects in the submitted ES. Keep the literature base on disturbance under review and utilise more appropriate methods for the submitted ES should they become available.	This is noted by the Applicant and the Applicant will continue to present all options for disturbance from UXO in the absence of established guidance. No new methods have been identified since PEIR; therefore no update has been made to the methods presented.
378	Natural England	P2_25	Figures 11.21 and 11.23 of the Marine Mammals PEIR Chapter show the results of the behavioural disturbance noise contours for Harbour/Grey seal overlain on Carter et al., 2022 at-sea density estimates. Section 11.7.68 states that the worst-case scenario is predicted to occur at the SW location for Harbour seal and section 11.7.80 states that the NW (Northwest) location is worst for Grey seal. However, both figures show the disturbance contours being modelled at the NE location. Clarification should be provided as to which location disturbance has been modelled for each seal species. The worst-case disturbance scenario (considering the at sea density estimates) should be presented and used in the assessment.  Review the disturbance modelling for seals and present the worst-case scenario with regards to at sea densities in the submitted ES.	The figures have been updated for clarity, however it should be noted that the assessments presented in the PEIR were based on the maximum number of individual disturbance, rather than the value for the Northeast (NE) location (which had the largest impact ranges).
379	Natural England	P2_25	The offshore reactive compensation platform (ORCP) area has the potential to cause more disturbance to Harbour seal given its proximity to the Wash population (potentially up to 4.22% of the MU). Natural England therefore do not agree that this should be considered as low magnitude, especially giving the recent population decline of Harbour seal in this population. A figure showing the disturbance contours for Harbour seals at the ORCP area (similar to the one presented for the main array area) is needed.	The ES assessment has been updated based on the revised noise modelling for the Project. The justification for the magnitude of effect is described in Chapter 11 Marine Mammals.
380	Natural England	P2_25	Table 11.7 states that during construction the peak number of vessels in a given 5km <sup>2</sup> area is 8, whilst Para.11.7.175 it says up to 10 vessels per 5km <sup>2</sup> .  Review and clarify what the peak number of vessels per 5km <sup>2</sup> area is during construction and operation and use this information in the submitted ES.	The numbers presented have been updated accordingly to confirm the peak number of vessel in a given 5km <sup>2</sup> is 10.
381	Natural England	P2_25	The vessel collision risk impact assessment is brief and could be presented in more depth. Additionally Natural England have not been provided the Vessel Management Plan (VMP) and therefore cannot agree at this stage that it will sufficiently minimise the potential for any potential collision risk.	Further information has been detailed in Outline VMP (document reference 8.20) submitted as part of the application. The Applicant has used the Humber ports as an indicative construction base and therefore collision risk is based on that basis and the standard mitigations for VMP, such as following existing routes where possible, are included.

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard
			Please provide a more thorough assessment of vessel collision risk in the submitted ES. We also recommend that a draft VMP is provided within the submitted ES.	
382	Natural England	P2_25	The statement in this para. 11.7.126 on the presence of the novel vessels on site (“The introduction of additional vessels during construction of the Project is not a novel impact for marine mammals present in the area”) seems contrary to the statement made in paragraph 11.7.87. This states that “In addition to this mitigation, it is also likely that the presence of novel vessels and associated construction activity will ensure that the vicinity of the pile is free of Harbour porpoise by the time that piling begins.” The former statement suggests that Harbour porpoises are habituated to the presence of vessels, while the latter suggests that the vessels on site do disturb and deter the animals prior to the construction activities.	This section has been revised for further clarification.
383	Natural England	P2_25	As mentioned in previous comments, Natural England have not been provided with the VMP and therefore cannot agree at this stage that it will sufficiently minimise the potential for impact from vessel disturbance. Please provide a draft VMP as part of the submitted ES.	The Applicant has submitted an Outline VMP as part of the application.
384	Natural England	P2_25	Assigned magnitude ‘Negligible’ is not sufficiently precautionary given the importance of prey to marine mammals, thus we would advise that this is revised to ‘Low’. Please update presented magnitude in the submitted ES.	The magnitude has been updated accordingly.
385	Natural England	P2_25	Given the uncertainty around the noise emitted by the larger turbines, we are not confident in the statement “...it is unlikely that operational noise is expected to be of a level that would result in any disturbance effect.” Thus, it would be more precautionary to assign ‘Low’ magnitude for disturbance instead of ‘Negligible’.  Review and provide further evidence to support the statement or amend the conclusion in the submitted ES.	The magnitude score has remained as Negligible and is detailed in Chapter 11 Marine Mammals.
386	Natural England	P2_25	Natural England notes that the locations for the construction (and operation/maintenance) ports have not been confirmed. Therefore, Natural England do not agree that disturbance at seal haul out sites can be assessed as having a ‘negligible impact’ until more information is provided regarding these locations. Provide port locations or likely options in the submitted ES and review the likely level of disturbance to seal haul-out sites from each location.	As outlined in the Outline VMP submitted as part of the application, the Applicant has used the Humber ports as an indicative construction base and therefore collision risk is based on that basis and the standard mitigations for VMP, such as following existing routes where possible, are included.
387	Natural England	P2_25	As Natural England have advised that changes to prey should be assigned a ‘Low’ significance as opposed to ‘Negligible’ this impact should also be considered in the cumulative assessment. Include ‘Changes to Prey’ in the cumulative assessment	The relevant table in Chapter 11 Marine Mammals has been updated accordingly.
388	Natural England	P2_25	Natural England recommend that collision risk is scoped into the cumulative assessment and the draft VMP is provided for review. Include collision risk in the cumulative assessment and provide the draft VMP in the submitted ES.	The Applicant has submitted an Outline VMP as part of the application.
389	Natural England	P2_25	Provide justification to why ‘it has been assumed that four seismic surveys could be conducted within the North Sea at any one time’. Provide justification for the assumption in the submitted ES.	The Applicant has provided justification in Chapter 11 Marine Mammals
390	Natural England	P2_25	Berwickshire and North Northumberland Coast SAC has only been screened in for vessel presence disturbance for the in-combination assessment, and not for any other impact or for the project alone assessment. Insufficient justification has been provided as to why certain impact pathways have been screened out for this site. Natural England advise that this SAC for Grey seals should be fully considered in the assessment.  Additionally, as the inshore bottlenose dolphin associated with the Moray Firth SAC are being considered in the assessment (see previous comments), we recommend that the Moray Firth SAC should also be screened into the HRA. Whilst the authority for the provision	The Applicant has noted this response and additional justification has been provided.  This has been noted by the Applicant and relevant amends have been made to the RIAA.

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard
			<p>of advice on SACs located within Scotland is with NatureScot, populations of bottlenose dolphin associated with this MPA have been recorded frequently in English waters.</p> <p>The submitted RIAA should provide justification for screening out other impact pathways for the Berwickshire and North Northumberland Coast SAC Grey seal feature.</p> <p>Screen in the bottlenose dolphin populations of the Moray Firth SAC for LSE (Likely Significant Effect).</p>	
391	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Changes to prey have only been screened in for Harbour Porpoise and the SNS SAC and not for any other sites/features in the project alone assessment. There should be consideration of how changes to prey could impact seals foraging at sea outside of their SAC boundary.</p> <p>Screen in relevant seal SACs into the submitted RIAA or provide justification as to why 'Changes to Prey' has been screened out for Grey and Harbour seal SACs.</p>	This has been noted by the Applicant and relevant amends have been made to the RIAA.
392	Natural England	P2_25	To note: Natural England notes that the carbon capture and storage projects will be assessed in-combination in the final RIAA.	The Applicant has noted this response.
393	Natural England	P2_25	Natural England welcome that a Draft Site Integrity Plan (SIP) will be provided at the DCO (Development Consent Order) Stage. We will comment on this when it is provided.	The Applicant has noted this response.
394	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Natural England cannot agree on the conclusions of the HRA (Stage 2) for both the project alone and in combination. This is because it has been informed by PEIR Chapter 11: Marine mammals for which we have a considerate number of comments (see above comments). The HRA within the submitted RIAA needs to be revised upon consideration of our comments on the volume 1, chapter 11: Marine mammals of the PEIR</p>	The Applicant has noted this response.
395	Natural England	P2_25	To note: Natural England notes that no project level separation distance (for piling) has been set but that 'there remains potential for a separation distance to be applied to the Project as mitigation, if required.' Natural England request to be included in any further discussions regarding a potential piling separation distance.	This has been noted by the Applicant.
396	Natural England	P2_25	<p>There are multiple incidences throughout the RIAA where Harbour seals have been mistakenly mentioned in sections that are focusing on Grey seals.</p> <p>Amend in the submitted RIAA.</p>	This has been noted by the Applicant and relevant amends have been made to the RIAA.
397	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Insufficient justification has been presented as to why for the O&amp;M stage of the project alone assessment, seals have been screened out for underwater noise impacts.</p> <p>Screen in or provide justification for screening out in the submitted RIAA.</p>	This has been noted by the Applicant and relevant amends have been made to the RIAA.
398	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Natural England have not been provided with the VMP (Vessel Management Plan) and therefore are unable to assess its suitability at reducing collision risk. Therefore, Natural England advise that collision risk is screened into the in-combination assessment and that the VMP is provided for review.</p> <p>Include collision risk in the in-combination assessment and provide the VMP as part of the submitted ES.</p>	Collision risk has been included in Chapter 11 Marine Mammals accordingly. The Applicant has submitted an Outline VMP as part of the application.
399	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Natural England note that auditory injury from underwater noise has not been included in the in-combination assessment as 'mitigation will be put in place to reduce injury risk.'</p> <p>Natural England's agreement of this approach is subject to agreement of the mitigation. Please refer to comments regarding the piling MMMP and absence of UXO MMMP.</p> <p>Refer to above comments regarding piling and UXO MMMP's.</p>	This is noted by the Project. See Outline MMMP for piling activities (document references 8.6.1) and Outline MMMP for UXO clearance (document reference 8.6.2) submitted with the DCO application. Underwater noise has been assessed in Chapter 11 Marine Mammals and the significance conclusions are presented for both unmitigated and mitigated piling and UXO clearance.
400	Natural England	P2_25	<p>As Natural England have advised that changes to prey should be assigned a 'Low' significance as opposed to 'Negligible' (see previous PEIR comments), this impact should also be considered in-combination.</p> <p>Include 'Changes to Prey' in the in-combination assessment in the submitted RIAA.</p>	The Applicants notes that it considers that as there are no adverse effects identified on any fish species, there is no potential effect on prey alone or in-combination.



Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard
401	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Para. states that the time period considered for the in-combination assessment is 2022-2030 inclusive. For the cumulative assessment in Chapter 11 section 11.8.5 it states that the time period considered is 2022-2032 inclusive. It is unclear why these two periods differ.</p> <p>The submitted RIAA should provide clarification on why time periods differ for the cumulative assessment and the in-combination assessment or make these assessments consistent.</p>	The Applicant notes this response. All application documents have been updated and are based on an updated outline programme presented in Chapter 3 Project Description (document reference 6.1.3).
402	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Dogger Bank South (East and West) are not included on this map. Add these OWFs to Figure 11.2.</p>	This is noted by the Applicant.
403	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Given the potential for seasonal and daily exceedance of the thresholds, Natural England advise that the applicant consider noise abatement measures to reduce impacts from underwater noise. Once the final assessment is received, we can comment in more detail on specific noise abatement measures that might be appropriate.</p> <p>Consider the use of noise abatement measures to reduce underwater noise impacts and include these measures 'up front' as part of the submitted ES.</p>	This is noted by the Applicant. The Applicant does not rule out the use of noise abatement measures, further details can be found in the Outline Marine Mammal Mitigation Protocol Piling (document reference 8.6.1).
404	Natural England	P2_25	<p>The Harbour seal population associated with the Wash and North Norfolk Coast SAC has undergone a notable decline in recent years. Natural England has updated their supplementary advice to conservation objectives (SACOs) relating to this site and we consider this feature to be unfavourable. As a result, developers must ensure that their proposals do not hinder the population's ability to recover to a favourable status. Natural England consider that whilst this unfavourable condition has been considered to a certain extent within the HRA, its significance has been downplayed and it has not been sufficiently considered within the assessment. Further discussion is needed on how this can be appropriately included in the assessment. For example, whether the threshold for a significant impact should be set lower for this specific SAC population, given the "Restore" target and the requirement to not hinder the conservation objectives.</p> <p>Further discussion of the assessment of Harbour seal associated with the WNNC SAC is needed in future ETG (Expert Topic Group) meetings in light of the current population decline, and agreement on a suitable impact assessment method sought to inform the submitted ES.</p>	The Applicant discussed the proposed impact assessment methodology with Natural England through the ETGs. The RIAA (document 7.1) notes the current status of the harbour seal population within the WNNC SAC and includes a greater consideration of the potential impacts to these individuals.
405	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Soft start duration is recorded as 600s. JNCC recommends the soft-start duration for piling of monopiles and pin-piles is at least 20 minutes (1200s) (JNCC (2010) 'Statutory nature conservation agency protocol for minimising the risk of injury to marine mammals from piling noise'). Amend soft start duration in the submitted outline MMMP to align with JNCC guidance.</p>	<p>The Project notes that JNCC (2010) defines the soft-start as: "the gradual ramping up of piling power, incrementally over a set time period, until full operational power is achieved."</p> <p>Under this definition, the full operational power at the Project is not reached until 6,000 sec (100 min) after the first blow (as outlined in the UWN Assessment (document reference 6.3.3.2)).</p>
406	Natural England	P2_25	<p>To note: Natural England acknowledges that a detailed communication protocol will be published in the final MMMP. We will review this when provided.</p>	The Applicant has noted this response.
407	Natural England	P2_25	<p>No information is provided to confirm the Marine Mammal Observers (MMOs) will have standard required qualifications and experience, understand the mitigation procedures of the project, and have all the necessary equipment to effectively carryout the mitigation. Expertise requirements for MMOs should be confirmed in the final version of the MMMP.</p>	The Project confirms that expertise and equipment requirements for MMObs will be confirmed in the final versions of the Piling and UXO Clearance MMMPs post-consent.
408	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Limited information has been presented on the procedure following a break in piling. In the final MMMP provide detail and include the actions taken if a break in piling occurs during reduced visibility (i.e., during fog, night-time, and increased sea state). In the final version of the MMMP provide a detailed protocol for when a break in piling occurs.</p>	As stated in the Outline MMMP for Piling Activities (document reference: 8.6.1), the Project will confirm the final procedure for breaks in piling, with input from the piling contractor and SNCBs, and present this information in the Final Piling MMMP post-consent.
409	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Natural England considers that the assigned magnitude and sensitivity has been downplayed throughout the assessment. Thus, we recommend that the assigned scores are revised to take into account the sensitivity of all species to underwater noise, especially when it comes</p>	This is noted by the Applicant. The Applicant has set out the magnetite and sensitivity scores in relevant ES chapters following the completion of further technical assessment, in accordance with Chapter 5 EIA Methodology (document reference 6.15).

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard
			to impacts of Unexploded Ordnance (UXO) clearance and piling. Also, there does not seem to be a 'hierarchy' of assigned scores between high and low impact activities. For example, sensitivity score 'Low' is assigned for Permanent Threshold Shift (PTS) from UXO clearance and piling as well as for disturbance from other construction activities, despite these impacts being substantially different. This requires revisiting. Review assigned magnitude and sensitivity scores and update the assessments for the submitted Environmental Statement (ES) accordingly.	
410	Natural England	P2_25	<p>The maximum design scenario detailed in Table 11.7 of Chapter 11 of the PEIR states that there will be a maximum of 2 monopile events per day of which there could be a maximum of 2 simultaneous piling events/day. Similarly in section 11.3.27 of the RIAA it indicates that 'Piling may be consecutive (single piling event per 24-hours) or concurrent (up to two piling rigs per 24-hours)'. In the Underwater Noise Assessment (Volume 2, Appendix 3.2) sequential modelling is also referred to but is not mentioned in these design scenarios. It is not clear how sequential piling fits into the described scenarios.</p> <p>The submitted ES should provide clarification on the different piling scenarios. And make sure that terminology is clearly defined and used consistently across reports.</p>	The Applicant has provided detail of piling scenarios in Chapter 3 Project Description (document reference 6.1.3), and where relevant in technical chapters.
411	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Survey data: 18 months of Digital Aerial Survey data are currently available to inform baseline characterisation. Although a further 6 months have been collected, they are not presented and analysed for review in the PEIR and associated documents.</p> <p>Natural England advises that 24 months of survey effort is the minimum expected evidence standard for both bird and marine mammal data. Therefore, NE cannot make any conclusive judgements based on this PEIR and accordingly, our advice focuses on the methodologies employed.</p>	24 months of survey data has been used to inform the baseline characterisation.
412	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Abundance and density estimates: Natural England note that only design-based methods have been used to estimate abundance and density.</p> <p>Natural England advise the use of model-based (e.g. MRSea) estimates to be presented alongside the design-based outputs. We advise that model-based estimates may be particularly useful in identifying high risk areas when considering the array area reduction.</p>	This is noted by the Applicant. Methods of analysis are described in Chapter 12 Offshore and Intertidal Ornithology (document reference 6.1.12), and in Appendices 12.1, 12.2, 12.3 and 12.4 (document references 6.3.12.1 – 6.3.12.4).
413	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Population scales: Natural England advises that, for the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), the key assessment should be an annual assessment of impact at the largest population size, and note that in the case of kittiwake, guillemot and puffin, the largest Biologically Defined Minimum Population Scale (BDMPS) is in the breeding season.</p> <p>Natural England advise that the reference populations recommended by Natural England are used to assess impacts for EIA in the submitted ES.</p>	Chapter 12 Offshore and Intertidal Ornithology (document reference 6.1.12).
414	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Calculation of baseline mortality: Natural England note that the demographic rates used to calculate 'average mortality' differ from those presented in Horswill &amp; Robinson (2015) for some species.</p> <p>The submitted Environmental Statement (ES) should provide more information regarding the method by which the various age classes, age class ratios and resulting mortality rates have been determined/calculated using the data from Horswill &amp; Robinson (2015).</p>	The Applicant has presented results from the Applicant's approach, and where different, from Natural England's preferred approach as well within Chapter 12 Offshore and Intertidal Ornithology (document reference 6.1.12).
415	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Bioseasons: use of the 'migration free' breeding seasons for species within foraging range, and use of the 'migration free' winter for red-throated diver.</p> <p>Natural England advise using the full breeding season for species within mean maximum + 1 SD foraging range, and a winter period of September to April for red-throated diver. In order</p>	The Applicant discussed the proposed approach to bioseasons with Natural England through the ETGs and where agreement has not been gained on the approach to use, has presented both the Applicant's and Natural England's approach.

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard
			for Natural England to provide advice into the Examination, the submitted ES will need to present assessment outputs based on our advised seasons.	
416	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Displacement: Construction and maintenance vessel routes and their potential to overlap with SPAs has not been considered.</p> <p>Natural England advises that the submitted ES should give some indication of the ports from which construction and maintenance ('O&amp;M') vessels are likely to transit, as well as the likely increase in vessels activity. If construction and O&amp;M bases are likely to be located adjacent to SPAs, and therefore transit routes have the potential to overlap with SPAs, consideration should be given to the potential impact of increase in vessel activity on these SPAs within the RIAA. This is of particular relevance to sites classified for non-breeding red-throated diver (RTD)</p>	This is noted by the Applicant. The Applicant has not yet selected construction or operation and maintenance ports. However, the Applicant has committed to the implantation of a Vessel Management Plan and provided an Outline Vessel Management Plan (document reference 8.20).
417	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Level of precaution within the assessments: throughout the PEIR documents, various justifications have been presented for why the applicant believes their assessment for each species can be considered 'over-precautionary' or 'highly over-precautionary'. Natural England do not feel it useful to comment on each individual justification provided within the PEIR; we have, however, addressed a few of these arguments, specifically with regards to collision risk and as-built vs. as-consented parameters, in the detailed comments below. It is also worth noting that the two years of baseline characterisation surveys are temporally and spatially restricted, and only provides a 'snapshot' of the baseline environment, hence the need for some level of precaution within the assessment.</p> <p>Please note. We highlight that prolonged discussions within previous Examinations regarding the extent of precaution in assessments have tended to delay rather than facilitate issue resolution.</p>	This is noted by the Applicant.
418	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Assessment of impacts: Natural England notes that no further consideration has been given within the EIA to seabird impacts assessed as exceeding the 1% threshold of baseline mortality, beyond justifications for why the assessment can be considered over-precautionary (see comment above).</p> <p>Natural England's advises that any impacts exceeding the 1% threshold of baseline mortality should be given further consideration, e.g. through population modelling or updates to previous population modelling for EIA scale impacts, to determine the significance of the mortality for the population in question.</p>	Where applicable, and in line with Natural England's advice, PVA has been undertaken for both the EIA and RIAA for the relevant species, with the results presented within the Offshore and Intertidal Ornithology chapter (document 6.1.12) and the RIAA (document 7.1).
419	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Projects with impacts considered to be negligible have been screened out of the cumulative and in-combination assessments.</p> <p>Natural England advise that all relevant project-alone impacts are considered when calculating cumulative and in-combination totals i.e., impacts deemed to be negligible alone should not be scoped out. This is to counter the risk that many such impacts could become significant when considered as a whole.</p>	The approach to screening of impacts for the cumulative and in-combination assessments has been updated, with the proposed approach having been discussed with Natural England through the ETGs.
420	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Whilst Natural England welcomes the development of proposed without prejudice compensatory measures by the project, we advise that, should the project be required to proceed with any of the measures, each will need considerably further development from that which is currently presented. For any of the measures to be considered viable, the project will need to demonstrate each can be effectively evidenced, defined and secured.</p> <p>In order for Natural England to be able to support proposed compensation measures we need to have full confidence that the measures will deliver the required level of compensation in relation to the level of impact caused by the project.</p> <p>Accordingly, for all proposed compensation measures, the project should provide more</p>	The Applicant has provided more detailed information on the specific nature of the relevant measures within the Compensation Plans and Evidence Base and Road Map documents submitted as part of the DCO application. The Applicant notes that in the case of bycatch reduction for guillemot and razorbill this measure has not been progressed further at this point.

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard
			detailed information on the specific nature of the measure, its proposed location and detailed design parameters. Additionally, in the case of the compensation measures proposed for guillemot and razorbill, particularly bycatch reduction, there is an ongoing need for the project to bring forward evidence to demonstrate that measures can provide effective compensation.	
421	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Comment - Only 18 months of Digital Aerial Survey data are available. Although a further 6 months have been collected, they are not presented and analysed for review in the PEIR and associated documents.</p> <p>Recommendation - Natural England highlights the risk that the additional data analysis could have the potential to change the conclusions of the submitted ES from those set out in the PEIR, and raise new issues not flagged by the PEIR assessments.</p> <p>More generally, NE advises that 24 months of survey effort is the minimum expected evidence standard for bird and marine mammal data and that accordingly the baseline characterisation in the submitted ES must meet this minimum requirement.</p>	This is noted by the Applicant. The ES and DCO application documents include 30 months Digital Aerial Survey data in relation to ornithology.
422	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Comment - It is acknowledged within the PEIR that disturbance and displacement of seabirds may be caused by, amongst other things, "the physical presence of partially or wholly constructed but not operational WTGs or other installed infrastructure". However, contradicting this is the assumption laid out in section 12.7.12 that "potential displacement will only occur in the array area and Offshore ECC, where vessels and construction activities are present". Furthermore, Table 12.10 showing the 'Maximum design scenario for Impact 2: Disturbance and displacement: Array' only considers the impact from vessel activity and not the displacement caused by the presence of turbines within the array, which will incrementally increase as the array is built.</p> <p>Recommendation - Amend section 12.7.12 and Table 12.10 in the submitted ES as appropriate to make it clear whether displacement from non-operational WTGs has been considered for the construction phase impacts. NE advises that array construction displacement impacts should be calculated as being 50% of the operational displacement impacts to account for incremental development over the construction period.</p>	The Applicant has updated the impact assessment to make the definition of displacement clearer and has used the recommended 50% of operational displacement impacts for the construction phase assessment.
423	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Comment - Natural England's best practice guidance states: "Tables of abundance and density estimates should be presented separately for birds in flight, birds on the water, and all birds."</p> <p>Recommendation - The submitted ES should present separate abundance and density estimates for birds in flight, birds on the water, and all birds.</p>	This is noted by the Applicant – the requested data tables have been presented within the technical appendices underpinning the impact assessments.
424	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Comment - Lawson et al. (2016) has been used to assess the densities and distributions of red-throated diver and common scoter within the ECC. Natural England agree that this is currently the most appropriate data set to use, however we highlight that further surveys of the Greater Wash SPA were conducted over winter 2022/23 and that this data should be available within the next few months.</p> <p>Recommendation - When this data becomes available it will be shared with the applicant; Natural England advises that this data should be used within the submitted ES to calculate impacts on Greater Wash SPA RTD within the ECC.</p>	The Applicant is not aware of this data having become available and therefore has not been able to be incorporated into the assessment. As such, Lawson et al. (2016) remains the most appropriate data source to be used at this current time.



Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard
425	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Comment - Natural England note that the applicant has thus far only used design-based methods to calculate population estimates.</p> <p>Recommendation - Natural England also advise the use of model-based (e.g. MRSea) estimates, and that design-based outputs are presented in the submitted ES alongside model-based outputs, along with distribution maps of the raw survey data. Evidence of the suitability of any novel modelling method should be presented.</p> <p>We also reiterate our advice provided during previous expert topic group (ETG) meetings that the additional use of model-based estimates may aid in identifying high risk areas when considering the array area reduction.</p>	MRSea model outputs were used by the Applicant to identify the highest density areas within the array area for guillemot, with this data having informed the changes to the array area between PEIR and ES, as detailed within the Site Selection and Alternatives Assessment (document 6.1.4).
426	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Comment - Peak estimates stated within the text for each species do not consistently match with the figures presented within the tables. For example, in section 12.3.81 the text states that "In the array area plus 4km buffer, red-throated diver numbers were similarly greatest during the return migration bio-season, with a peak abundance of 269 birds and peak density of 0.29 birds/km2 (Table 12.32)." whilst Table 12.32 shows a figure of 295 and 0.32 respectively. Furthermore, these figures do not match those presented within Ch12 Table 12.8 which show a seasonal abundance for the return migration bio-season of 217.</p> <p>Recommendation - Please ensure any errors in the text and/or tables in both Ch12 and Appendix 12.1 are corrected in the submitted ES.</p>	This is noted by the Applicant, the impact assessment has been updated with all values amended to reflect the greater data availability to inform the DCO Application.
427	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Comment - Construction and operation &amp; maintenance vessel routes have not been considered.</p> <p>Recommendation - Natural England advises that the submitted ES should give some indication as to the ports from which construction and maintenance vessels are likely to transit, as well as the likely increase in vessels activity. If construction and O&amp;M bases are likely to be located adjacent to SPAs, and therefore transit routes have the potential to overlap with SPAs, consideration should be given to the potential impact of increase in vessel activity on these SPAs within the RIAA. This is particularly relevant to SPAs classified for non-breeding RTD.</p>	This is noted by the Applicant. The Applicant has not yet selected construction or operation and maintenance ports. However, the Applicant has committed to the implantation of a Vessel Management Plan and provided an Outline Vessel Management Plan (document reference 8.20).
428	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Comment - Natural England agrees with the inclusion of kittiwake, greater black-backed gull, lesser black-backed gull, herring gull, sandwich tern and gannet for consideration of collision risk, and welcomes the intention of the applicant to reassess the status of all species following review of the 24 months of DAS data to determine if any additional species require assessment of collision impacts.</p>	This is noted by the Applicant.
429	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Comment - Natural England note that it is stated within Table 12.3 (Summary of consultation relating to Intertidal and Offshore Ornithology) that common gull has been screened out for collision whilst Table 12.33 shows it as having been screened in for collision during the O&amp;M phase.</p> <p>Recommendation - The submitted ES should confirm whether common gull has been screened in or out for collision risk during the O&amp;M phase, and whether or not they are being assessed using migratory CRM only.</p>	The Applicant confirms that common gull has been screened out for both CRM and migratory CRM, as set out within the relevant appendices to the ES (document reference 6.3.12.2 and 6.3.12.5 respectively).
430	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Comment - Bioseasons: the migration-free breeding season has been used for kittiwake, gannet and sandwich tern. Natural England's advice is that the full breeding season should be used for species within mean maximum + 1 SD foraging range.</p> <p>Recommendation - Natural England advise using the full breeding season for species within mean maximum + 1 SD foraging range, and a winter period of September to April for red-</p>	The Applicant discussed the proposed approach to bioseasons with Natural England through the ETGs and where agreement has not been gained on the approach to use, has presented both the Applicant's and Natural England's approach.

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard
			throated diver. In order for Natural England to provide advice into the Examination, the submitted ES will need to present assessment outputs based on our advised seasons.	
431	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Comment - Operational displacement: Natural England note that the displacement matrices presented in this section are derived from central abundance estimates alone. We advise that matrices are also presented of the upper and lower confidence intervals, so that the full range of impact scenarios can be understood.</p> <p>Recommendation - The submitted ES should present matrices of the upper and lower confidence intervals for each species considered within the operational displacement assessment.</p>	The Applicant considers the mean abundance estimate to be most appropriate for the displacement assessment, however, the Project has included upper confidence limits (at a minimum) within the displacement assessment appendix (document reference 6.3.12.3).
432	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Comment - Red-throated diver: it is stated that 'a mortality rate of 1% and a displacement rate of 50% were chosen for assessment of red-throated diver'. It should be noted that Natural England's advised displacement and mortality rates for red-throated diver within the array are 100% displacement and 1-10% mortality.</p> <p>Nonetheless, the applicant has presented displacement estimates based on 100% displacement and 1% mortality, and 90-100% displacement and 1-10% mortality, within Table 12.23.</p> <p>Recommendation - No action required as the applicant has presented the Natural England advised rates alongside their own preferred rates. Note that Natural England will consider the potential impacts over a range of mortality and displacement rates and that impacts leading to &gt;1% increase in baseline mortality arising within those ranges are likely to require further investigation.</p>	This is noted by the Applicant.
433	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Comment - Collision risk: amongst the various justifications put forward by the applicant in support of their argument that the assessment of collision risk is considered precautionary/over-precautionary are the studies at Thanet OWF and at Aberdeen Offshore Wind Farm. The SNCB's are aware of the recent studies at Aberdeen Bay and Thanet Offshore wind farms that have shown low to zero collisions between seabirds and turbine blades during operation of the arrays. Whilst these results add to the evidence base around the frequency and magnitude of collision risk, for a number of reasons we do not consider them to provide sufficient or robust evidence to alter our current advice. The studies themselves are of small scale arrays (or of a small number of turbines in larger arrays), in areas of relatively low bird density where relatively few collisions would have been expected in any case and/or in areas where species composition and behaviours are atypical of more offshore sites. They do not therefore, provide sufficient evidence to draw wider conclusions on collision risk for other projects.</p> <p>Recommendation - To note.</p>	This is noted by the Applicant.
434	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Comment - There is no mention within Ch12 of the use of population viability modelling for those species where the increase in baseline mortality exceeds 1% (though it is considered within the draft RIAA). Natural England's best practice advises that any impacts exceeding the 1% threshold of baseline mortality be given further consideration, e.g. through population modelling, to determine the significance of the mortality for the population in question at both HRA and EIA-level assessments. Natural England does not consider the applicant's arguments for why the assessment can be considered over-precautionary as 'further consideration' of impacts at this level.</p>	Where applicable, and in line with Natural England's advice, PVA has been undertaken for both the EIA and RIAA for the relevant species, with the results presented within the Offshore and Intertidal Ornithology chapter (document 6.1.12) and the RIAA (document 7.1).

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard
			Recommendation - Further consideration, e.g. through population modelling, should be given to any impacts exceeding the 1% threshold of baseline mortality, updating existing modelling where appropriate.	
435	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Comment - Cumulative collision risk: amongst the various justifications put forward by the applicant in support of their argument that the assessment of collision risk can be considered precautionary/over-precautionary is that the cumulative assessment is based on as-consented parameters and that as-built parameters are 'more realistic'. This is particularly relevant to sandwich tern, where the applicant has provided two scenarios for impacts, but is also relevant to where the applicant has used the difference in as-built vs. as-consented parameters as an argument for the assessment being over-precautionary.</p> <p>Recommendation - Natural England are actively engaged with industry considering ways that 'as-built' parameters can be used within assessments. However, at present we do not consider it appropriate to reduce impact estimates by considering as-built parameters, unless they can be shown to be legally secured through the DCO licence. In the meantime, we recommend reviewing Natural England's submissions into the Sheringham shoal and Dudgeon Extensions Examination (SEP &amp; DEP) regarding this matter and Sandwich tern.</p>	This is noted by the Applicant.
436	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Comment - Cumulative effects: Natural England note that, when the applicant produce their submitted ES, the most recent agreed cumulative assessment is likely to be that produced for the Hornsea 4 and SEP &amp; DEP projects and advise that the applicant refer to the list of projects considered and the agreed cumulative totals from these projects in their own cumulative assessment.</p> <p>Natural England note that we have been unable to rule out significant adverse impacts at the EIA scale for gannet, kittiwake, great black-backed gull, guillemot, razorbill, and red-throated diver as a result of OWF impacts, irrespective of whether SEP &amp; DEP impacts are included in the cumulative totals. We note that ODOW, along with other Round 4 projects and to-be submitted Extensions projects, will be further adding to these cumulative totals. Therefore it is highly unlikely that Natural England's EIA advice will differ for the ODOW cumulative effects assessment.</p> <p>Recommendation - Please note.</p>	This is noted by the Applicant.
437	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Comment - cumulative Effects Assessment – there is no key for the screening categories (a-g) used within the Offshore Cumulative Effects Assessment Matrices.</p> <p>Recommendation - The submitted ES should include a key to show what a-g indicates for each environmental receptor within the Offshore Cumulative Effects Assessment Matrices so it is possible to see how they have been categorised for offshore ornithology.</p>	The Applicant has included a key for the screening categories included within the cumulative effects matrices.
438	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Comment - The potential for operation &amp; maintenance vessel activity to result in disturbance to red-throated diver, common scoter, guillemot, razorbill and puffin has not been considered. Although it is stated within the 'Approach to O&amp;M' that "There is a variation in responses from seabird species to the presence of offshore windfarms and the associated infrastructure, including shipping activity related to maintenance activities and the presence of WTGs" (added emphasis), the assessment for each species does not include an assessment of impacts from O&amp;M vessels.</p> <p>Recommendation - Natural England advises that some indication should be given as to the ports from which construction and maintenance vessels are likely to transit, as well as the</p>	Whilst the construction and O&M port has not been defined at this stage, for the purposes of the assessments, an assumption of ports within the Humber have been used, in part as this leads to the greatest likelihood of an overlap with the Greater Wash SPA. Impacts from vessels have been considered for the relevant species in the ES and RIAA. As set out in the RIAA (document 7.1) and the Outline VMP (document 8.20), the Applicant has committed to following Natural England's previously advised mitigation measures for reducing effects to red-throated diver and common scoter.

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard
			<p>likely increase in vessels activity. If construction and O&amp;M bases are likely to be located adjacent to SPAs, and therefore transit routes have the potential to overlap with SPAs, consideration should be given to the potential impact of increase in vessel activity on these SPAs within the RIAA.</p> <p>As a minimum, routes through relevant SPAs should follow best practice protocols (including adhering to existing routes wherever possible) to minimise disturbance to common scoter and red-throated diver.</p>	
439	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Comment - Red-throated diver and common scoter at the Greater Wash are included in Table 10.8 as site and features identified for potential AEoI for disturbance and displacement impacts within the O&amp;M phase, however they are missing from the O&amp;M Assessment – Disturbance and Displacement section. It is not clear whether they have been screened out at this stage.</p> <p>Recommendation - Natural England's view is that, although the project array is more than 10km from the Greater Wash SPA, red-throated diver and common scoter should be considered for the potential impacts from O&amp;M vessel activity following analysis of the full 24 months of baseline characterisation data and should not be screened out for potential impacts during the operation &amp; maintenance phase at this stage.</p>	Disturbance and displacement impacts to red-throated diver and common scoter features of the Greater Wash SPA from vessel activities and the presence of the ORCP have been considered within the impact assessment for the RIAA (document 7.1).
440	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Comment - We have not yet received Appendix 7.1.4: Offshore and Intertidal Ornithology Apportioning and therefore cannot comment on apportioning methodology for HRA at this stage.</p> <p>Recommendation - In the light of discussions regarding apportioning at the last ETG, please provide this appendix should you wish us to provide DAS advice on the approach to apportioning. Apportioning can be a key issue during Examination, so any progress that can be made pre-application would be worthwhile.</p>	Noted. This has been provided by the Project (document reference: 7.1.1)
441	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Comment - Lawson et al. (2016) has been used to assess the densities and distributions of red-throated diver and common scoter within the ECC. Natural England agree that this is currently the most appropriate data set to use, however we highlight that further surveys of the Greater Wash SPA were conducted over winter 2022/23 and that this data should be available within the next few months.</p> <p>Recommendation - When this data becomes available it will be shared with the applicant and Natural England advises that this data should be used within the Environmental Statement and RIAA to calculate impacts on red-throated diver within the ECC</p>	The Applicant is not aware of this data having become available and therefore has not been able to be incorporated into the assessment. As such, Lawson et al. (2016) remains the most appropriate data source to be used at this current time.
442	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Comment - Natural England note that impacts to RTD within the ECC during the construction phase is based on the average density of birds derived from Lawson et al. (2016).</p> <p>We advise that impacts are also presented for the upper and lower confidence intervals (CIs) of density, so that the full range of impact scenarios can be understood.</p> <p>Recommendation - Please include the 95% CIs of density in the assessment for construction phase impacts on RTD within the Greater Wash SPA.</p>	The Applicant has considered the upper and lower CIs in the RTD assessment within the Greater Wash SPA.
443	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Comment - Use of sabbaticals: sabbaticals have been used within the draft RIAA, however no explanation has been given as to where the sabbatical rates for each species have been obtained. Furthermore, Natural England currently advise that the evidence base is insufficient to support the consideration of sabbaticals within assessments.</p> <p>Recommendation - Please amend the assessment in the submitted RIAA accordingly and</p>	The relevant outputs are now presented without sabbatical rates within the RIAA (document reference 7.1).



Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard
			present outputs without using sabbatical rates so that Natural England can advise the Examination using our preferred approach.	
444	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Comment - Natural England note the offshore ECC will pass directly through the Greater Wash SPA, and therefore there is the potential for disturbance and displacement during the construction of the offshore ECC.</p> <p>Recommendation - Natural England advise that the need for seasonal restrictions for certain activities such as cable installation may require consideration (1st November – 31st March inclusive) subject to analysis of the full 24 months of baseline surveys.</p>	<p>The Applicant notes that there would not be a considerable increase in the baseline level of vessel traffic transiting through the SPA, the impacts from displacement are not predicted to be significantly greater than baseline levels.</p> <p>The Applicant has committed to the implementation of a Vessel Management Plan and provided and Outline Vessel Management Plan (document reference 8.20) as part of the application as such the Applicant does not consider a seasonal restriction to be required.</p>
445	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Comment - It is not clear how the background mortality figures (number of individuals) for each species-SPA combination have been calculated, since baseline mortality rates are not stated within the text, nor is there a table summarising the baseline mortality rates used within the draft RIAA.</p> <p>Recommendation - Please provide the baseline mortality rates used in each species at each SPA. For HRA, these should be based on adult survival rather than the integrated/weighted age-class survival rates used for EIA.</p>	<p>The Applicant has provided the baseline mortalities and methods used at each SPA.</p>
446	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Comment - Natural England considers that the displacement impact to red-throated diver at the Greater Wash SPA should principally be considered in terms of the area over which some level of displacement may occur, both in terms of km<sup>2</sup> and % of the SPA.</p> <p>Recommendation - Natural England refers the applicant to the draft Supplementary Advice on Conservation Objectives which has recently been published for the Greater Wash SPA (available at: Supplementary Advice - Greater Wash SPA) and in particular notes the attribute for red-throated diver of 'Supporting habitat: extent, distribution and availability of supporting habitat for the non-breeding season' for which the target is to restore.</p>	<p>The impact assessment in the ES has been updated to align with the recommended assessment methodology.</p>
447	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Comment - Bioseasons: the migration-free breeding season has been used for kittiwake, gannet and sandwich tern. Natural England's advice is that the full breeding season should be used for species within mean maximum + 1 SD foraging range. For red-throated diver, the migration-free winter (Jan-Feb) has been used.</p> <p>Recommendation - Natural England advise using the full breeding season for species within mean maximum + 1 SD foraging range, and a winter period of September to April for red-throated diver. In order for Natural England to provide advice into the Examination, the submitted ES will need to present assessment outputs based on our advised seasons.</p>	<p>The Applicant discussed the proposed approach to bioseasons with Natural England through the ETGs and where agreement has not been gained on the approach to use, has presented both the Applicant's and Natural England's approach.</p>
448	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Comment - Natural England note that limited information has been provided as to how red-throated diver and common scoter densities within the ECC have been estimated from data presented by Lawson et al. 2016. We also note that the applicant has based the impacts on the proportion of RTD 'considered to be adults based on data presented in Furness (2015)'. Impacts on red-throated diver in the Greater Wash should be considered for all individuals, not only adults.</p> <p>Recommendation - Please provide further explanation as to how the densities within the ECC have been estimated from data presented by Lawson et al. 2016, noting that this should be for the area covered by the ECC plus a 2km buffer. Please also amend the assessment to consider impacts on all individuals not only adult RTDs.</p>	<p>Data extracted from Lawson et al., 2016 has been used to inform the displacement assessment for red-throated diver and common scoter within the ECC, with further information provided on the methodologies used, considering all red-throated diver within the Greater Wash SPA (Volume 3, Appendix 12.3: Displacement Assessment Appendix) (document 6.3.12.3).</p>
449	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Comment - Natural England advise that all impacts on SPA seabirds should be scoped into the in-combination assessment. i.e. impacts that do not result in &gt;1% increases of baseline mortality should still be considered.</p>	<p>The approach to screening of impacts for the cumulative and in-combination assessments has been updated, with the proposed approach having been discussed with Natural England through the ETGs.</p>

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard
			Recommendation - Natural England advise that all contributory impacts must be considered in-combination in the submitted ES. Project alone impacts considered to be negligible should not be scoped out.	
450	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Comment - Natural England note that, when the applicant produces their final assessment, the most recent agreed in combination totals are likely to be those produced for the Hornsea 4 or SEP &amp; DEP projects and advise that the applicant refer to the agreed in-combination totals from these projects in their own in-combination assessment.</p> <p>Natural England note that, at the end of recent OWF examinations, we were unable to rule out adverse effect on integrity on kittiwake, guillemot, razorbill and seabird features of FFC SPA, and we note that SEP &amp; DEP and ODOW, along with other Round 4 projects and extensions projects, will be further adding to these in-combination totals. The existing level of in-combination impact on Greater Wash SPA RTD may also present issues for ODOW depending on the project-specific impacts on that site, as may also be the case for other site/species combinations.</p> <p>Recommendation - Please note.</p>	This is noted by the Applicant. As set out in the RIAA, the most recent data was that from DEP and SEP, with modifications to these values stated within the RIAA, where new data has since become available.
451	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Comment - Impacts arising from recently consented projects (Hornsea 3), and projects currently being considered (SADEP), with compensatory measures to offset their impacts have been deducted from the in-combination total for kittiwake at FFC SPA and sandwich tern at NNC SPA respectively. Natural England advises that in-combination totals should be presented both with and without the impacts of compensated-for projects in the ES, as this is likely to reflect Department for Energy Security and Net Zero's (DESNZ's) assessment requirements, and takes account of the current uncertainty regarding the effectiveness of compensatory measures for seabirds.</p> <p>Recommendation - Impacts arising from consented projects, and those currently under consideration, with compensatory measures should be considered in the in-combination impact total, alongside totals without those impacts being included.</p>	The Applicant has presented the impacts for both approaches within the ornithology in-combination assessment for the RIAA.
452	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Comment - Removal of Beatrice Demonstrator as the Project will be decommissioned by the time ODOW is predicted to be in operation.</p> <p>Recommendation - Advise that the validity of this statement is checked against the possibility of the project lifetime being extended.</p>	The Applicant considers this statement to be valid. The Beatrice Demonstrator project is scheduled to be decommissioned by 2029.
453	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Comment - Natural England note that, "The Applicant is confident that, where required, compensation could be provided for any AEoI from the construction and operation of the Project in-combination. Where options are not currently fully evidenced, the Applicant will seek to provide further evidence or provide a suite of measures to increase the confidence that compensation can be provided as part of the DCO application."</p> <p>Natural England highlight that the Applicant is essentially relying on the same suite of measures to potentially compensate the same range of species as Hornsea Project 4 (HP4). A great deal of work was undertaken by that project to attempt to fully evidence, define, and secure those measures. This work included trials of bycatch reduction measures and feasibility studies of potential predator eradication sites. Nonetheless, Natural England (and other key stakeholders) remained unconvinced that the measures proposed for FFC SPA guillemot and razorbill could adequately compensate for that project's predicted impacts. That position remains unchanged due to ongoing high levels of uncertainty around fundamental issues. Thus, Natural England do not share the optimism of Outer Dowsing with</p>	This is noted. However, the Applicants position remains that the without prejudice compensation measures presented in respect of FFC SPA guillemot and razorbill would be sufficient to compensate for the Projects predicted impacts. Further detail has been added since PEIR (including the addition of a further measure which has been subsequently discussed with Natural England) and is presented in the relevant Compensation plans (documents 7.7.1 and 7.7.3) and Evidence Base and Road Map documents (7.7.4, 7.7.5, and 7.7.6).

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard
			<p>respect to these species.</p> <p>Recommendation - We recommend the project reviews Natural England’s final Examination position on the Hornsea 4 compensatory measures: EN010098 Natural England’s End of Examination Position on the Applicant’s Proposed Compensatory Measures These highlight many of our concerns regarding the compensatory measures proposed and gives guidance on actions required.</p>	
454	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Comment - For the reasons stated, Natural England agrees with the statement that ‘the Project does not currently consider onshore artificial nesting structures to be a preferred compensatory measure.’ Natural England is not persuaded that further onshore ANS in the North Sea beyond those already implemented or being considered offer the prospect of an overall increase in the number of recruits entering the FFC SPA population.</p> <p>Recommendation - Maintain welcome focus on developing offshore ANS as a compensatory measure.</p>	This is noted by the Applicant.
455	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Comment - Compensation for gannet, should that be required in the future, is likely to be highly challenging. Natural England agrees that addressing bycatch mortality is the most promising option, but significant challenges need to be overcome, not least the potential requirement for measures to take place outside of UK waters.</p> <p>Recommendation - Continue further investigations into feasibility of bycatch reduction as a compensatory measure for gannet on a ‘without-prejudice’ basis.</p>	Natural England have since confirmed their position that an AEoI can be ruled out in the case of the gannet feature of the FFC SPA (Natural England bilateral meeting on 9 <sup>th</sup> January 2024). Therefore, no without prejudice case has been put forward for this species.
456	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Comment - Whilst covering the key ecological factors and presenting an appropriate approach to location determination, Natural England consider that the ecological evidence and a roadmap in support of offshore ANS gives a high-level overview only. Significant progress will be required prior to submission if the measure is to be considered secured. Natural England welcome the work undertaken to further the understanding of kittiwakes currently nesting offshore in the southern North Sea and hope this can be progressed and built upon to further inform the measure.</p> <p>Recommendation - Natural England highlight some key issues that should be discussed and agreed through the ETG process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scale of nesting provision</li> <li>• Number of structures</li> <li>• Structure design, including (if required) potential to accommodate multiple species</li> </ul>	The Applicant has included detailed proposals for this measure in the updated ANS Evidence Base and Road Map (document 7.7.4 and Kittiwake Compensation Plan (7.7.1)). The Applicant also notes that for strategic kittiwake compensation these details are described within document 7.8 (The Crown Estate Kittiwake Strategic Compensation Plan (KSCP)).
457	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Comment - With respect to non-like-for-like measures, we anticipate that the forthcoming Defra consultation on updated guidance will provide clarity on whether this is an option for developers.</p> <p>Recommended - To note. We recommend that Outer Dowsing revisit their overall compensation strategy once the updated guidance is available.</p>	This is noted by the Applicant. The Applicant notes that Defra commenced a consultation on draft policies to inform updated guidance on Marine Protected Area assessments on 9 February 2024. Whilst the Applicant is aware of this documentation it is noted that (1) the documentation is still out for consultation and (2) the timing of the publication in relation to the programme of DCO application submission did not allow for full inclusion of the recommendations. However, due regard has been given to the guidance in the time available.
458	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Comment - Natural England consider that predator control and bycatch reduction are theoretically viable compensatory measures.</p> <p>However, we highlight the relatively undeveloped and high-level nature of the submitted documents. There is a concerning lack of demonstrable progress in terms of identifying specific delivery options and securing the measures.</p> <p>Due to the significant challenges associated with these measures, Natural England are concerned that these measures may not be provably deliverable at submission. We further</p>	The Applicant notes that bycatch reduction has not been progressed further at this stage. With respect to predator control the Applicant has included a detailed without prejudice Evidence Base and Road map which includes the identification of a suitable site and how this could deliver the compensation that could be required under the Applicants approach. In the event that further compensation was required the Applicant has proposed further measures which could contribute to the delivery of the compensation (e.g. to manage the scale of provision across multiple measures). These are detailed in the relevant Compensation Plans and Evidence Base Road maps submitted as part of the Application.

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard
			<p>highlight that any reliance on the initiatives of other projects (e.g. LEB trials) is a high-risk approach.</p> <p>Recommendation - Natural England propose some key issues that should be discussed and agreed through the ETG process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identifying proven bycatch reduction methods</li> <li>• Identifying and quantifying bycatch rates in operational fisheries</li> <li>• Identifying suitable sites for predator eradication</li> <li>• Managing the scale of provision across multiple measures</li> </ul> <p>Natural England consider that collaborative, strategic approaches to development and delivery of these measures could accelerate the process of establishing their feasibility and effectiveness and enable wide scale delivery to increase the chance of success.</p>	
459	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Natural England welcomes the provision of key terms within the DCO. However, we note that there are some terms where some ambiguity remains.</p> <p>To expedite the Examination process, Natural England recommend that the project ensures that any ambiguity is addressed within the final submission, to ensure that the terms have clear definitions which are easily understood and leave no room for misinterpretation.</p>	This is noted by the Applicant. The Applicant has made updates within the draft DCO where it considered it to be necessary.
460	Natural England	P2_25	<p>The timeline for submission of several key plans and mitigation documents has been stated as four months prior to beginning of construction.</p> <p>Due to the complexity of the documents and the length of the required review process, as with other offshore wind DCOs we advise that documents are submitted no later than six months prior to commencing construction to ensure that these are fully agreed and to avoid delays to the project. We are willing to work with the project to discuss these timelines on a document-by-document basis. For the submission of the Site Integrity Plan to control impacts on the Southern North Sea SAC, this should be no later than six months, but no sooner than nine months.</p>	The Applicant notes this comment but considers four months to be an appropriate timeframe for most of the pre-construction plans and documents. The Applicant has updated the DMLs to require the Site Integrity Plan and Marine Mammal Mitigation Protocol to be submitted at least six months prior to the commencement of piling activities to give Natural England more time to consider these documents given their complexity.
461	Natural England	P2_25	<p>We note that there is scope for interpretation around the provision and management of any agreed compensatory measures.</p> <p>There is a need for the DCO to secure a robust framework around the provision of compensation measures to ensure that they are functioning and have been shown to be effective prior to the start of construction. We also advise that the Secretary of State should have the final say on amendments to or discharge of these measures and this should be secured within the DCO.</p>	This is noted. The Applicant believes that the current drafting of the draft DCO is appropriate and also notes that for all measures the relevant compensation implementation and monitoring plan must be submitted to the Secretary of State for their approval. Therefore the Secretary of State would have the final say on amendments to or discharge of these measures.
462	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Natural England advises that the restriction of cable protection post construction be restricted to 10 years from completion of construction. Further this should only apply to areas outside the Inner Dowsing Race Bank and North Ridge (IDRBNR) SAC. There may be a need within Schedule 12 to include a separate condition which excludes cable protection within the IDRBNR SAC.</p> <p>Condition should be amended and the inclusion of further condition to secure the exclusion of cable protection within the IDRBNR SAC drafted.</p>	The Applicant has updated the draft DCO to amend this to 10 years.
463	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Natural England has some concerns with the definition of commence, specifically the definition of offshore commencement. The wording used implies that the definition excludes site preparation works from the definition. Though we note the definition included of offshore preparation works limits the works to just surveys and monitoring. We consider there is some potential for confusion post consent on this point.</p>	This is noted by the Applicant. The definition of commence has been updated in the draft DCO submitted with the application.



Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard
			Consider if an amendment would provide further clarity during the construction phase and if so, incorporate into the submitted DCO.	
464	Natural England	P2_25	Natural England considers that the definition of maintain should be linked to an outline Offshore Operations and Maintenance plan. An outline Offshore Operations and Maintenance Plan should be included as part of the DCO application, and the wording of maintain should be amended to reference that the extent of offshore maintenance is limited to the detailed wording within the plan.	The definition of maintain covers both onshore and offshore elements of the project and therefore it would not be appropriate to link this to the offshore operations and maintenance plan. Furthermore, there is no precedent in offshore wind DCOs for such an approach to the definition of maintain and the Applicant does not consider it to be appropriate or necessary.
465	Natural England	P2_25	Natural England considers that the figures provided here should match with the figures provided within the Environmental Statement (ES). If these figures change during the pre-application process the DCO must be updated. Further it is noted there does not appear to be a figure included here detailing the volume of dredge material or volume of material for disposal.  All details within the detailed offshore design parameters requirement within the DCO application should be cross checked against the figures provided within the ES and other supporting documents (such as the disposal site characterisation report). To ensure all documents are providing the same figures. The figures for the maximum amount of disposal should also be included within the parameters provided.	All figures within the draft DCO submitted as part of the application have been updated to reflect the Project parameters as set out in Chapter 3 Project Description (document reference 6.1.3).
466	Natural England	P2_25	As per the DCO interpretations section we do not support this definition of offshore commencement. Consider amendment in the submitted DCO.	This is noted by the Applicant. The definition of commence has been updated in the draft DCO submitted with the application.
467	Natural England	P2_25	Definition of maintain, same comment as on the DCO definition. Consider amendment in the submitted DCO.	The definition of maintain covers both onshore and offshore elements of the project and therefore it would not be appropriate to link this to the offshore operations and maintenance plan. Furthermore, there is no precedent in offshore wind DCOs for such an approach to the definition of maintain and the Applicant does not consider it to be appropriate or necessary.
468	Natural England	P2_25	As per the comment on the offshore design parameters it is important to ensure the details of the project are correct and updated if any changes are made. Further it is noted that the details of disposal are only provided in Part 1 of this schedule covering the total amount of disposal across the entire project. The maximum disposal volume for this Schedule should be provided here as well.  To ensure all documents are providing the same figures. All details within the offshore design parameters requirement should be cross checked against the figures provided within the ES and other supporting documents (such as the disposal site characterisation report). The figures for the maximum amount of disposal under this schedule should also be included within the parameters provided.	The maximum disposal volumes provided in Part 1 of the DMLs set the limit of what is authorised by the DML. It is not necessary to also include a condition in Part 2 as the undertaker is not authorised to dispose of a volume greater than what is permitted by the licence.
469	Natural England	P2_25	Natural England would like the relevant SNCB to be named as consultee on relevant documents. There has been some confusion in post consent on some projects and to avoid confusion or potential delays we consider it appropriate to be named as consultees on the pre-construction requirements. Include the relevant SNCB as a named consultee on all documents except (g) and (i).	The Applicant does not consider it necessary to name Natural England as a consultee on relevant documents in the DMLs as the MMO has discretion to consult with any stakeholders they consider to be appropriate and so where it is appropriate for the relevant SNCB to be consulted, the MMO will consult with them.
470	Natural England	P2_25	Natural England notes and supports the commitment to micro-site around environmental receptors. Clarity should be provided on what receptors will be micro sited around. Previous wording used for similar conditions has included the terms “features of conservation, ecological or economic importance”.  Recommend considering updating the wording on the micro-siting condition in the submitted DCO to make it clearer what features will be avoided.	The Applicant does not consider it necessary to include the additional text suggested. The current text in the DMLs reflects the text in other recent OWF DCPs and makes it clear that it relates to micro-siting in relation to environmental constraints. Where additional text has been included in this condition in other DMLs, the word “environmental” has not been included before “micro-siting” and so it may not have been clear what was intended without the additional clarificatory text.

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard
471	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Natural England notes that this condition is located after the pre-construction documentation. To avoid confusion, it should be located after condition 13. Further Natural England does not agree with the time period specified for submission of the Site Integrity Plan (SIP) report. This plan is required to avoid an Adverse Effect on Integrity (AEol) on the Southern North Sea (SNS) Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and should be subject to further Habitats Regulation assessment (HRA) by the MMO, with consultation as appropriate. Four months does not provide sufficient time for this to be carried out. However, we note that due to the in-combination aspect of this assessment the detail should not be provided so far in advance as to make assessment of in-combination factors uncertain. Therefore, we suggest it be submitted no earlier than 9 months prior to commencement of offshore piling.</p> <p>A condition should be included requiring a SIP which is to be submitted no sooner than 9 months and no later than 6 months prior to commencement of offshore piling.</p>	<p>The Applicant has updated the DMLs to require the Site Integrity Plan and Marine Mammal Mitigation Plan to be submitted at least six months prior to the commencement of piling activities to give Natural England more time to consider these documents given their complexity.</p>
472	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Natural England does not agree with the submission of documents four months prior to commencement. Due to the increase in complexity of the larger projects this four-month period is no longer sufficient. Experience with other post-consent consultations has shown many documents require multiple versions and several rounds of consultations before they are of sufficient standard to gain approval. Further, some documents may require additional assessment.</p> <p>Amend the submitted DCO to ensure documentation is provided at least 6 months prior to commencement. Natural England notes on the Dudgeon and Sheringham Extension projects an agreement has been made to provide some documentation at 6 months and others at 4 months. Natural England would be willing to engage in a discussion to agree similar for this project.</p>	<p>The Applicant notes this comment but considers four months to be an appropriate timeframe for most of the pre-construction plans and documents. The Applicant has updated the DMLs to require the Site Integrity Plan and Marine Mammal Mitigation Protocol to be submitted at least six months prior to the commencement of piling activities to give Natural England more time to consider these documents given their complexity.</p>
473	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Natural England notes the restriction of cable protection post construction to a period of 15 years from the grant of the order. Our advice is that this should be restricted to 10 years from completion of construction. Further, this should only apply to areas outside the Inner Dowsing Race Bank and North Ridge (IDRBNR) SAC. Depending on the outcome of discussions in relation to the risk and issues we raise within our Appendix B -Benthic Ecology on the placement of cable protection with IDRBNR SAC; there may be a need within Schedule 12 to include a separate condition which excludes cable protection within the IDRBNR SAC.</p> <p>Amend condition 21 to state deployment up to 10 years following completion of construction outside of designated sites and potentially add a further condition to schedule 12 that excludes cable protection within the IDRBNR SAC.</p>	<p>The Applicant has updated the draft DCO to amend this to 10 years. The Applicant has committed to only using cable protection (where it required) on sandbanks within the IDRBNR SAC that is removable.</p>
474	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Natural England notes there is no definition of completion of construction within the DCO. Therefore, we question what will trigger the timing requirement of this condition as it currently requires action within three months of completion of construction, but there are many potential interpretations of what is completion of construction (final installation of infrastructure, full commissioning of all turbines, or a mix such as full commissioning of all turbine and deployment of all cable protection).</p> <p>Include a definition of completion of construction in the submitted DCO.</p>	<p>The Applicant does not consider it necessary to include a definition of completion of construction. The MMO will be aware of the date of completion of construction as a result of notifications required under other DML conditions and so will be able to take action in the event that notification under this condition is not provided within the three-month period.</p> <p>The Applicant does not consider it necessary to include a definition of “completion of construction” within the DMLs and note that there is no precedent in offshore wind DMLs to date supporting the inclusion of such a definition.</p>
475	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Natural England notes and appreciates the commitments to undertake monitoring. However, if the monitoring highlights impacts that are significantly in excess of those assessed, then we highlight that further monitoring and potentially mitigation may be required. Natural England considers that an additional condition is required that secures a commitment to this additional investigation once monitoring has been conducted, and</p>	<p>The Applicant does not consider it necessary to include this within the DML conditions as final monitoring plans must accord with the In Principle Monitoring Plan (document reference 8.3).</p>

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard
			<p>potentially to mitigation or further management.</p> <p>Add a further condition to secure that a plan for additional monitoring and/or mitigation will be provided if the results of the monitoring highlight an impact beyond those assessed or unforeseen in the ES.</p>	
476	Natural England	P2_25	<p>This condition requires the production of a plan to detail the work of the Kittiwake Steering Group (KSG). This includes a terms of reference, timetable, dispute resolution mechanism and membership of the group. As the statutory nature conservation body, Natural England is likely to be required on this group. However, as currently drafted we would get no consultation on these important aspects of how the KSG would run.</p> <p>Further, this condition allows that, once this plan to address the compensation has been approved, the offshore works may commence. Natural England notes that our position is that compensation should be in place and functioning prior to any impact. Similar compensation packages have included a condition which restricts the offshore works to after the compensation has been constructed and four full breeding seasons have passed.</p> <p>This condition should be amended to either require consultation with the statutory members of the group by the Secretary of State (SoS) or to require the applicant to provide details of such consultation and all consultation responses to the SoS, so they may make an informed decisions prior to agreeing any such plans.</p> <p>Further, a condition should be included to make it clear offshore works will not take place until the compensation works are in place and functioning for at least four full breeding seasons. Note that as per the Hornsea 3, Norfolk Boreas, Vanguard, East Anglia 1 North, and East Anglia 2 decisions the SoS has determined that this period is appropriate.</p>	<p>The relevant condition of the draft DCO has been updated as described with the exception of breeding seasons. The Applicant wishes to clarify that, in the made DCOs referenced, the condition is specific that: 'no operation of any turbine forming part of the authorised development may begin until four full breeding seasons following the implementation of the measures set out in the KIMP'. This is more specific than 'offshore works will not take place until the compensation works are in place and functioning for at least four full breeding seasons' as suggested by Natural England. The relevant condition (5) is aligned with other made DCOs with the exception of breeding seasons as the Applicants view is that three breeding seasons prior to the operation of any turbine forming part of the authorised development is appropriate as Kittiwakes can breed from three years and the Applicant is confident that any mortality debt would be offset over the lifetime of the project (see document 7.7.4 Offshore Artificial Nesting Structures Evidence Base and Road Map).</p>
477	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Natural England notes condition 4 (h), (i) and (j) allows for third parties to conduct the compensation on behalf of the applicant. Condition 5 has the effect of disapplying conditions 6, 7 and 8 if a third party conducts the compensation. Conditions 6, 7 and 8 relate to securing that the compensation does take place and is not decommissioned until such time as approved by the SoS. Under this wording the use of a third party removes the power of the SoS should the compensation fail to be delivered, or should the compensation need further adaptive management, there is no requirement for monitoring or on the timing of the works. Once a third-party plan is signed off there appears to be no monitoring, no adaptive management and no chance to adapt plans should the compensation fail or should there be unexpected delays or issues. Further, the SoS would not have control over the decommissioning.</p> <p>Natural England considers this leaves a significant uncertainty in the security that compensation measures would be implemented, and that should there be a need adaptive management would be implemented.</p> <p>Natural England considers this is a significant risk and that further consideration is needed on the wording to ensure that the SoS will have appropriate control over third party options for compensatory measures. Further explanation needs to be provided of exactly what powers the SoS could use to control third parties once condition 4 (h), (i) or (j) has been approved, should compensation works not occur, or not be successful.</p>	<p>Condition 4 (b) of the draft DCO now includes provision that in the instance where the Applicant elects to deliver the compensation either by way of a financial contribution to, or collaboratively with, another party wholly or partly in substitution for the artificial nesting measure or as an adaptive management measure, then the technical specification must be agreed with the Kittiwake Compensation Steering Group (KCSG).</p>
478	Natural England	P2_25	<p>This condition usually contains the requirement that no offshore works, or wind turbines will be operated prior to the compensation being in place for at least 4 full breeding cycles. As per our comments on Condition 2, above.</p>	<p>As noted in the Applicants response to 501, the Applicants view is that three breeding seasons prior to the operation of any turbine forming part of the authorised development is appropriate as Kittiwakes can breed from three years and the Applicant is confident that any mortality debt would be offset over the lifetime of the project (see document 7.7.4 Offshore Artificial Nesting Structures Evidence Base and Road Map).</p>

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard
479	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Both Natural England (as the statutory consultee) and the LW AONB partnership (as a non statutory consultee with detailed local knowledge) would seek to be involved in the pre application stage of Lincs Node and the proposed connection between Grimsby and Walpole.</p> <p>As interested parties, we wish to outline our collective concern in relation to the reliance for energy transmission via a new connection between Grimsby and Walpole and the Lincs Node, and the resulting impact these developments could have on the LW AONB and Heritage coast.</p> <p>Crossing through the LW AONB and impacting the settings thereof represents a significant challenge in the context of avoiding or reducing significant adverse impacts to the special qualities of the LW AONB: notably to the landscape character (scenic beauty and rural charm, expansive sweeping views, peace and tranquillity), Earth Heritage (chalk upland, geological and glacial) features and archaeology (deserted medieval villages, burial mounds and monuments) special qualities of the Lincolnshire Wolds AONB.</p> <p>The 2018 to 2023 management plan for Lincolnshire Wolds AONB (The Lincolnshire Wolds Countryside Service, 2018) states specifically within its description of pressures and threats to the special quality of 'Expansive Sweeping Views' that there is "particular potential threat from hilltop or skyline developments including overhead powerlines".</p> <p>We note that for other projects impacting on designated landscapes the National Grid have avoided areas of high amenity value, such as AONBs, in their adoption of the 'Holford Rules' for undergrounding of new high voltage overhead transmission lines. But this has delivery timeframe implications and still requires considerable stakeholder engagement. And whilst we would expect similar mitigation measures to be implemented for any proposed connections to the existing grid, this doesn't mitigate for the potential changes to the settings and special qualities of the LW AONB and the defining characteristics of a new Heritage Coast from the construction of Lincs Node, the energy hub and associated infrastructure within a part of Lincolnshire which primarily consists of rural communities and low-lying arable farming and grazing practices.</p> <p>Whilst we advise that every effort should be made to minimise designated landscape impacts, there remains a risk this will not be sufficient to avoid adverse impacts on special qualities of the LW AONB.</p>	<p>This is noted by the Applicant. Following the HND, in August 2023 the Applicant received confirmation from National Grid Energy Systems Operator (NGESO) that the confirmed grid connection for the Applicant would be Weston Marsh. This confirmation came following the publication of the PEIR and therefore, at this point the Applicant issued a Press Release and was able to confirm that the Lincolnshire Node connection option for the Project would no longer be pursued.</p>
480	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Whilst we acknowledge that some survey data are to be presented in the Environmental Statement (ES), we are concerned that there may not be sufficient time for these results to be fully considered and assessed prior to the anticipated application submission. We would, therefore, encourage the Project to use the EPP via post-PEIR ETGs to discuss outstanding issues, additional data requirements, and the assessment of impacts and levels of significance, prior to submission.</p> <p>Natural England considers that a critical next step within the EPP is for a steering group meeting to be convened to discuss, and agree, with all interested parties, the subsequent next steps and processes required to resolve outstanding issues in order to successfully enter the application phase.</p>	<p>Post PEIR, ETGs were held in September and November to discuss outstanding issues. The Applicant also conducted additional targeted consultation as the Project design was developed.</p>



Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard
481	Natural England	P2_25	We also recommend that a Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) is started by the Project early within the EPP, in order to accurately catalogue all areas of agreement for the project and highlight any areas of disagreement. The ETG meeting minutes and Agreement/Disagreement log have been successfully used by other projects as the foundation for the SoCG.	Consultation logs were updated and issued with the minutes of the ETGs. The logs were completed by the Applicant and reviewed by the consultees. The consultation logs have been finalised and included with the minutes of the ETGS as Appendix 6.1 Annex C Consultation Logs, and where SOCGs are to be produced will form the basis of these.
482	Natural England	P2_25	We acknowledge that a matrix approach to determining the significance of effects on ecological features, is commonly used. However, this method often relies on value- rather than evidence-based judgements. The subjective evaluation of magnitude of impact and sensitivity/importance of receptors through expert judgement has led to many impact magnitudes and receptor importance/sensitivities being downgraded across topics in the PEIR. We also note that any effect that is concluded to be of moderate or major significance in the PEIR, is deemed to be 'significant' in EIA terms, whereas effects concluded to be of negligible or minor significance, are deemed 'not significant' in EIA terms. This cut-off could exclude any effect concluded to be less than moderate, in turn, this could lead to errors in assessing cumulative effects adequately.	The Applicant understands Natural England's concern with regard to the matrix approach; however, this approach has been retained within the ES as it provides a standardised, established approach to the impact assessment. Where any uncertainty arises within the assessment approach, the precautionary principle is followed, with the sensitivity of the receptor or magnitude of the impact being upgraded as deemed appropriate by the topic experts. Furthermore, where evidence or data gaps may lead to a degree of uncertainty in the assessment, further mitigation and monitoring has been proposed where these are considered appropriate. The cumulative effects assessment for each aspect has given careful consideration of the potential for many small impacts to combine into a larger scale effect as an integral component of the assessment.
483	Natural England	P2_26	Impacts to offshore sandbank systems within and near the array have not been considered. The Project needs to fully consider potential impacts to ecologically and morphologically important offshore sandbank systems within and near the array area. All phases of the project development should be considered, including impacts on sandbank extent, structure and function and sandwave recovery as this could have wider impacts to marine physical processes and ecosystems reliant upon them.	Offshore sandbanks have been considered as receptors within Chapter 7 Marine Physical Processes as appropriate, specifically within Paragraph 135 and Paragraph 175. Impacts on the ecology of sandbank systems is considered within Chapter 9 Benthic and Intertidal Ecology
484	Norfolk County Council	P2_29	Thank you for sending this information to us. However, we consider this development (off the coast of Lincolnshire) to be out of scope for the Norfolk Coast AONB and will not be submitting any comment.	The Applicant has noted this response.
485	Norwegian Environment Agency	P2_30	The Norwegian Environment Agency have consulted relevant authorities, and there are no comments from Norway at this stage.	The Applicant has noted this response.
486	Orsted Entities	P2_32	Thus any interactions and impact should be considered to be long-term and the various project stages of operation/maintenance, re-powering and decommissioning should be taken into account by the Outer Dowsing Offshore Wind Project. In addition, it is important that during the long-term interaction of the projects, the Gunfleet Sands consents (including consent conditions) and any stakeholder agreements entered into by Gunfleet Sands are not adversely affected.	An assessment of potential impacts to shipping and navigation, including potential vessel displacement, restriction of adverse weather routeing, and potential cumulative effects, is provided in Chapter 15: Shipping and Navigation.
487	Orsted Entities	P2_32	The Outer Dowsing Offshore Wind Project array area is expected to be 196 km away from Gunfleet Sands	This has been noted by the Applicant
488	Orsted Entities	P2_32	We note that impacts on vessel displacement and restriction of adverse weather routeing post PEIR will be revisited once array reductions have been applied. Once this information has been provided we would appreciate the opportunity to properly understand and respond to the potential impacts and mitigations being proposed.	An assessment of potential impacts to shipping and navigation, including potential vessel displacement, restriction of adverse weather routeing, and potential cumulative effects, is provided in Chapter 15: Shipping and Navigation.
489	Orsted Entities	P2_32	Cumulative and in-combination effects – these are an area of concern due to the nature of the increased development in a congested area of sea, particularly in relation to shipping and navigation and marine mammals, as well as seabed morphology	An assessment of potential impacts to ornithological receptors, marine mammals, sea bed morphology receptors and commercial fisheries including potential cumulative effects is provided in Chapter 11 Marine Mammals, Chapter 12 Offshore and Intertidal Ornithology, Chapter 7 Marine Physical Processes, Chapter 14 Commercial Fisheries.

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard
490	Orsted Entities	P2_32	Navigation and shipping The area of the proposed Outer Dowsing Windfarm Project has significant amounts of existing shipping activity. We note that impacts on vessel displacement and restriction of adverse weather routeing post PEIR will be revisited once array reductions have been applied. Once this information has been provided we would appreciate the opportunity to properly understand and respond to the potential impacts and mitigations being proposed.	An assessment of potential impacts to shipping and navigation, including potential vessel displacement, restriction of adverse weather routeing, and potential cumulative effects, is provided in Chapter 15: Shipping and Navigation.
491	Orsted Entities	P2_32	It is important to ensure that all environmental impacts of your project are properly and fully assessed including any potential cumulative or in combination effects with Gunfleet Sands Demo. We would also welcome the opportunity to discuss further the following cumulative and in-combination impacts: • Cumulative and in-combination effects – these are an area of concern due to the nature of the increased development in a congested area of sea, particularly in relation to shipping and navigation, marine mammals, as well as seabed morphology	An assessment of potential impacts to ornithological receptors, marine mammals, sea bed morphology receptors and commercial fisheries including potential cumulative effects is provided in Chapter 11 Marine Mammals, Chapter 12 Offshore and Intertidal Ornithology, Chapter 7 Marine Physical Processes, Chapter 14 Commercial Fisheries.
492	Orsted Entities	P2_32	Thus, any interactions and impact should be considered long-term and the various project stages of operation/maintenance, repowering and decommissioning should be considered by the outer Dowsing Offshore Wind Project. In addition, it is important that during the long-term interaction of the projects, the Hornsea 1 consents (including consent conditions) and any stakeholder agreements entered for the benefit of Hornsea 1 are not adversely affected. (see table)	Consideration of access to existing OWFs, including Hornsea One, is assessed within Chapter 18 Infrastructure and Other Marine Users and embedded mitigation set out therein. The Applicant will continue to engage with Ørsted in order to manage any potential effects.
493	Orsted Entities	P2_32	The Outer Dowsing Offshore Wind Project array area is expected to be 21.4km from Hornsea 1.	This is noted by the Applicant
494	Orsted Entities	P2_32	As set out, the proposed Outer Dowsing Wind Project array is 21.4km from Hornsea 1. Due to this proximity, there is significant potential for the Outer Dowsing Offshore Wind Project turbines to interfere with wind speed or wind direction of Hornsea 1 and thus cause a reduction in energy output from the Hornsea 1 turbines. This requires to be accurately assessed, appropriate mitigation applied with any remaining adverse effects appropriately compensated for the duration of the consents and licences.	The Project has been sited in accordance with requirements of The Crown Estate's Offshore Wind Leasing Round 4 process, including that projects may not be located within 7.5km of an existing OWF unless the owner of the OWF has given their written consent.
495	Orsted Entities	P2_32	We would also welcome the opportunity to discuss further the following cumulative and in-combination impacts: Cumulative impacts, particularly relating to ornithology, have the potential to affect the post construction monitoring of Hornsea 1 therefore this needs to be considered.	An assessment of potential impacts to ornithological receptors, marine mammals, sea bed morphology receptors and commercial fisheries including potential cumulative effects is provided in Chapter 11 Marine Mammals, Chapter 12 Offshore and Intertidal Ornithology, Chapter 7 Marine Physical Processes, Chapter 14 Commercial Fisheries.
496	Orsted Entities	P2_32	We would also welcome the opportunity to discuss further the following cumulative and in-combination impacts: Further displacement of fisheries and established co-existence relationships.	This is noted by the Applicant.
497	Orsted Entities	P2_32	Hornsea 2 is expected to continue to operate to the full extent of its consents and licences, be maintained, and may in due course be upgraded and repowered, and will at some stage be decommissioned. Thus, any interactions and impact should be	An assessment of potential impacts on other infrastructure is presented within Chapter 18 Marine Infrastructure and other Users (document reference 6.1.18).

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard
			considered to be long-term and the various project stages of operation/maintenance, re-powering and decommissioning should be considered by the outer Dowsing Offshore Wind Project. In addition, it is important that during the long-term interaction of the projects, the Hornsea 2 consents (including consent conditions) and any stakeholder agreements entered for the benefit of Hornsea 2 are not adversely affected. (See table)	
498	Orsted Entities	P2_32	The Outer Dowsing Offshore Wind Project array area is expected to be 17.7km from Hornsea 2.	This is noted by the Applicant.
499	Orsted Entities	P2_32	As set out, the proposed Outer Dowsing Wind Project array is 17.7km from Hornsea 2. Due to this proximity, there is significant potential for the Outer Dowsing Offshore Wind Project turbines to interfere with wind speed or wind direction of Hornsea 2 and thus cause a reduction in energy output from the Hornsea 2 turbines. This requires to be accurately assessed, appropriate mitigation applied with any remaining adverse effects appropriately compensated for the duration of the consents and licences.	The Project has been sited in accordance with requirements of The Crown Estate's Offshore Wind Leasing Round 4 process, including that projects may not be located within 7.5km of an existing OWF unless the owner of the OWF has given their written consent.
500	Orsted Entities	P2_32	The area of the proposed Outer Dowsing Windfarm Project has significant amounts of existing shipping activity. We note that impacts on vessel displacement and restriction of adverse weather routeing post Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) will be revisited once array reductions have been applied. Once this information has been provided we would appreciate the opportunity to properly understand and respond to the potential impacts and mitigations being proposed.	An assessment of potential impacts to shipping and navigation, including potential vessel displacement, restriction of adverse weather routeing, and potential cumulative effects, is provided in Chapter 15: Shipping and Navigation.
501	Orsted Entities	P2_32	We would also welcome the opportunity to discuss further the following cumulative and in-combination impacts: Cumulative impacts, particularly relating to ornithology, have the potential to affect the post construction monitoring of Hornsea 2 therefore this needs to be considered.	An assessment of potential impacts to ornithological receptors, marine mammals, sea bed morphology receptors and commercial fisheries including potential cumulative effects is provided in Chapter 11 Marine Mammals, Chapter 12 Offshore and Intertidal Ornithology, Chapter 7 Marine Physical Processes, Chapter 14 Commercial Fisheries.
502	Orsted Entities	P2_32	Hornsea Three is expected to operate to the full extent of its consents and licences, be maintained, and may in due course be upgraded and repowered, and will at some stage be decommissioned. Thus, any interactions and impact should be considered to be long-term and the various project stages of construction operation and maintenance, re-powering and decommissioning should be considered by the outer Dowsing Offshore Wind Project. In addition, it is important that during the long-term interaction of the projects, the Hornsea Three consents (including consent conditions) and any stakeholder agreements entered for the benefit of Orsted are not adversely affected. (see table)	This is noted by the Applicant.
503	Orsted Entities	P2_32	The Outer Dowsing Offshore Wind Project array area is expected to be 59.4km from the Hornsea Three array area.	This is noted by the Applicant.
504	Orsted Entities	P2_32	As set out, the proposed Outer Dowsing Wind Project array is 59.4km from the Hornsea Three array area. Due to this proximity, there is significant potential for the Outer Dowsing Offshore Wind Project turbines to interfere with wind speed or wind direction within the Hornsea Three Offshore Wind Farm and thus cause a reduction in energy output from the proposed Hornsea Three turbines. This requires to be accurately assessed, appropriate mitigation applied with any remaining adverse effects appropriately compensated for the duration of the consents and licences.	The Project has been sited in accordance with requirements of The Crown Estate's Offshore Wind Leasing Round 4 process, including that projects may not be located within 7.5km of an existing OWF unless the owner of the OWF has given their written consent.
505	Orsted Entities	P2_32	Due to the location of the Outer Dowsing Wind Project there is a potential for overlap and impacts to required vessel logistics and access to the Hornsea Project Three Offshore Wind Farm primarily during operation but potentially in construction should installation schedules result in an overlap of activities.	Consideration of access to existing OWFs, including Hornsea Three, is assessed within Chapter 18 Infrastructure and Other Marine Users and embedded mitigation set out therein. The Applicant will continue to engage with Ørsted in order to manage any potential effects.
506	Orsted Entities	P2_32	We would also welcome the opportunity to discuss further the following cumulative and in-combination impacts: · Cumulative and in-combination effects – these are an area of concern due	An assessment of potential impacts to shipping and navigation, including potential vessel displacement, restriction of adverse weather routeing, and potential cumulative effects, is

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard
			to the nature of the increased development in a congested area of sea, particularly in relation to shipping and navigation, ornithology, and marine mammals, as well as seabed morphology	provided in Chapter 15 Shipping and Navigation. An assessment of potential impacts to ornithological receptors including potential cumulative effects is provided in Chapter 12 Intertidal and Offshore Ornithology. An assessment of potential impacts to marine mammals receptors including potential cumulative effects is provided in Chapter 11 Marine Mammals. An assessment of potential impacts to fisheries receptors including potential cumulative effects is provided in Chapter 14 Commercial Fisheries. An assessment of potential impacts to seabed morphology receptors including potential cumulative effects is provided in the Seabed Mobility Report.
507	Orsted Entities	P2_32	We would also welcome the opportunity to discuss further the following cumulative and in-combination impacts: Further displacement of fisheries and established co-existence relationships. Ensuring that projects maintain a consistent approach to using best practise guidelines.	This is noted by the Applicant..
508	Orsted Entities	P2_32	Lincs is expected to continue to operate, be maintained, and may in due course be upgraded and repowered, and will at some stage be decommissioned. Thus any interactions and impact should be considered to be long-term and the various project stages of operation/maintenance, re-powering and decommissioning should be taken into account by the Outer Dowsing Offshore Wind Project. In addition, it is important that during the long-term interaction of the projects, the Lincs consents (including consent conditions) and any stakeholder agreements entered into by Lincs are not adversely affected. (See table)	The Applicant has noted this response. An assessment of potential impacts on other infrastructure is presented within Chapter 18 Marine Infrastructure and other Users (document reference 6.1.18).
509	Orsted Entities	P2_32	As set out, the proposed Outer Dowsing Offshore Wind Project array is 50 km away from Lincs. Due to this proximity, there is the possibility for the Outer Dowsing Offshore Wind Project turbines to interfere with wind speed and/or wind direction experienced at Lincs and thus cause a reduction in energy output from the Lincs turbines. This requires to be properly assessed, appropriate mitigation applied with any remaining adverse effects appropriately compensated.	The Project has been sited in accordance with requirements of The Crown Estate's Offshore Wind Leasing Round 4 process., including that projects may not be located within 7.5km of an existing OWF unless the owner of the OWF has given their written consent.
510	Orsted Entities	P2_32	It was noted that Lincs was not assessed as a cumulative scheme. Given there is no information currently available on vessel routes or proposed construction or Operation and Maintenance ports, it is difficult to understand the potential risks to assets associated with the generation and transmission of electricity from Lincs. We would appreciate if more information on this could be provided so we can properly understand and respond to the potential impacts and mitigations being proposed. It is important that any solutions properly take into account existing consent conditions and agreements.	The Applicant has followed the approach set out in The Planning Inspectorate's Advice Note 17. An assessment of potential impacts on other infrastructure is presented within Chapter 18 Marine Infrastructure and other Users (document reference 6.1.18).
511	Orsted Entities	P2_32	We would also appreciate being given the opportunity to input into and participate in discussions around navigational risks (including issues of search and rescue lanes and vessel traffic service) and mitigations.	An assessment of potential impacts to shipping and navigation, including potential vessel displacement, restriction of adverse weather routeing, and potential cumulative effects, is provided in Chapter 15: Shipping and Navigation.
512	Orsted Entities	P2_32	We note that impacts on vessel displacement and restriction of adverse weather routeing post PEIR will be revisited once array reductions have been applied. Once this information has been provided we would appreciate the opportunity to properly understand and respond to the potential impacts and mitigations being proposed.	An assessment of potential impacts to shipping and navigation, including potential vessel displacement, restriction of adverse weather routeing, and potential cumulative effects, is provided in Chapter 15: Shipping and Navigation.
513	Orsted Entities	P2_32	It is very important that Lincs and its associated transmission assets can at all times be accessed to allow for appropriate Operation and Maintenance work and, in due course, upgrading, re-powering and decommissioning activities. It would therefore be useful to understand all of the Outer Dowsing Offshore Wind Project components and routes associated with the proposed works	Consideration of access to existing OWFs, including Lincs, is assessed within Chapter 18 Infrastructure and Other Marine Users and embedded mitigation set out therein. The Applicant will continue to engage with Ørsted in order to manage any potential effects.



Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard
			(including proposed transmission works) so that we can establish that access for Lincs, including access for jack-up vessels and anchor splays (etc.), will be maintained and that physical interactions can be avoided, or understood and appropriately mitigated	
514	Orsted Entities	P2_32	We would also welcome the opportunity to discuss further the following cumulative and in-combination impacts: Further displacement of fisheries and established co-existence relationships	The Applicant has noted this response.
515	Orsted Entities	P2_32	Hornsea Four is expected to continue to operate to the full extent of its consents and licences, be maintained, and may in due course be upgraded and repowered, and will at some stage be decommissioned. Thus, any interactions and impact should be considered long-term and the various project stages of operation/maintenance, re-powering and decommissioning should be considered by the outer Dowsing Offshore Wind Project. In addition, it is important that during the long-term interaction of the projects, the consents (including consent conditions) and any stakeholder agreements entered for the benefit of Orsted are not adversely affected. (See table)	The Applicant has noted this response. An assessment of potential impacts on other infrastructure is presented within Chapter 18 Marine Infrastructure and other Users (document reference 6.1.18).
516	Orsted Entities	P2_32	Due to the location of the Outer Dowsing Wind Project there is a potential for overlap and impacts to required vessel logistics and access to the Hornsea Four Offshore Wind Farm primarily during construction and operation should installation schedules result in an overlap of activities.	An assessment of potential impacts to shipping and navigation, including potential vessel displacement, restriction of adverse weather routeing, and potential cumulative effects, is provided in Chapter 15: Shipping and Navigation.
517	Orsted Entities	P2_32	There is the potential for an overlap in underwater noise generating activities and in particular piling operations should installation schedules result in an overlap. Orsted would expect Hornsea Four to be taken into consideration in the Outer Dowsing Offshore Wind Project marine mammal mitigation protocol (MMMP) and the Site Integrity Plan (SIP) for the Southern North Sea Special Area of Conservation (SAC).	Hornsea Four has been considered within the Outline Site Integrity Plan. Due to the distance between the Project and Hornsea Four, even in the event that piling at the projects was concurrent, there would be no potential for the noise from each project to act cumulatively for injury risk and is therefore not considered further.
518	Orsted Entities	P2_32	We would also welcome the opportunity to discuss further the following cumulative and in-combination impacts:  · Cumulative and in-combination effects – these are an area of concern due to the nature of the increased development in a congested area of sea, particularly in relation to shipping and navigation, ornithology, and marine mammals.	An assessment of potential impacts to shipping and navigation, including potential vessel displacement, restriction of adverse weather routeing, and potential cumulative effects, is provided in Chapter 15 Shipping and Navigation. An assessment of potential impacts to ornithological receptors including potential cumulative effects is provided in Chapter 12 Intertidal and Offshore Ornithology. An assessment of potential impacts to marine mammals receptors including potential cumulative effects is provided in Chapter 11 Marine Mammals. An assessment of potential impacts to fisheries receptors including potential cumulative effects is provided in Chapter 14 Commercial Fisheries. An assessment of potential impacts to seabed morphology receptors including potential cumulative effects is provided in the Seabed Mobility Report.
519	Orsted Entities	P2_32	We note the conclusion on the impact of Staxton Wold, Trimmingham as not significant. We reserve our position pending further information in this regard.	The Applicant has noted this response.
520	Orsted Entities	P2_32	Race Bank is expected to continue to operate, be maintained, and may in due course be upgraded and repowered, and will at some stage be decommissioned. Thus any interactions and impact should be considered to be long-term and the various project stages of operation/maintenance, re-powering and decommissioning should be taken into account by the Outer Dowsing Offshore Wind Project. In addition, it is important that during the long-term interaction of the projects, the Race Bank consents (including consent conditions) and any stakeholder agreements entered into by Race Bank	An assessment of potential impacts on other infrastructure is presented within Chapter 18 Marine Infrastructure and other Users (document reference 6.1.18).

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard
			are not adversely affected. (See table)	
521	Orsted Entities	P2_32	As set out, the proposed Outer Dowsing Offshore Wind Project array is 23 km away from Race Bank. Due to this proximity, there is the strong likelihood for the Outer Dowsing Offshore Wind Project turbines to interfere with wind speed and/or wind direction experienced at Race Bank and thus cause a reduction in energy output from the Race Bank turbines. This requires to be properly assessed, appropriate mitigation applied with any remaining adverse effects appropriately compensated.	The Project has been sited in accordance with requirements of The Crown Estate's Offshore Wind Leasing Round 4 process, including that projects may not be located within 7.5km of an existing OWF unless the owner of the OWF has given their written consent.
522	Orsted Entities	P2_32	It was noted that Race Bank was not assessed as a cumulative scheme. Given there is no information currently available on vessel routes or proposed construction or Operation and Maintenance ports, it is difficult to understand the potential risks to assets associated with the generation and transmission of electricity from Race Bank. We would appreciate if more information on this could be provided so we can properly understand and respond to the potential impacts and mitigations being proposed. It is important that any solutions properly take into account existing consent conditions and agreements	An assessment of potential impacts to shipping and navigation, including potential vessel displacement, restriction of adverse weather routeing, and potential cumulative effects, is provided in Chapter 15 Shipping and Navigation.
523	Orsted Entities	P2_32	We would also appreciate being given the opportunity to input into and participate in discussions around navigational risks (including issues of search and rescue lanes and vessel traffic service) and mitigations.	An assessment of potential impacts to shipping and navigation, including potential vessel displacement, restriction of adverse weather routeing, and potential cumulative effects, is provided in Chapter 15 Shipping and Navigation.
524	Orsted Entities	P2_32	We note that impacts on vessel displacement and restriction of adverse weather routeing post PEIR will be revisited once array reductions have been applied. Once this information has been provided we would appreciate the opportunity to properly understand and respond to the potential impacts and mitigations being proposed.	An assessment of potential impacts to shipping and navigation, including potential vessel displacement, restriction of adverse weather routeing, and potential cumulative effects, is provided in Chapter 15 Shipping and Navigation.
525	Orsted Entities	P2_32	It is very important that Race Bank, including any future extension to the project, and its associated transmission assets can at all times be accessed to allow for appropriate Operation and Maintenance work and, in due course, upgrading, re-powering and decommissioning activities. It would therefore be useful to understand all of the Outer Dowsing Offshore Wind Project components and routes associated with the proposed works (including proposed transmission works) so that we can establish that access for Race Bank, including access for jack-up vessels and anchor splays (etc.), will be maintained and that physical interactions can be avoided, or understood and appropriately mitigated.	Consideration of access to existing OWFs, including Race Bank, is assessed within Chapter 18 Infrastructure and Other Marine Users and embedded mitigation set out therein. The Applicant will continue to engage with Ørsted in order to manage any potential effects.
526	Orsted Entities	P2_32	We would also welcome the opportunity to discuss further the following cumulative and in-combination	An assessment of potential impacts to ornithological receptors, marine mammals, sea bed morphology receptors and commercial fisheries including potential cumulative effects is provided

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard
			impacts: • Cumulative and in-combination effects – these are an area of concern due to the nature of the increased development in a congested area of sea, particularly in relation to shipping and navigation, ornithology, and marine mammals, as well as seabed morphology	in Chapter 11 Marine Mammals, Chapter 12 Offshore and Intertidal Ornithology, Chapter 7 Marine Physical Processes, Chapter 14 Commercial Fisheries.
527	Orsted Entities	P2_32	We would like to understand better from you your proposed radar mitigation solutions to ensure that they do not adversely affect the solutions currently in place for Race Bank (and other Wind Farms in the area).	Mitigation solution for NATS radar impacts will be developed in consultation with NATS and will consider the existing mitigation (Greater Wash Transponder Mandatory Zone) for other wind farms in the area.
528	Orsted Entities	P2_32	Westermost Rough is expected to continue to operate, be maintained, and may in due course be upgraded and repowered, and will at some stage be decommissioned. Thus any interactions and impact should be considered to be long-term and the various project stages of operation/maintenance, re-powering and decommissioning should be taken into account by the Outer Dowsing Offshore Wind Project. In addition, it is important that during the long-term interaction of the projects, the Westermost Rough consents (including consent conditions) and any stakeholder agreements entered into by Westermost Rough are not adversely affected. (See table)	An assessment of potential impacts on other infrastructure is presented within Chapter 18 Marine Infrastructure and other Users (document reference 6.1.18).
529	Orsted Entities	P2_32	As set out, the proposed Outer Dowsing Offshore Wind Project array is 60 km away from Westermost Rough. Due to this proximity, there is the likelihood for the Outer Dowsing Offshore Wind Project turbines to interfere with wind speed and/or wind direction experienced at Westermost Rough and thus cause a reduction in energy output from the Westermost Rough turbines. This requires to be properly assessed, appropriate mitigation applied with any remaining adverse effects appropriately compensated.	The Project has been sited in accordance with requirements of The Crown Estate's Offshore Wind Leasing Round 4 process, including that projects may not be located within 7.5km of an existing OWF unless the owner of the OWF has given their written consent.
530	Orsted Entities	P2_32	The area of the proposed Outer Dowsing Windfarm Project has significant amounts of existing shipping activity. We note that impacts on vessel displacement and restriction of adverse weather routing post PEIR will be revisited once array reductions have been applied. Once this information has been provided we would appreciate the opportunity to properly understand and respond to the potential impacts and mitigations being proposed.	An assessment of potential impacts to shipping and navigation, including potential vessel displacement, restriction of adverse weather routing, and potential cumulative effects, is provided in Chapter 15: Shipping and Navigation.
531	Orsted Entities	P2_32	We would also welcome the opportunity to discuss further the following cumulative and in-combination impacts: · Cumulative and in-combination effects – these are an area of concern due to the nature of the increased development in a congested area of sea, particularly in relation to shipping and navigation, ornithology, and marine mammals, as well as seabed morphology	An assessment of potential impacts to ornithological receptors, marine mammals, sea bed morphology receptors and commercial fisheries including potential cumulative effects is provided in Chapter 11 Marine Mammals, Chapter 12 Offshore and Intertidal Ornithology, Chapter 7 Marine Physical Processes, Chapter 14 Commercial Fisheries.
532	RSPB	P2_33	Due to resource constraints, the RSPB has been unable to review and provide comments on the offshore ornithology aspects of the Outer Dowsing proposal set out in the PEIR documents, including the without prejudice compensation strategy. The RSPB will continue to contribute to the consideration of these matters through the relevant Expert Working Group.	The Applicant has noted this response.
533	South Holland	P2_34	we have no specific comments to offer other than the importance of achieving a 10% biodiversity net gain for this proposed nationally significant development, in line with The Environment Act 2021. Lastly, temporary construction works	The Applicant has noted this response. The Applicant has submitted a Biodiversity Net Gain Approach and Principles Report as part of this document

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard
	District Council		can have a significant affect and we would therefore welcome a full scheme of remediation and reinstatement after these works have been undertaken	
534	The Danish Maritime Authority	P2_36	Don't have any responses to the Statutory Pre-Application Consultation under Section 42 of the Planning Act 2008	The Applicant has noted this response.
535	The Environment Protection Agency (Denmark)	P2_37	the units: Species and Nature Conservation and Marine and Water Environment: Don't have any responses, but wants to participate in the further environmental assessment process.	The Applicant has noted this response.
536	The National Federation of Fishermen's Organisation	P2_38	We welcome the practice of undertaking site specific surveys to aid in characterisation of the fish and shellfish baseline.	This is welcomed by the Applicant; the site-specific surveys are detailed in Appendix 10.1 Fish and Shellfish Ecology Technical Baseline and are summarised in Chapter 10 Fish and Shellfish Ecology
537	The National Federation of Fishermen's Organisation	P2_38	This practice is not common in many offshore wind development pre-construction processes, we commend such and recommend it becomes common practice for advising the baseline characteristics. We also welcome the use of site-specific use of eDNA sampling as a tool to further enhance the understanding of the fish and shellfish ecology in the area. The challenges associated with differing methodologies biasing data collection for specific species receptors is well described and the use of presence/absence instead of abundance indices is well reasoned.	This is welcomed by the Applicant
538	The National Federation of Fishermen's Organisation	P2_38	However, we do have concerns with regards to the conclusions drawn and lack of mitigation proposed within the PEIR. Section 10.1.3 describes that the PEIR provided a contemporary and comprehensive analysis of the available data, we disagree. Except for the site-specific surveys, which are acknowledged to give only a temporal 'snapshot', the remaining data presented is not contemporary and over 10 years old in many cases. For example, whilst we have reservations on the over-reliance of offshore wind development EIAs on Ellis et al., 2012, this PEIR uses the more dated Ellis et al., 2010 to characterise baseline spawning and nursery areas. The same is observed with regards to relying on shellfish monitoring reports (Roach and Cohen, 2015) when a more contemporary, peer reviewed publication is available for the same study (see Roach et al., 2022).	The Applicant welcomes the suggestion of additional publications to inform the baseline and these have been incorporated into Appendix 10.1 Fish and Shellfish Ecology Technical Baseline and Chapter 10 Fish and Shellfish Ecology
539	The National Federation of Fishermen's Organisation	P2_38	The list of data sources (Table 10.2) describes the use of MMO landings statistics to advise the baseline. These data are not described in the Shellfish Ecology Technical Baseline, their inclusion and analysis would further inform the baseline.	This is noted by the Applicant, and MMO landings statistics have been incorporated into the fish and shellfish baseline as presented in Appendix 10.1 Fish and Shellfish Ecology Technical Baseline. This data has also been summarised in Chapter 10 Fish and Shellfish Ecology and used to inform the assessment where appropriate.
540	The National Federation of Fishermen's Organisation	P2_38	Figure 10.4 portrays offshore wind developments that conducted data collection that was included to advise the baseline for the Outer Dowsing development. We would expect to see the sampling stations and type to be included here to assess their relevance to be included.	This is noted by the Applicant and the sampling stations and type have been incorporated into Figure 10.4 accordingly.
541	The National Federation of Fishermen's Organisation	P2_38	Table 10.7 needs to include scientific names of species for clarity – for example, what spider crab was sampled?	This is noted by the Applicant and has been updated accordingly.



Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard
542	The National Federation of Fishermen's Organisation	P2_38	Section 10.5.3 refers to the Cefas Yorkshire and Humber Lobster stock assessment, the appropriate assessment to use in this context would be the Cefas East Anglia Lobster stock assessment.	The Applicant welcomes the suggestion of the use of the Cefas East Anglia Lobster stock assessment to inform the baseline. This data source has been incorporated into Appendix 10.1 Fish and Shellfish Ecology Technical Baseline accordingly.
543	The National Federation of Fishermen's Organisation	P2_38	Hornsea One and Two have been scoped out of the cumulative assessments, whilst we acknowledge these developments are in the operational phase, there is likely to be an operational effect contributing to the cumulative impacts to receptors. If data from these developments are suitable to be used to advise the baseline, then they should be included in the cumulative assessment.	As the completion/commissioning of Hornsea Projects One and Two occurred prior to the data collection process for the Project, these projects are considered as part of the baseline. Furthermore, any impacts from the operation of these projects are anticipated to be highly localised and will therefore not contribute to a cumulative effect on fish and shellfish receptors. The Applicant therefore maintains their position that the operational Hornsea Projects One and Two are not considered in the cumulative assessment undertaken and set out in Chapter 10 Fish and Shellfish Ecology.
544	The National Federation of Fishermen's Organisation	P2_38	The reliance of offshore wind impact assessments on Coull et al., (1998) and in this case, Ellis et al., (2010), has been called into question in nearly all our responses to offshore development licensing and planning reports. These data are 25 and 13 years old respectively but seem to be used as a 'gold standard' to assess impacts on spawning and nursery grounds. We would expect to see a more precautionary use of these data, based on those papers' well described limitations.	The Applicant confirms that the limitations of these datasets have been acknowledged in Chapter 10 Fish and Shellfish Ecology. The Coull et al. (1998) and Ellis et al. (2010) (updated in 2012 to include fish nursery grounds (Ellis et al., 2012)2) data sources are widely accepted across the offshore wind industry. Furthermore, to supplement these data sources, site specific PSA data have been used to inform the locations of suitable spawning substrates for demersal spawning receptors such as herring and sandeel and additional research publications and trawl survey data have also been reviewed to provide site-specific information which is summarised in Chapter 10 and detailed in Appendix 10.1 Fish and Shellfish Ecology Technical Baseline
545	The National Federation of Fishermen's Organisation	P2_38	Shellfish species have not been assessed to the same standards of the fish species and conclusions drawn have not been treated with any precaution. What are the distributions of the shellfish species and key spawning areas in relation to the study area? Minimal data for impacts to shellfish receptors has been presented, with the site-specific surveys limited to presence/absence. We would expect to see a more precautionary approach taken to assessing impacts to shellfish receptors in the absence of robust data to assess.	The Applicant confirms that Appendix 10.1 Fish and Shellfish Ecology Technical Baseline has been updated to present a more comprehensive baseline for shellfish receptors. The baseline has also been summarised in and has been used to inform the assessment within Chapter 10 Fish and Shellfish Ecology
546	The National Federation of Fishermen's Organisation	P2_38	We are concerned with the lack of fish and shellfish species monitoring proposed. The proposed development completely overlaps key spawning and nursery grounds for several key species, yet impacts to these receptors has been assessed as minor adverse at worst due to the impact being a localised effect. The evidence does not support this assumption.	The Applicant has undertaken an assessment of potential impacts to fish and shellfish receptors has been based on parameters of the Project set out in Chapter 3 Project Description (document reference 6.1.3) and has assumed the presence of sensitive receptors within the defined study area to ensure a precautionary assessment. A comprehensive and precautionary assessment of the potential for impacts to sensitive fish and shellfish receptors from the project has been undertaken in Section 10.6 of Chapter 10 Fish and Shellfish Ecology (document reference 6.1.10). No significant effects on fish and shellfish populations have been concluded, and therefore the Applicant does not consider it necessary to propose fish and shellfish monitoring.
547	The National Federation of Fishermen's Organisation	P2_38	We acknowledge the difficulties with the lack of site-specific, contemporary data for all receptors, but we would expect to see some element of precaution taken when assessing impacts on fish and shellfish ecology, especially when that assessment is informed by studies which employed methodologies inappropriate to this task or is based on presence/absence as opposed to abundance/biomass estimates.	The Applicant notes that a site-specific benthic survey of the study area was undertaken which included grab sampling of seabed sediments for particle size analysis (PSA). PSA data has been used to determine sandeel habitat suitability and herring spawning habitat suitability. The Applicant has incorporated acknowledgement of these datasets into this section of the ES Chapter.
548	The National Federation of Fishermen's Organisation	P2_38	The proposed Outer Dowsing wind farm and export cable sites support a diverse and economically important fishing fleet. This is well characterised within the PEIR on some occasions; however, the use of fisheries-based data could have been used to enhance the characterisation of the baseline in areas where there is a paucity of data (e.g., the < 10 m fleet).	The Applicant acknowledges the shortage of spatial data relevant to the <10 m length fleet (noting that landings data does capture the <10 m fleet). The Applicant has sought to engage with the NFFO and other fisheries stakeholders to obtain all available and relevant baseline data. Engagement with fishers active in the Project area has been undertaken via the company FLO to validate and support other sources of baseline data
549	The National Federation of Fishermen's Organisation	P2_38	We feel that engagement with local fishing fleets could have been improved leading up to the development of the PEIR, for example only 4 vessels from the Norfolk coast were consulted (Table 14.2), this is unlikely to represent all fishing businesses that will be impacted in the region.	Engagement with local fishers commenced in 2021 and has been ongoing, led by the Applicant and company FLO. This has specifically included trips to the Norfolk coastline to meet with local fishers. Since engagement with the NFFO in July 2023, the company FLO has again made a number of local

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard
				port visits to engage with local fishers. Details are included within Chapter 6 Technical Consultation
550	The National Federation of Fishermen's Organisation	P2_38	We welcome the commitment to the development of a Fisheries Liaison and CoExistence Plan. We would like to see this developed with all fisheries stakeholders in the region	An outline Fisheries Liaison and Co-existence Plan (FLCP) has been developed by the Applicant and is supplied in support of the application. .
551	The National Federation of Fishermen's Organisation	P2_38	We are concerned with the mis-match of data presented to describe the baseline. Landings data from the UK fleet is from 2017-2021 with no allowances made for the Covid 19 pandemic. Landings data for the EU fleet is dated (2012-2016) and pre-Brexit and do not reflect the current EU fleets operating in the region. The same mismatch is observed for the spatial data used, with three reference periods for the UK and EU VMS data and the AIS data. How can appropriate assessments be made with this mismatch in reference periods for the different data sources used? Inconsistencies in reference periods are highlighted by the fact that the scout data presented, highlights a high intensity of potting gear in the array area that is not highlighted in any of the other spatial data sources used. Additionally, the AIS data presented does not distinguish between active fishing or transiting, leading to a misrepresentation in spatial distribution of effort. We would expect to see a consistency in the approach taken in analysing different evidence sources and a precautionary approach taken with regards to a lack of contemporary (< 5 y/o) data used.	The limitations of individual commercial fisheries datasets are transparently acknowledged in Chapter 14 Commercial Fisheries and in the Commercial Fisheries Baseline Technical Report (Document Reference 6.3.14.1). Multiple datasets have been sourced and analysed to build up a robust understanding of fishing activity in the study area. Datasets used represent those that are publicly available and contain the most recent data that is available. In direct response to NFFO feedback, the Applicant has presented an extended 11-year time series of landings data to enable corroboration of datasets. Engagement with fishers active in the Project area has been undertaken via the company FLO to validate and support other sources of baseline data.
552	The National Federation of Fishermen's Organisation	P2_38	Reference to the EIFCA stock assessments in Sections 14.3.37 and 14.3.43 are only relevant to < 6nm, i.e., the ECC area. Use of the Cefas stock assessments for the appropriate crab and lobster functional units should also be introduced as evidence for the wider region.	Chapter 14 Commercial Fisheries and the Commercial Fisheries Baseline Technical Report (Document Reference 6.3.14.1) refer to both EIFCA and Cefas stock assessments, noting the relevance of each to different parts of the commercial fisheries study area.
553	The National Federation of Fishermen's Organisation	P2_38	The assessment of potential impacts makes several assumptions and conclusions that we disagree with when reviewing the data presented and feedback from our members in the region	The Applicant welcomes engagement with the NFFO and has met with them to discuss each of these areas of disagreement. Areas of disagreement and responses are detailed in Chapter 14 Commercial Fisheries.
554	The National Federation of Fishermen's Organisation	P2_38	We disagree with the assumption that potting effort can continue in the site post-construction (14.7.158). This is not known, as many factors influence whether potting can continue to take place in offshore wind farm sites. Using the example of the Westermost Rough site, where potting has taken place post-construction, to justify this practice can take place in all sites is flawed. For example, within the Humber Gateway site (10 miles from Westermost Rough), potting effort has not returned to levels seen before the development in direct contradiction to the Westermost Rough example.	As outlined in Chapter 14 Commercial Fisheries potting activity will not be possible within the footprint of installed infrastructure and within any active Safety Zones. Beyond these areas, spacing between infrastructure allows for resumption of potting, and the impact assessment reflects this. As discussed in a meeting with the NFFO, the Applicant acknowledges that experiences in resumption of fishing within operational UK windfarms vary based on local fishing practices and conditions within the array area. Regionally, and based on anecdotal information gathered by the company FLO, it is understood by the Applicant that fishers are deploying static gear within a operational windfarm array area. The assessment does acknowledge that 'the individual decisions made by the skippers of fishing vessels with their own perception of risk will determine the likelihood of whether their fishing will resume within the array area. Inclement weather will be a significant contributor to this risk perception.'
555	The National Federation of Fishermen's Organisation	P2_38	We disagree strongly that displacement of fishing effort has been scoped out of the cumulative impact assessment, this is done in the PEIR immediately after characterising the extensive spatial restrictions to fisheries in the region. Displacement of fishing is one of the key impacts that needs to be assessed at a cumulative scale, both from existing and upcoming spatial restrictions.	Displacement of fishing effort is assessed in the cumulative impact assessment presented in Chapter 14 Commercial Fisheries.
556	The National Federation of	P2_38	The Eastern Inshore and Offshore Marine Plan, Policy FISH 1 states that "Within areas of fishing activity, proposals should demonstrate in order of preference avoid, minimise, mitigate" impacts to commercial fisheries. The PEIR identifies impacts to the	Chapter 14 Commercial Fisheries sets out a number of designed-in project measures that seek to minimise impacts on commercial fishing, including a reduction in project scale. Where significant impacts on commercial fishing are identified, despite the implementation of

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard
	Fishermen's Organisation		static gear sector as “medium/adverse”, with mitigation suggested in response to following FLOWW guidelines regards disruption payments. What steps were undertaken to avoid or minimise impacts to commercial fisheries in accordance with Policy FISH 1? Avoiding these steps is in direct contravention of the Eastern Marine Plans.	embedded measures, further mitigation measures have been proposed. This approach aligns with the stated policy.
557	The National Federation of Fishermen's Organisation	P2_38	We disagree with the assessment of displacement effects. Commercial fisheries in the region, both UK and EU fleets, are already subject to extensive spatial restrictions. The displacement effects of this development and others within the Southern North Sea region will have a continued effect on all commercial fisheries and this needs to be assessed correctly.	The impact assessment presented in Chapter 14 Commercial Fisheries acknowledges and assesses the potential for displacement across all Project phases. The assessment assumes that where the effects of exclusion are appropriately managed and mitigated, or where exclusion does not occur (e.g. where it is assumed fishing will resume within the operational Project) displacement effects should not be significant.
558	The National Federation of Fishermen's Organisation	P2_38	The commercial fisheries in the region can expect to see a vastly changing landscape through the lifespan of the Outer Dowsing project. The spatial squeeze on fisheries due to offshore developments in the region is already extensive and the likelihood of further restrictions with regards to the potential bans on mobile gear within MCZs also envisaged. Factors associated with the renegotiation of the Trade and Cooperation Agreement and consequent changes in access arrangements for EU vessels will also affect commercial fishing opportunities in the region. Whilst these elements are acknowledged in the PEIR as possible factors, they are not accounted for in the impact assessments or a contemporary setting.	The cumulative impact assessment presented in Chapter 14 Commercial Fisheries considers the potential interaction of the Project with other planned developments, including designated sites. The commercial fisheries assessment considers and describes the expected ‘future baseline’ within which the Project would be present
559	The National Federation of Fishermen's Organisation	P2_38	It is recognised that the PEIR characterises a commercial fisheries baseline by analysing many different data sources to describe and analyse the commercial fisheries impact, but this needs a consistent reference period across all sources and inclusion of stakeholder expertise. The assumptions made, and subsequent impacts assessed from these data, do not align with the level of economic impact assessed, however, and we do not agree with them.	The limitations of individual commercial fisheries datasets are transparently acknowledged in Chapter 14 Commercial Fisheries and in the Commercial Fisheries Baseline Technical Report (Document Reference 6.3.14.1). Multiple datasets have been sourced and analysed to build up a robust understanding of fishing activity in the study area. Datasets used represent those that are publicly available and contain the most recent data that is available. In direct response to NFFO feedback the Applicant has presented an extended 11-year time series of landings data to enable corroboration of datasets. Engagement with fishers active in the Project area has been undertaken via the company FLO to validate and support other sources of baseline data. The assessment identifies the potential for significant impacts to the UK potting fleet and acknowledges the need for further mitigation in response.
560	The National Federation of Fishermen's Organisation	P2_38	In fisheries management, a precautionary principle is enacted where there is a paucity of relevant data or significant uncertainties. This does not seem to be the case for impact assessments. Limitations of data are acknowledged but do not seem to influence the outcomes of impact assessments: a flaw in the methodological design and interpretation.	The limitations of individual commercial fisheries datasets are transparently acknowledged in Chapter 14 Commercial Fisheries and in the Commercial Fisheries Baseline Technical Report (Document Reference 6.3.14.1). Multiple datasets have been sourced and analysed to build up a robust understanding of fishing activity in the study area. Datasets used represent those that are publicly available and contain the most recent data that is available. In direct response to NFFO feedback the Applicant has presented an extended 11-year time series of landings data to enable corroboration of datasets. Engagement with fishers active in the Project area has been undertaken via the company FLO to validate and support other sources of baseline data. The assessment identifies the potential for significant impacts to the UK potting fleet and acknowledges the need for further mitigation in response.
561	The National Federation of Fishermen's Organisation	P2_38	Whilst we appreciate the difficulties in assessing impacts with limited data sources, we feel that the effects of this needs to be fully accounted for in the methodology. This development will have a direct impact on commercial fisheries and their communities, and we feel the PEIR under-represent these	The limitations of individual commercial fisheries datasets are transparently acknowledged in Chapter 14 Commercial Fisheries and in the Commercial Fisheries Baseline Technical Report (Document Reference 6.3.14.1). Multiple datasets have been sourced and analysed to build up a robust understanding of fishing activity in the study area. Datasets used represent those that are publicly available and contain the most recent data that is available. In direct response to NFFO feedback the Applicant has presented an extended 11-year time series of landings data to enable corroboration of datasets. Engagement with fishers active in the Project area has been undertaken via the company FLO to validate and support other sources of baseline data. The assessment identifies the potential for



Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard
				significant impacts to the UK potting fleet and acknowledges the need for further mitigation in response.
562	The UK Chamber of Shipping	P2_39	The Chamber had a meeting on 16 August 2022 where it requested that PEIR included an idea of scale, possibly through the use of a grid to understand what the size of a certain development in the area will resemble. The response notes that this has been addressed in Section 3.4 of the NRA. This is incorrect and it is disappointing that this request has not been fulfilled.	This is noted by the Applicant. Figure 17-1 of the NRA (document reference 6.3.15.1) presents a heat map based upon the geographical distribution of vessel encounter tracks within a density grid.
563	The UK Chamber of Shipping	P2_39	The Chamber notes the reference to Draft National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy Infrastructure (EN-3) (Department for Energy, Security & Net Zero (DESNZ), 2023) within Chapter 6.1.15. Given the statements referenced are in draft format and not formally approved and may be subject to change, they should not be given undue precedence, with the 2011 DECC NPS statements being the correct policies to follow at this time.	The Applicant has updated all relevant application documents to reference the National Policy Statement's that were published in November 2023 and formally approved in January 2024.
564	The UK Chamber of Shipping	P2_39	The Chamber notes that the two proposed developments of DBS have a total power rating of 1500MW and areas for lease of approximately 500km <sup>2</sup> . This equates to an energy generating density of approximately 3MW per km <sup>2</sup> , which by present development standards in the UK EEZ is a low density and may be considered unnecessarily so given other developments are working to 5 or more MW per km <sup>2</sup> . With regards to the specifics of the site, referring to Array Area Boundary Key Coordinates included within the NRA, the Chamber recommends two areas for reductions in the RLB. Firstly, the A-B northerly extent has the most interaction to high density traffic routes and the most impact upon navigational squeeze and accordingly safety. The Chamber also suggests that B and the resulting right angle creates a sharp turn and collision hot spot as identified in Figure 15.2 of the NRA, with the result being that a drawing in of the boundary at B be recommended to reduce the direct nature of vessel interaction. Secondly, the G-H westerly extent of the development as it abuts into the Outer Dowsing Channel. The Chamber acknowledges the 10m contour as being the defining depth for the majority of traffic using the Outer Dowsing Channel but does not agree that building to the edge of 10m contour is in the best interest of navigational safety given the recommended sailing distance of 2nm from the edge of a wind farm development.	The Applicant has considered this response and has reduced the western and northern boundary of the array area as detailed in Chapter 4 Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference 6.1.4). Further detail is also presented in Appendix 15.1 Navigational Risk Assessment (document reference 6.3.15.1).
565	The UK Chamber of Shipping	P2_39	The Chamber welcomes the inclusion of MAIB accident data from 2000-2009 as greater historical data but would like to see a visual representation of it post PEIR. The Chamber also questions why 2020-2022 data is not shown given its availability.	This is noted by the Applicant and the NRA (document reference 6.3.15.1) now includes 21 years of MAIB data (up to 2022).
566	The UK Chamber of Shipping	P2_39	The Chamber has reviewed Chapter 15 and the NRA but found no detail regarding the decommissioning plan. The Chamber strongly advocates for the full removal of all infrastructure above and below the seabed, acknowledging BATNEEC when it comes to turbine foundations which penetrate deep into the seabed. The Chamber is aware that various developments have a preference for cabling to remain in situ. The Chamber objects to this for a number of reasons as detailed below.  Firstly, the Chamber has concerns that buried cables left in situ may become exposed and therefore pose a hazard to anchoring activity, especially in an emergency when such activity is most likely to take place. This has been highlighted by the International Hydrographic Organization (IHO) who at their Assembly meeting held at Monaco in April 2017 highlighted: "Mariners are also warned that the seafloor where cables were originally buried may have changed and cables become exposed; therefore particular caution should be taken when operating vessels in areas where submarine cables exist especially where the depth of water means that there is a limited under-keel clearance" Such risk is minimised during the economic life of the wind farm, as navigational traffic through the development will be reduced and it is expected that regular monitoring of the cabling and its protection will be carried out with any necessary remedial works. However	This is noted by the Applicant. The Project would be decommissioned in line with a decommissioning plan under the Energy Act (2004) and any requirements of The Crown Estate. The draft DCO includes the requirement for a decommissioning programme to be approved prior to the commencement of construction. As such, it is not appropriate to determine the scope of decommissioning works at this point in time.



Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard
			<p>once decommissioned, the site will be open to a greater extent to surface navigation and other activity. The Chamber is not aware of commitments by developers post commissioning to regularly monitor and rebury or remove cabling which has become exposed.</p> <p>Secondly, it is widely recognised that ships' anchors pose a significant hazard to submarine cables as they are designed to penetrate the seabed. The depth of penetration will depend on the size and type of anchor and the nature of the seabed. Hence, the Chamber is concerned that cable burial at typical depths does not fully safeguard against anchor fouling and entanglement. This was exemplified through the incident of the Stema Barge II incident in the English Channel when emergency anchoring led to the IFA interconnector being fouled and cut through. Passing the cost of potential fouling and disentanglement to the shipping company, authorities, insurers and any Search and Rescue (SAR) services required is not desirable.</p> <p>Thirdly, through the leaving of cabling in situ, future seabed activity in the area is significantly constrained, either rendered unfeasible, or costly for the next seabed user to remove or work around such cabling.</p>	
567	The UK Chamber of Shipping	P2_39	<p>The Chamber recognises the necessity for large scale deployment of offshore wind as part of the UK energy mix to reach net zero and therefore calls upon the developer to be frugal in its usage of the seabed and reduce the footprint of the OWF or not build out to the full red line boundary (RLB).</p> <p>The UK EEZ is finite and unnecessary use of the seabed squanders the valuable wind resource the UK has. Through reducing the seabed area developed by Outer Dowsing, it means there is available sea-room set aside for other activities, including commercial navigation, along with the potential for more build out of offshore wind in later rounds.</p>	<p>The Applicant has considered this response and has reduced the western and northern boundary of the array area as detailed in Chapter 4 Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference 6.1.4). Further detail is also presented in Appendix 15.1 Navigational Risk Assessment (document reference 6.3.15.1).</p>
568	Trinity House	P2_40	<p>I can confirm that Trinity House has the following comments/requests to make at this stage:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I have attached our most recent standard navigation conditions, which we would expect to be provided for within your DCO/DML.</li> <li>• Could you please provide us with the most recent shape files for this project?</li> <li>• We would welcome your earliest possible consultation regarding proposed turbine layouts, as well as the locations of any other infrastructure.</li> </ul> <p>I hope these comments are helpful and we look forward to working with you throughout this project.</p>	<p>The Applicant has considered the propose DCO/dML conditions provided by Trinity House and where relevant has included such conditions in the DCO / dMLS. The Applicant notes the request for discussion on turbine layouts and location of infrastructure and will engage further with Trinity House once further detailed engineering work has been undertaken to inform turbine layouts. Indicative turbine layouts have been used in the Environmental Statement, and layout principals are detailed in Chapter 15 Shipping and Navigation.</p>

## 2.2 Onshore

Table 2.2 Applicant Regard to Phase 2 Section 42 Consultation Responses (Onshore)

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
1	Alford Town Council	P2_1	Having a substation near villages will devalue the houses.	The Applicant has evaluated the potential substation sites in line with the connection options proposed by National Grid, which were Lincolnshire Node and Weston Marsh. Following the confirmation of the grid connection location the proposed substation site at Lincolnshire Node referred to was no longer progressed and the Applicant has committed to the substation at Weston Marsh. The constraints mapping that was undertaken as part of the siting process for onshore infrastructure included proximity to residential receptors.	6.1.4 Site Selection
2	Alford Town Council	P2_1	There will be no local employment opportunities	<p>The economic opportunities from the development of the offshore wind sector are considered to be critical for the economic future of the area.</p> <p>Based on the assumptions and methodology outlined in Chapter 29 Socioeconomics it is estimated that under a worst case scenario the Project could result in the creation of 1,690 years of employment in the Local Economic Area (LEA) and 2,010 years of employment in the Regional Area.</p> <p>In addition to the direct and supply chain impacts the Project will support economic activity through the spending of those employed in its construction. The majority of this economic activity is expected to occur during the construction period and peak in Q3 of 2029 when the construction of the Project is expected to support 680 jobs in the LEA and 810 jobs in the Regional Area.</p>	6.1.29 Socioeconomics
3	Alford Town Council	P2_1	Alford Town Council strongly opposes overhead pylons.	The Applicant has committed to underground cables for the entirety of the cable corridor. No overhead pylons are proposed as part of the Project.	N/A
4	Alford Town Council	P2_1	The substation will be visible for miles around - the town council feels that the local towns and villages should be compensated, not just the Farmer who owns the land.	<p>A key consideration in the Applicant's site selection process was the sensitivity of the surrounding landscape and the of residents, road users, workers and recreational users of the landscape.</p> <p>The Applicant has committed to mitigation planting that will be utilised to create an effective screen reducing and/or eliminating significant effects on landscape character and visual amenity. Details of the proposed planting are set out in the Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Strategy (OLEMS)</p> <p>The Applicant has continued to develop a community benefit fund that will benefit the local community around the Project's infrastructure which will be launched post-consent.</p>	<p>6.1.28 Landscape and Visual Assessment</p> <p>8.10 Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Strategy</p>
5	Alford Town Council	P2_1	Increased heavy traffic - Alford is impacted whenever there is significant infrastructure	<p>The Applicant has considered the impacts of construction traffic including around Alford as set out in Chapter 27 Traffic and Transport.</p> <p>The Applicant has submitted an Outline CTMP which sets out the key elements that will be secured in the final CTMP to be submitted post consent to the relevant planning authority in accordance with the DCO including the approach that will be taken to manage the potential impacts of construction traffic for the onshore works.</p>	<p>8.15 Outline CTMP</p> <p>6.1.27 Traffic and Transport</p>

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
6	Alford Town Council	P2_1	The proposed sites will dominates the landscape due to the flat terrain	<p>A key consideration in the Applicant’s site selection process was the sensitivity of the surrounding landscape and the of residents, road users, workers and recreational users of the landscape.</p> <p>The Applicant has committed to mitigation planting that will be utilised to create an effective screen reducing and/or eliminating significant effects on landscape character and visual amenity. Details of the proposed planting are set out in the Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Strategy (OLEMS)</p>	<p>6.1.28 Landscape and Visual Assessment</p> <p>8.10 OLEMS</p>
7	Anglian Water	P2_3	<p>Can we arrange an inception meeting to inform Anglian Water's response to the statutory consultation. The meeting would be with colleagues considering the impact on the water resources network, the water recycling network, the need for diversions of assets, the impact on groundwater, Anglian Water's above ground assets and Protective Provisions. We would also welcome clarification whether new water or sewerage connections are required and specifically the quantum of water demand for the construction and operational phases of the project.</p> <p>My colleague Phil Jones is considering the unsigned agreement provided by your land agents Dalcour Maclaren on the approach you would want to take to covering Anglian Water's cost in supporting the project.</p>	<p>The Applicant has engaged with Anglian Water throughout the consultation process as outlined in the Consultation Report and Chapter 6 Technical Consultation to discuss the existing infrastructure in the area and protective provisions</p>	<p>6.1.6 Technical Consultation</p>
8	Bilsby & Farlesthorpe Parish Council	P2_4	The building will be overbearing, no other new construction in East Lindsey is as high as the proposal, although it is unclear if the main building is 12m high, 19m or 25m, which is it?	<p>Following the confirmation of the grid connection location the proposed substation site at Lincolnshire Node referred to was no longer progressed and the Applicant has committed to the substation at Weston Marsh.</p>	
9	Bilsby & Farlesthorpe Parish Council	P2_4	It will be TOTALLY out of character in this rural area.	<p>A key consideration in the Applicant’s site selection process was the sensitivity of the surrounding landscape and the of residents, road users, workers and recreational users of the landscape.</p> <p>Following the confirmation of the grid connection location the proposed substation site at Lincolnshire Node referred to was no longer progressed and the Applicant has committed to the substation at Weston Marsh.</p> <p>At Weston Marsh the Applicant has committed to mitigation planting that will be utilised to create an effective screen reducing and/or eliminating significant effects on landscape character and visual amenity. Details of the proposed planting are set out in the Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Strategy (OLEMS)</p>	<p>6.1.28 Landscape and Visual Assessment</p> <p>8.10 OLEMS</p>
10	Bilsby & Farlesthorpe Parish Council	P2_4	It will dominate the landscape in an inappropriate way, being a large industrial unit in the middle of agricultural landscape.	<p>A key consideration in the Applicant’s site selection process was the sensitivity of the surrounding landscape and the of residents, road users, workers and recreational users of the landscape.</p> <p>Following the confirmation of the grid connection location the proposed substation site at Lincolnshire Node referred to was no longer progressed and the Applicant has committed to the substation at Weston Marsh.</p> <p>At Weston Marsh the Applicant has committed to mitigation planting that will be utilised to create an effective screen reducing and/or eliminating significant effects on landscape character and visual amenity. Details of the proposed planting are set out in the Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Strategy (OLEMS)</p>	<p>6.1.28 Landscape and Visual Assessment</p> <p>8.10 OLEMS</p>

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
11	Bilsby & Farlesthorpe Parish Council	P2_4	Being a predominantly flat locality, it will be visible for many miles.	<p>A key consideration in the Applicant's site selection process was the sensitivity of the surrounding landscape and the of residents, road users, workers and recreational users of the landscape.</p> <p>Following the confirmation of the grid connection location the proposed substation site at Lincolnshire Node referred to was no longer progressed and the Applicant has committed to the substation at Weston Marsh.</p> <p>At Weston Marsh the Applicant has committed to mitigation planting that will be utilised to create an effective screen reducing and/or eliminating significant effects on landscape character and visual amenity. Details of the proposed planting are set out in the Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Strategy (OLEMS)</p>	<p>6.1.28 Landscape and Visual Assessment</p> <p>8.10 OLEMS</p>
12	Bilsby & Farlesthorpe Parish Council	P2_4	There are always long views in this area, views of the Wolds, of the Coast and of the varying landscape and field patterns, this will be lost.	<p>A key consideration in the Applicant's site selection process was the sensitivity of the surrounding landscape and the of residents, road users, workers and recreational users of the landscape.</p> <p>Following the confirmation of the grid connection location the proposed substation site at Lincolnshire Node referred to was no longer progressed and the Applicant has committed to the substation at Weston Marsh.</p> <p>At Weston Marsh the Applicant has committed to mitigation planting that will be utilised to create an effective screen reducing and/or eliminating significant effects on landscape character and visual amenity. Details of the proposed planting are set out in the Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Strategy (OLEMS)</p>	<p>6.1.28 Landscape and Visual Assessment</p> <p>8.10 OLEMS</p>
13	Bilsby & Farlesthorpe Parish Council	P2_4	There are always long views of areas of interest SSSIs, Scheduled Ancient Monuments and Listed Buildings all these will be lost.	<p>The Applicant has carried out a desk based assessment to identify the presence of scheduled monuments, which has identified one Scheduled Monument within the Order Limits where measures may be required to preserve the monument as set out within the Schedule of Mitigation.</p> <p>SSSIs and any impacts on these have been considered in the RIAA submitted as part of the application.</p> <p>At Weston Marsh the Applicant has committed to mitigation planting that will be utilised to create an effective screen reducing and/or eliminating significant effects on landscape character and visual amenity. Details of the proposed planting are set out in the OLEMS.</p>	<p>6.1.20 Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage</p> <p>8.13 Schedule of Mitigation</p> <p>8.10 OLEMS</p> <p>7.1 RIAA</p>
14	Bilsby & Farlesthorpe Parish Council	P2_4	The building will be totally alien the largest buildings in this area are chicken units at approximately 6m high. The proposed building is over 3 times higher.	<p>A key consideration in the Applicant's site selection process was the sensitivity of the surrounding landscape and the of residents, road users, workers and recreational users of the landscape.</p> <p>Following the confirmation of the grid connection location the proposed substation site at Lincolnshire Node referred to was no longer progressed and the Applicant has committed to the substation at Weston Marsh.</p> <p>At Weston Marsh the Applicant has committed to mitigation planting that will be utilised to create an effective screen reducing and/or eliminating significant effects on landscape character and visual amenity. Details of the proposed</p>	<p>6.1.28 Landscape and Visual Assessment</p> <p>8.10 OLEMS</p>



Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
				planting are set out in the Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Strategy (OLEMS)	
15	Bilsby & Farlesthorpe Parish Council	P2_4	We are extremely concerned at the potential for large pylon type structures to carry cables to and from the building, again totally alien features in this area.	The Applicant has committed to burying the cables underground. The visual effects of the construction of the onshore ECC and 400kV cable corridor are presented in Chapter 28 LVIA.	6.1.28 Landscape and Visual Assessment
16	Bilsby & Farlesthorpe Parish Council	P2_4	Loss of agricultural land, vital in the country's food production chain.	The Environmental Statement assessment has concluded that there would be no significant effects on the ALC grade of the land as a result of the cabling due to the limited scale and duration of activities - which is considered to be of relevance to long-term food security. Food security and the businesses/supply chain impacted by disruptions is further discussed in Chapter 29 Socio-economic Characteristics	6.1.29 Socioeconomics, Recreation and Tourism
17	Bilsby & Farlesthorpe Parish Council	P2_4	The footprint of the building will be some 4500 sq m, excluding access roads and local infrastructure.	<p>A key consideration in the Applicant's site selection process was the sensitivity of the surrounding landscape and the of residents, road users, workers and recreational users of the landscape.</p> <p>Following the confirmation of the grid connection location the proposed substation site at Lincolnshire Node referred to was no longer progressed and the Applicant has committed to the substation at Weston Marsh.</p> <p>At Weston Marsh the Applicant has committed to mitigation planting that will be utilised to create an effective screen reducing and/or eliminating significant effects on landscape character and visual amenity. Details of the proposed planting are set out in the Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Strategy (OLEMS)</p>	<p>6.1.28 Landscape and Visual Assessment</p> <p>8.10 OLEMS</p>
18	Bilsby & Farlesthorpe Parish Council	P2_4	Looking at the two suggested sites, the site further south in the Spalding area would seem a more sensible location as there are already large industrial units in that area, together with the infrastructure to serve the substation and onward transmission of power.	<p>The Applicant has undertaken an iterative site selection process as outlined in Chapter 4: Site Selection.</p> <p>Following the confirmation of the grid connection location the proposed substation site at Lincolnshire Node referred to was no longer progressed and the Applicant has committed to the substation at Weston Marsh.</p>	6.1.4 Site Selection
19	Bilsby & Farlesthorpe Parish Council	P2_4	Information provided by Outer Dowsing is far from clear, it is confusing and underhand drip feeding instead of being transparent.	The Applicant has noted this comment.	N/A
20	Bilsby & Farlesthorpe Parish Council	P2_4	This simply the wrong place for a development such as this, for the reasons stated above, this is Bilsbys HR2 in disguise.	The Applicant notes this comment, however due to the iterative site selection process and the grid connection confirmation the Lincolnshire Node OnSS is no longer part of the development proposals and the issues no longer need to be addressed	N/A
21	Bilsby & Farlesthorpe Parish Council	P2_4	If the building is approved, and we are totally against this, then it should be a planning condition that there is NO outside lighting and, before the site is developed, the area should be landscaped to allow such landscaping to grow to go some way towards hiding the construction and finished building and infrastructure.	The Applicant notes this comment, however due to the iterative site selection process and the grid connection confirmation the Lincolnshire Node OnSS is no longer part of the development proposals and the issues no longer need to be addressed.	N/A
22	Boston Borough Council	P2_5	Impact on Freiston. Whilst I understand the need to route the cable south of Boston, I find the route of the cable is unnecessarily disruptive to both the local people and farmers. The cable cuts through the village and several high quality fields. On this basis I do not understand why a less disruptive route could not be found, the obvious course if the cable runs north of the A52 would be to take it to the Hob Hole drain and then run it along the drain. This is a much simpler route that will not affect the village and local farmers over a period of 2 to 3 years.	The adopted cable route runs east of Frieston village, noting it is constrained to the west by Butterwick village. The cable route was refined significantly since the PEIR which showed a typical 300m corridor, noting the corridor has been refined down to an approximate 80m width and will not directly impact the village. The Applicant did not take the option of running the cable along hobhole drain forward due to it not being practicable from an engineering perspective as the Hobhole drain is only circa 25m wide and the permeant easement	6.1.4 Site Selection, 6.1.24 Hydrology and Flood Risk, 6.1.25 Land Use, 8.1.5 Outline Surface Water and Drainage Strategy

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
			In summary whilst I understand the need for renewable energy systems, I am extremely concerned with the proposed routing of this cable south of the A52 through the UKs finest soils and food production areas, but also along a bank that has a known and serious tidal flood risk. This flooding risk will only worsen with climate change, as the sea level rises, and climate variance becomes more extreme	<p>required by the Project is 60m. It should also be noted that the Hobhole drain is a Local Wildlife Site and Local Geological site.</p> <p>Flood risk has been a guiding influence on the siting of the onshore infrastructure as discussed in Chapter 4 Site Selection.</p> <p>An Outline Surface Water and Drainage Strategy (SWDS) (document 8.1.4) has been submitted as part of the Outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP). The SWDS sets out the principles and protocols to address potential drainage and flooding issues during construction.</p>	
23	Boston Borough Council	P2_5	<p>Algarkirk PC discussed the scoping exercise at the meeting last night and agree in principle with the proposals. The PC understands there may be a community fund linked to the application and would like to know more about how this may benefit Algarkirk.</p> <p>We understand that this project is in its very early stages and would appreciate further information as it becomes available</p>	The Project continues to be committed to developing a community benefit fund and proposals as to suggested themes and criteria were included within January's Community Liaison Group meetings and suggestions invited for projects that the Project can pursue pre-consent that are aligned with these.	N/A
24	Boston Borough Council	P2_5	<p>Concerns similar to those expressed in the Wrangle Parish Council response, which relate to the construction of the onshore cables (the route comes from Anderby Creek and will pass through Wyberton) and the impact on traffic over a protracted period.</p> <p>Although the outlines for the scoping stage seems ok and that the idea, is keeping much closer to the shore line, I feel that this may be extremely close, on entry into our parish, to the RSPB Frampton (within our parish), with no clear evidence on how this project may affect migrating birds. This site is a hugely popular ornithological site within the region alongside RSPB Freiston Shore.</p>	The Applicant has taken account of all concerns raised in respect of traffic impacts which are reviewed and addressed in Chapter 27 Traffic and Transport. Principles and protocols for traffic management are also outlined in the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan and the Outline Travel Plan which have been submitted as part of the application. Onshore ornithological impacts have been reviewed and addressed in Chapter 22 Onshore Ornithology. Additionally the Applicant has engaged with the RSPB both through the Evidence Plan Process and bilaterally throughout the pre-application stage including in relation to the Frampton Marsh reserve.	6.1.22 Onshore Ornithology, 6.1.27 Traffic and Transport, 8.15 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan, 8.16 Outline Travel Plan,
25	Boston Borough Council	P2_5	Whilst we appreciate many stakeholders will comment directly to the Applicant on the project, we wanted to provide a robust and inclusive response by giving all internal stakeholders the opportunity to comment that may not be fully aware of the proposals. We have spent considerable time engaging with such bodies and this has encouraged a large range of responses received. We feel that there is a good understanding of the project and we respect there is some time to go before a preferred route is chosen. It is not until this time that the full effects on Boston Borough Council can be fully appreciated and therefore commented upon. This response has focused on the proposed methodology for each respective PEIR chapter. It is only when the full EIA submission is made that comments on specific impacts will be made. We note your community engagement to date however we would welcome future discussions over any proposed community benefits as well as any proposed employment and skills schemes that could be provided to the local workforce as well as any other potential grid infrastructure improvements that may be facilitated by the development.	<p>The Applicant has noted this response.</p> <p>The Applicant has engaged with the local community throughout the pre application phase including in relation to the community benefit fund that will be launched post consent.</p> <p>The Applicant has committed to developing a Procurement Strategy that will consider the role of local suppliers and contribution to skills development.</p>	N/A
26	Boston Borough Council	P2_5	The Council would expect and landscape visual assessment for any above ground features and for each to be looked at separately.	Chapter 28 of the Environmental Statement identifies and assesses all landscape and visual receptors that have the potential to be significantly affected by components of the onshore infrastructure.	6.1.28 Landscape and Visual Assessment
27	Boston Borough Council	P2_5	<p>Landscape and Visual Assessment</p> <p>At this stage we do not have details of the final substation location, appearance, or extent, however the information as provided for the Phase 2 Consultation has been reviewed by external consultants Terra Loci, with the following</p>	The Applicant has continued to engage and consult with BBC both through the ETG process and bilateral engagement. The methodology used has been set out in Chapter 28 Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment. Chapter 28 also includes a Landscape Character Assessment which includes reference to the relevant LCAs for the LVIA study area.	6.1.28 Landscape and Visual Assessment 8.18 Design Approach Document

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
			<p>comments on behalf of the Local Planning Authority which are summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The landscape and visual receptors and representative viewpoints need to be submitted and approved prior to the assessment being undertaken. Supporting Zone of Theoretical Visibility mapping should also be provided to ensure that the proposed study area is sufficient.</li> <li>- The full LVIA methodology, including factors and / or matrices used for determining sensitivity of landscape and visual receptors and magnitude and significance of effects should be submitted and approved prior to the assessment being undertaken. The combination of desk and field-based study can be sufficient to understand the baseline landscape and visual resource, however complete methodologies are required to agree if the method of assessment is sufficient and appropriate.</li> <li>- All visual representation with any submitted Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) should be in line with The Visual Representation of Development Proposals Technical Guidance Note (TGN) 06/19 (Landscape Institute, September 2019) to ensure the assessment of visual impact is accurate and in turn an appropriate judgement of the assessed impacts can be made. Locations for proposed 'photomontage' visualisations, including visualisation types, following TGN 06/19 should be submitted and approved prior to being undertaken.</li> <li>- The EIA should include a full assessment of the potential impacts of the development on local landscape character using landscape assessment methodologies. The use of Landscape Character Assessment (LCA), based on the good practice guidelines produced jointly by the Landscape Institute and Institute of Environmental Assessment in 2013 is encouraged. LCA provides a sound basis for guiding, informing, and understanding the ability of any location to accommodate change and to make positive proposals for conserving, enhancing or regenerating character, as detailed proposals are developed.</li> <li>- It is recommended that any development proposal explores and applies the Building with Nature standards and achieves an accreditation to highlight what 'good' looks like at each stage of the GI lifecycle and strengthen the development and demonstrate the development goes beyond the statutory minima, to create places that really deliver for people and wildlife.</li> <li>- The assessment should refer to the relevant National Character Areas as published by Natural England. Local landscape character areas should be mapped at a scale appropriate to the development site as well as any relevant management plans or strategies pertaining to the area. The EIA should include assessments of visual effects on the surrounding area and landscape together with any physical effects of the development, such as changes in topography and loss or disturbance of vegetation.</li> <li>- In order to foster high quality development that respects, maintains, or enhances, local landscape character and distinctiveness, the LVIA should</li> </ul>	<p>Information on site selection, layout design and mitigation planting, cumulative effects and operational effects have been considered in Chapter 28.</p> <p>Chapter 28 also sets out an assessment of effects on visual amenity and physical elements.</p> <p>Information on the design of the OnSS is present in the Design Approach Document and the Design Principles Statement. Detailed design will be developed further post application.</p> <p>The cumulative assessment is presented in Chapter 28 and includes the National Grid Onshore Substation (NGSS) which is at the pre-application stage.</p> <p>The residual effects arising from the landfall, onshore ECC and 400kV cable corridor will be very limited as assessed in Chapter 28. The residual effects extending from the construction phase into the operational phase are also considered in this Chapter.</p>	<p>8.19 Design Principles Statement</p>

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
			<p>consider the character and distinctiveness of the area, with the siting and design of the proposed development reflecting local design characteristics. The Environmental Impact Assessment process should detail the measures to be taken to ensure the building design will be of a high standard, as well as detail of layout alternatives together with justification of the selected option in terms of landscape impact and benefit.</p> <p>- The assessment should also include the cumulative effect of the development with other relevant existing or proposed developments in the area. A list of proposed cumulative schemes should be submitted and approved prior to the assessment being undertaken.</p> <p>Cumulative impact assessment should include other proposals currently at Scoping stage and onwards. Due to the overlapping timescale of their progress through the planning system, cumulative impact of the proposed development with those proposals currently at Scoping stage would be likely to be a material consideration at the time of determination of the planning application.</p> <p>- Operational effects arising from the Onshore ECC and export cable landfall should be scoped into the assessment as there is potential for a loss of vegetation and alteration of the baseline landscape and visual resource which will be longer lasting than the construction phase and the long-term effectiveness of remediation and mitigation proposals should be considered. Other potential effects identified are sufficient, pending the submission and approval of full landscape and visual receptor groups and representative viewpoints.</p>		
28	Boston Borough Council	P2_5	<p>Air Quality Having reviewed the information put forward within the PEIR, the approach taken appears reasonable in the methodology and we have the below comments to offer. The Council would expect the following to be complied with during the project installation phase: - Burning of waste should be avoided. Any burning of waste deemed strictly necessary should be undertaken in accordance with the relevant waste management exemption issued the Environment Agency, and consideration should be given to the timing of such burning, and the prevailing weather conditions to impact emissions to air and nuisance to offsite receptor's ; and - Soil stockpiles should be sealed to recued fugitive dust emissions</p>	<p>The Applicant has submitted an Outline Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) as part of the DCO application which sets out mitigation measures, such as those highlighted by BBC details control measures relating to emissions to air which are required to prevent/avoid or reduce and mitigate potential impacts. Furthermore, soils will be handled and managed in line with the Outline Soil Management Plan (Document 8.1.3). Both outline plans form part of the Outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), the implementation of which is secured as a requirement of the DCO.</p>	<p>8.1.2 Outline Air Quality Management Plan 8.1.3 Outline Soil Management Plan 8.1 Code of Construction Practice</p>
29	Boston Borough Council	P2_5	<p>From a Boston Borough Council perspective, the proposed development affects the Borough by installing underground cables if the southern route is adopted. If the northern route is adopted it suggests we may be affected by the National Grid overhead cable proposals as they go south, but that is another issue. On balance an underground impact is preferable in my view.</p> <p>The Borough has accommodated underground cables on at least two other occasions for renewable energy related development: Tritton Knoll off shore wind farm and Viking Link interconnector and may do so again for two large solar parks in nearby local authorities that intend to connect to Bicker Fen substation. As such the impact is limited and temporary.</p>	<p>The Project is to connect in to the vicinity of the overhead lines at Weston Marsh. The Project is not seeking development consent for overhead lines and is not part of or reliant on the National Grid proposals. The Environmental Statement addresses the issues raised in Chapter 20, Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage, Chapter 21 Onshore Ecology, Chapter 26 Noise and Vibration, Chapter 27 Traffic and Transport. Additionally the Project has submitted an Outline Soil Management Plan as part of the DCO application which sets out principles and protocols to be followed in respect of dust and soil management. With regards to the potential effect on fishing, the Project have undertaken significant consultation with the local fishing industry though a fisheries liaison officer and other fishing industry organisations to identify all those believed to</p>	<p>6.1.20 Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage, 6.1.21 Onshore Ecology, 6.1.26 Noise and Vibration, 6.1.27 Traffic and Transport, 8.1.3 Soil Management Plan</p>



Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
			<p>The issues that underground cabling raise are designated and not designated habitat along the route, management of soils, dust, construction noise, traffic and archaeology / historic assets.</p> <p>I note the mapping includes local, national and internationally designated habitats. The PEIR contains chapters on ecology and ornithology. Given the quality of the agricultural land it is important that it is carefully removed, stored and replaced. This is raised in the land use chapter and promises a soil management plan as part of the code of construction practice. The DCO covers this in Part 3 Article 18. Construction hours are part of controlling noise impacts and this is also covered in the DCO part 3 article 19. A construction traffic management plan is also required by the DCO in part 3 article 20. On shore archaeology is covered in Part 3 article 17.</p> <p>The PEIR acknowledges the likely impacts on the Borough and other consultees will have more detailed knowledge to accept, or not, the methodology and conclusions of the impact. We have a fishing fleet and I note that the PEIR includes a chapter on fish and shell fish ecology and commercial fisheries. The commercial fishing chapter mentions consultation with fishermen (Page 19) but does not mention Boston. I do not know if the site impacts on the Boston fisherman’s fishing grounds and so we should cover that in our response.</p>	<p>be potentially affected by the Project. The Boston Fisherman Grounds (in the Wash) are not affected by the Project.</p>	
30	Boston Borough Council	P2_5	<p>Onshore Ecology</p> <p>Boston Council do not have an in-house ecologist and the Wildlife Trust may have chosen to comment directly on the content of the consultation at phase 2, however having reviewed the information put forward within the PEIR, the approach taken appears reasonable in the methodology and we have no specific comments to offer other than the following:</p> <p>The Council would like to reiterate the importance of achieving a 10% biodiversity net gain for this proposed nationally significant development, in line with The Environment Act 2021. Additionally, comments from Parish members noted that the impacts to RSPB Frampton, a very popular ornithological site within the region alongside RSPB Freiston Shore have not been assessed, with it remaining unknown how they will be impacted by the proposed development. Lastly, temporary construction works can have a significant affect and we would therefore welcome a full scheme of remediation and reinstatement after these works have been undertaken.</p>	<p>The Project continues to investigate opportunities for biodiversity net gain, as outlined in the Biodiversity Net Gain Principles and Approach document which has been submitted as part of the DCO application. The potential impacts to RSPB Frampton Marsh and Freiston Marsh have been assessed within Chapter 22 Onshore Ornithology and continues to engage with the RSPB regarding potential impacts arising from the Project. The ES assesses the impact, mitigations proposed and/ or remediation of any potential adverse effects on the local area from both an environmental and social perspective.</p>	6.1.22 Onshore Ornithology, 8.14 Biodiversity Net Gain Principles and Approach
31	Boston Borough Council	P2_5	<p>Geology and Ground Conditions</p> <p>Boston Council do not have an in-house geologist and the Coal Authority may have chosen to comment directly on the content of the consultation at phase 2, however having reviewed the information put forward within the PEIR, the approach taken appears reasonable in the methodology and we the following specific comments to offer:</p> <p>Boston Council do not have an in-house geologist and the Coal Authority may have chosen to comment directly on the content of the consultation at phase 2, however having reviewed the information put forward within the PEIR, the approach taken appears reasonable in the methodology and we the following specific comments to offer:</p> <p>Specific comments from a member of Freiston Parish Council have been</p>	<p>The route option south of the A52 close to the Wash sea defence banks through the parish of Freiston at PEIR is no longer in consideration and following the confirmation of the Project’s grid connection has not been progressed to application.</p> <p>The potential impact and subsequent reinstatement and aftercare of soils has been considered in Chapter 23 Geology and Ground Conditions and Chapter 25 Land Use. It is noted that the soils in the region are high quality and complex soils. The Outline Soil Management Plan includes further management practices and mitigation to address the potential risk and will manage handling and protection of soils, including management practices and mitigation measures for working in marine silts, and ceasing work during wet weather.</p>	6.1.23 Geology and Ground Conditions, 8.1.3 Outline Soil Management Plan

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
			<p>received and officers share these concerns. In relation to this topic the following has been raised: Soil management practices may need further evidence and investigation with relation to marine silts. Methodologies to prevent silt slurries should be presented as these pose a dangerous environmental risk.</p>		
32	Boston Borough Council	P2_5	<p>I am a resident of Freiston, Lincs and also a member of the Parish Council. I live in Freiston, having grown up on a family farm within the village. Professionally, I am a Professor of Agri Food Technology, HonFRAGS, FIAgrE and FRSB and Founding Director of the Lincoln Institute of Agri-Food Technology. I was awarded the Royal Agricultural Society's medal for science and innovation in agriculture and have advised the government on aspects of agricultural innovation. In addition my team have specifically studied the impacts of tidal flood risk on this specific region's soils and potential recovery from salt water inundation. I attach a copy of our peer reviewed publication for your records. Given my specific expertise and local knowledge, I am concerned about the current plans, in particular the potential cable track that routes south of the A52 and close to the Wash sea defence banks and how they route through the parish of Freiston. My concerns are;</p> <p>Flood risk. I was surprised that I could not find any references to the 2 serious flood events in the region that have occurred over the last 10 years. This includes the breach of the River Steeping causing a fluvial flood in June 2019. This flooded 550ha of land and the evacuation of 580 houses in the region. Whilst floods per se might not affect the cable it would certainly impact flood evacuation planning and any infrastructure near and associated with the cable. Of greater concern was the tidal surge flood of 6 December 2013, and the reason we studied the impacts of tidal floods in our attached paper. Your study has not mentioned that the tidal surge breached the bank at Wrangle, approximately 1000m from your cable run (south A52) at Wrangle. The land next to the breached bank was indeed never recovered. However the lessons are of critical importance since when the tide breached at Wrangle it led to an extraordinary and deep (up to 8m) exudation/erosion of silt on the landward side of the bank. In addition as the land was inundated with salt water, the soil properties were destroyed with a dramatic loss of hydraulic capacity as the salt destroyed the soil structure. In theory this soil structure will recover after 7+ years once the salt is washed through the silt by rain (see paper). However, given this, the cable run so close to the sea bank is a very serious risk. If the banks breach (they have now twice in the last 70 years), the water action could cause significant and rapid soil erosion and the land will be rendered impossible for ground works as the structure will be lost. Indeed, I cannot conceive any reason as to why such a critical piece of national infrastructure should be placed so close to those banks. If you wish to find further information on the risk impacts within the region, the EA have modelled breach scenarios along your development zone, these were used in our paper and are referenced. The EA</p>	<p>Flood events have been considered within Chapter 24 Hydrology and Flood Risk and the appendices. A Flood Management and Response Plan will be produced prior to construction. The Project continues to engage with stakeholders regarding the provision of Protective Provisions. The Project has noted all comments regarding future approach to flood risk management. The Project considers that the other issues raised in this response are an issue due to the confirmation of the cable route options.</p>	<p>6.1.24 Hydrology and Flood Risk, 6.3.24.2 Flood Risk Assessment ECC &amp; 400kv 6.3.24.3 Flood Risk Assessment OnSS</p>

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
			<p>will provide them to you on request, I have copies for research (one is published as a supplemental in our paper) so unfortunately cannot pass them to you directly but it is important that you request this information. The Wrangle 2013 breach could have been far worse, in that breach the sea water was contained between two banks. If the breach had occurred 200m to the south of the 2013 breach there is no second containment bank, if that had happened it is quite likely that Staples yard would have been inundated (beyond the run of your cable in that area).</p>		
33	Boston Borough Council	P2_5	<p>Hydrology, Hydrogeology and Flood Risk Lincolnshire County Council act as Lead Local Flood Authority and may comment directly to the proposed development. Having reviewed the information put forward within the PEIR, the approach taken appears reasonable in the methodology and we have no specific comments to offer.</p> <p>Specific comments from a member of Freiston Parish Council have been received however and again officers share their concerns: The proposed cable run close to the sea bank is at risk from tidal surge event type flooding.</p>	<p>Flood risk impacts have been considered within Chapter 24 Hydrology and Flood Risk and the appendices. A Flood Management and Response Plan will be produced prior to construction. The Project continues to engage with stakeholders regarding the provision of Protective Provisions. The Project has noted all comments regarding future approach to flood risk management.</p>	<p>6.1.24 Hydrology and Flood Risk, 6.3.24.2 Flood Risk Assessment ECC &amp; 400kv 6.3.24.3 Flood Risk Assessment OnSS</p>
34	Boston Borough Council	P2_5	<p>I am a resident of Freiston, Lincs and also a member of the Parish Council. I live in Freiston, having grown up on a family farm within the village. Professionally, I am a Professor of Agri Food Technology, HonFRAGS, FIAgrE and FRSB and Founding Director of the Lincoln Institute of Agri-Food Technology. I was awarded the Royal Agricultural Society's medal for science and innovation in agriculture and have advised the government on aspects of agricultural innovation. In addition my team have specifically studied the impacts of tidal flood risk on this specific region's soils and potential recovery from salt water inundation. I attach a copy of our peer reviewed publication for your records. Given my specific expertise and local knowledge, I am concerned about the current plans, in particular the potential cable track that routes south of the A52 and close to the Wash sea defence banks and how they route through the parish of Freiston. My concerns are;</p> <p>Impacts on food security. The impact assessment has not properly considered potential effects on food security. The Lincolnshire food region produces 26% of all the UK's fresh vegetables, the majority of it produced on the belt of Grade 1 marine silt soils that border the Wash. This includes the main tract of land that is proposed for the South A52 cable route. Food production in this region has unusual national significance and is a function of its exceptional soil quality that enables the cultivation of high value vegetable crops (brassica, potatoes, onions etc) with minimal use of irrigation, since the silt has both significant depth and water holding / movement potential.</p> <p>Disruption to the farming system in these regions for up to 2 years, could have significant and national consequences. These impacts would likely be as a</p>	<p>Impacts on ALC grade land have been considered in the Chapter 25 Land Use, the outcome of this assessment demonstrates that there would not be a material impact on agricultural land (subject to the permanent land lost at the substation site) given the limited scale and duration of the works as a result of the BMV land being returned to its previous standard through the mitigations that will be secured in the Soil Management Plan which will be drafted in accordance with the Outline Soil Management Plan submitted as part of the DCO application .</p> <p>Market implications from loss of agricultural output due to temporary or permanent changes in land use have been reviewed and addressed in Chapter 29 Socioeconomics Characteristics through the assessment on Potential Impacts on the Agricultural Market.</p> <p>The disruption to farming practices on an individual scale have been assessed in Chapter 25 Land Use using the maximum construction temporal scale, however, it is expected that much of the disruption will be significantly shorter in duration. The Applicant is committed to ongoing discussions with landowners to minimise impacts to ongoing agricultural activities. The results of these discussions will be considered in the land use assessment.</p> <p>The Order Limits have undergone several stages of optimisation, refinements and subsequent consultations to reduce indirect impacts on agricultural practices, such as the severance of land beyond the Order Limits.</p> <p>The Applicant has also committed to the cable route being on the north of the A52.</p>	<p>6.1.25 Land Use, 6.1.29 Socioeconomics Characteristics, 8.1.3 Outline Soil Management Plan</p>

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
			secondary consequence of the installation of the cable, via disruption to cropping plans, rotation plans, the splitting of fields, access disruptions for all farming operations etc. Our paper (attached) shows the likely economic impact of a tidal flood in the region, whilst the installation of a cable cannot be directly compared to a flood impact, the scale of the economic activity in the region is self-evident. In addition, any food supply issues will also affect the livelihood of workers across the whole farming supply chain (packing operations, logistics, food providers etc), not just the farmers considered in your study. Food security impacts if the cable was laid north of A52 would be lower, this land is typically used for cereal crops with lower economic values, but as cereals are commodity products they can be easily substituted via other markets...short life vegetables cannot be easily substituted.		
35	Boston Borough Council	P2_5	<p>Noise and Vibration</p> <p>Having reviewed the information put forward within the PEIR, the approach taken appears reasonable in the methodology and we have the below comments to offer.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Council should be provided with contact details in the event of complaints to assist in the management of complaints and concerns.</li> <li>- The Council and all relevant noise sensitive receptors in the immediate area to any proposed works are to be informed ahead of these works should they occur outside of normal working hours.</li> <li>- The Council and all relevant vibration sensitive receptors in the immediate area to any proposed works are to be informed ahead of these works. Additionally appropriate monitoring equipment is to be used in the vicinity of works in order to assess the level of vibration propagating from the works site.</li> </ul>	<p>Contact details of an appointed representative will be made available to the relevant authorities and local community for the duration of the construction period.</p> <p>Direct mitigation relating to vibration from construction operations (drilling, piling) is not proposed. However, the following is proposed within the Noise and Vibration Management Plan which will be produced post consent in accordance with the Outline Noise and Vibration Management Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prior to any vibration generating works being undertaken the residents of the nearest Vibration Sensitive Receptors would be notified of the nature and proposed duration of the works (BS5228:2014 states that vibration levels up to 1.0mm/s PPV be tolerated if prior warning and explanation has been given to residents)</li> <li>• If required vibration monitoring would be undertaken at the nearest VSRs during the works to monitor the levels being generated, which would be compared to agreed limits. If the limits are exceeded, then the cause of the exceedance would be determined as far as reasonably practicable and suitable mitigation measures implemented.</li> </ul>	6.1.26 Noise and Vibration, 8.1.1 Outline Noise and Vibration Management Plan
36	Boston Borough Council	P2_5	<p>Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage</p> <p>No comments have been received from the Council's Archaeological and Cultural Heritage consultant, however having reviewed the information put forward within the PEIR, the approach taken appears reasonable in the methodology and we have the below comments to offer:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Council would expect a detailed landscape and visual assessment for any above ground features and for each to be looked at separately pending the final location and scale of the substation and other large scale above ground features; and</li> <li>- We would expect a scheme of trail trenching to be included as part of the main planning submission.</li> </ul>	The Project has proposed a two phased programme of trial trenching works. The first phase would be undertaken prior to determination and focus on areas of higher risk - either those areas where geophysical anomalies indicate the presence of remains which could be of relatively higher importance or those areas of the scheme where a greater level of disturbance would be incurred. A second phase would be undertaken after consent to further inform mitigation works. This would primarily target areas not previously targeted. A detailed landscape and visual assessment for the onshore substation is set out in Chapter 28 and will be accompanied by viewpoint visualisations representative of local visual receptors. A detailed landscape and visual assessment has been included in respect of the potential effects during the construction phase. Other than the onshore substation, there will be no other large-scale above-ground features with potential to give rise to significant effects. The effects of residual effects relating to the removal of trees or hedgerows during the construction phase has been considered in the assessment of the operational phase.	6.1.28 Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment
37	Boston Borough Council	P2_5	I would draw the applicants attention to the National Planning Policy Framework, Paragraph 180 (c) development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats (such as ancient woodland and ancient or	No irreplaceable terrestrial habitats will suffer deterioration or loss during either construction or operation of the project. Our ecological surveys have found no ancient woodlands, or ancient/ veteran trees) either within the project	



Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
			<p>veteran trees) should be refused, unless there are wholly exceptional reasons and a suitable compensation strategy exist.</p> <p>Guidance on this topic is available here - <a href="https://www.gov.uk/guidance/ancient-woodland-ancienttrees-and-veteran-trees-advice-for-making-planning-decisions">https://www.gov.uk/guidance/ancient-woodland-ancienttrees-and-veteran-trees-advice-for-making-planning-decisions</a> Trees and Woodland protected by a Tree Preservation Order are also important and I would expect any development which might impact on both the above and below ground parts of such trees to be assessed (see above guidance).</p>	<p>boundary, or the 100m buffer zone beyond. Sand dunes within designated sites at the landfall will be crossed underground using trenchless techniques.</p> <p>The final siting of the landfall, onshore cable corridor and onshore substation will avoid trees and woodland protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) where practicably possible. Where the removal of TPO trees or woodland is unavoidable, a full and detailed assessment of their loss will be undertaken and provision for their replacement made in the Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP).</p>	
38	Boston Borough Council	P2_5	<p>When a route is decided will the effect of the number of vehicles, 7 - 8 per hour, be considered: Mud on the roads, the weight of the vehicles carrying stone damaging the roads that are already in a poor state of repair and will a one-way system be in place when work is being carried out to prevent vehicles having to pass each other on the roads? Would it be possible to have one community liaison person in place for contact with any issues which arise whilst any works are being carried out? It would help if one person was a contact point for each community.</p>	<p>The Project have appointed a Community Liaison Officer who acts as an independent link between the Project and the local community.</p>	
39	Boston Borough Council	P2_5	<p>Traffic and Transport Lincolnshire County Council act as highways authority Lincolnshire County Council act as Highway Authority and may comment directly on the proposed development. having reviewed the information put forward within the PEIR, the approach taken appears reasonable in the methodology and we have no specific comments to offer other than the following points as received during consultation: Parish members have suggested one community liaison person in place for contact with any issues should they arise whilst works are being carried out; Consideration of the effect of mud on roads as well as the impact of large load vehicles on roads which are already in a poor state; Consideration of works traffic hours in relation to effects on local transport; and Construction compounds and field accesses in the countryside can have a significant affect and we would therefore welcome a full scheme of remediation and reinstatement after the cable/works have been undertaken.</p>	<p>The Project has noted all of these comments and suggestions which will be set out in the Construction Traffic Management Plan which will be drafted post consent in accordance with the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan submitted as part of the application. The Project have appointed a Community Liaison Officer who acts as an independent link between the Project and the local community. Additionally refined construction compounds and accesses were consulted on as part of the Autumn Consultation, the materials for which are included within the Consultation Report.</p>	5.1 Consultation Report, 8.1.5 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan
40	Boston Borough Council	P2_5	<p>JRC Windfarm Coordinations Old This proposal is cleared with respect to radio link infrastructure operated by the local energy networks. JRC analyses proposals for wind farms on behalf of the UK Fuel &amp; Power Industry. This is to assess their potential to interfere with radio systems operated by utility companies in support of their regulatory operational requirements. In the case of this proposed wind energy development, JRC does not foresee any potential problems based on known interference scenarios and the data you have provided. However, if any details of the wind farm change, particularly the disposition or scale of any turbine(s), it will be necessary to re-evaluate the proposal. In making this judgement, JRC has used its best endeavours with the available data, although we recognise that there may be effects which are as yet unknown or inadequately predicted. JRC cannot therefore be held liable if subsequently problems arise that we have not predicted. It should be noted that this clearance pertains only to the date of its issue. As the use of the spectrum is dynamic, the use of the band is changing on an ongoing basis and consequently, developers are advised to seek re-coordination prior to considering any design changes.</p>	<p>The Applicant has noted this response.</p>	

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
41	Boston Borough Council	P2_5	<p>I am a resident of Freiston, Lincs and also a member of the Parish Council. I live in Freiston, having grown up on a family farm within the village. Professionally, I am a Professor of Agri Food Technology, HonFRAGS, FIAgrE and FRSB and Founding Director of the Lincoln Institute of Agri-Food Technology. I was awarded the Royal Agricultural Society's medal for science and innovation in agriculture and have advised the government on aspects of agricultural innovation. In addition my team have specifically studied the impacts of tidal flood risk on this specific region's soils and potential recovery from salt water inundation. I attach a copy of our peer reviewed publication for your records. Given my specific expertise and local knowledge, I am concerned about the current plans, in particular the potential cable track that routes south of the A52 and close to the Wash sea defence banks and how they route through the parish of Freiston.</p> <p>My concerns are;</p> <p>2. Impacts on soils. I note that the impact assessment describes our soils from the Cranfield register as "Loamy and clayey soils of coastal flats with naturally high groundwater". Whilst the use of the register is correct, the Grade 1 soils in the region are exceptional high quality marine silts. This detail is critical as silt soils have complex and often difficult physical properties, not least they have a tendency to "run". This makes any ground work very difficult since the silt can move rapidly, in addition it forms slurries that can contaminate water courses and suffer wind blows. These slurries have very low oxygen contents and are very dangerous to life if they enter water courses. The EA enforces actively against silt slurries. The silts in our region are also deep (given their quality) which will add considerable complexity to the ground works. Given the nature of the soils I doubt that the soil management practices to restore the field is sufficient (noted in your appendix). This generally lacked specific details but the risk of silt turning into slurry during groundworks is a very real and significant concern that is not addressed, and frankly is difficult to address</p>	<p>Noted. The Applicant's adopted route is the most westerly route (landward side/ north of the A52) away from the coastal sea defences as discussed in Section <b>Error! Reference source not found.</b> of ES Chapter 4 Site Selection which provides details with respect to running silts.</p>	
42	Boston Borough Council	P2_5	Environmental Health - No response has been received during the consultation period.	The Applicant has noted that there are no responses on Environmental Health.	N/A
43	Boston Borough Council	P2_5	Business Rates Assurance Manager - Mr Andy Hall - No response has been received during the consultation period.	The Applicant has noted that there are no responses from the Business Rates Assurance Manager.	N/A
44	Cadent Gas	P2_6	<p>In respect of existing Cadent infrastructure, Cadent will require appropriate protection for retained apparatus including compliance with relevant standards for works proposed within close proximity of its apparatus, Cadent Infrastructure within or in close proximity to the development Cadent has identified the following apparatus within the vicinity of the proposed works:</p> <p>Intermediate pressure (above 2 bar) Gas Pipelines and associated equipment</p> <p>Low and Medium pressure (below 2 bar) gas pipes and associated equipment. (As a result it is highly likely that there are also gas services and associated apparatus in the vicinity, these are not shown on plans but their presence should be anticipated)</p> <p>Note: No liability of any kind whatsoever is accepted by Cadent Gas Limited or their agents, servants or contractors for any error or omission.</p>	The Applicant has noted this response and has continued to engage with Cadent Gas in respect of appropriate protection for any retained apparatus that may be affected.	N/A
45	Cadent Gas	P2_6	<p><b>Diversions:</b></p> <p>Where diversions of apparatus are required to facilitate the scheme, Cadent will</p>	The Applicant has noted this response and will ensure that if applicable discussions with Cadent will be carried out as soon as practicable.	N/A

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
			<p>require adequate notice and discussions should be started at the earliest opportunity. Please be aware that diversions for high pressure apparatus can take in excess of two years to plan and procure materials.</p> <p>Cadent will require the party requesting the diversion works to obtain any necessary land rights, planning permissions and other consents to enable the diversion works to be carried out. Details of these consents should be agreed in writing with Cadent before any application is made. Cadent requires a minimum of C4/ Design study to have been carried out to establish an appropriate diversion route, temporary and permanent land take ahead of any application being made.</p> <p>Where diversions sit outside the highway boundary the party requesting the diversion will be responsible for obtaining at their cost and granting to Cadent the necessary land rights, on Cadent's standard terms, to allow the construction, maintenance and access of the diverted apparatus. As such adequate land rights must be granted to Cadent (e.g. following the exercise of compulsory powers to acquire such rights included within the DCO) to enable works to proceed, to Cadent's satisfaction. Cadent's approval to the land rights powers included in the DCO prior to submission is strongly recommended to avoid later substantive objection to the DCO. Land rights will be required to be obtained prior to construction and commissioning of any diverted apparatus, in order to avoid any delays to the projects timescales. A diversion agreement may be required addressing responsibility for works, timescales, expenses and indemnity.</p>		
46	Cadent Gas	P2_6	<p><b>Protection/Protective Provisions:</b> Where the Promoter intends to acquire land, extinguish rights, or interfere with any of Cadent's apparatus, Cadent will require appropriate protection for retained apparatus and further discussion on the impact to its apparatus and rights including adequate Protective Provisions. Operations within Cadent's existing easement strips are not permitted without approval and will necessitate a Deed of Consent or Crossing Agreement being put in place. Any proposals for work in the vicinity for Cadent's existing apparatus will require approval by Plant Protection under the Protective Provisions/Asset Protection Agreement and early discussions are advised.</p> <p><b>Key Considerations:</b> Cadent has a Deed of Grant of Easement for each pipeline, which prevents the erection of permanent / temporary buildings/structures, change to existing ground levels or storage of materials etc within the easement strip. Please be aware that written permission is required before any works commence within the Cadent easement strip and a Crossing Agreement may be required if any apparatus needs to cross the Cadent easement strip The below guidance is not exhaustive and all works in the vicinity of Cadent's asset shall be subject to review and approval from Cadent's plant protection team in advance of commencement of works on site.</p> <p><b>General Notes on Pipeline Safety:</b> You should be aware of the Health and Safety Executives guidance document HS(G) 47 "Avoiding Danger from Underground Services", and Cadent's</p>	<p>The Applicant has noted this response. The Applicant Is in contact with Cadent Gas Limited's legal team and are awaiting draft protective provisions.</p> <p>The Applicant will take new rights in plots in which Cadent Gas Limited apparatus is located. The Applicant considers Cadent Gas Limited statutory operations will not be detrimentally affected by the Project.</p>	N/A

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
			<p>specification for Safe Working in the Vicinity of Cadent High Pressure gas pipelines and associated installations - requirements for third parties GD/SP/SSW22. Digsafe leaflet Excavating Safely - Avoiding injury when working near gas pipes. There will be additional requirements dictated by Cadent's plant protection team. Cadent will also need to ensure that our pipelines remain accessible throughout and after completion of the works. The actual depth and position must be confirmed on site by trial hole investigation under the supervision of a Cadent representative. Ground cover above our pipelines should not be reduced or increased. If any excavations are planned within 3 metres of Cadent High Pressure Pipeline or, within 10 metres of an AGI (Above Ground Installation), or if any embankment or dredging works are proposed then the actual position and depth of the pipeline must be established on site in the presence of a Cadent representative. A safe working method agreed prior to any work taking place in order to minimise the risk of damage and ensure the final depth of cover does not affect the integrity of the pipeline. Below are some examples of work types that have specific restrictions when being undertaken in the vicinity of gas assets therefore consultation with Cadent's Plant Protection team is essential:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Demolition</li> <li>▪ Blasting</li> <li>▪ Piling and boring</li> <li>▪ Deep mining</li> <li>▪ Surface mineral extraction</li> <li>▪ Landfilling</li> <li>▪ Trenchless Techniques (e.g. HDD, pipe splitting, tunnelling etc.)</li> <li>▪ Wind turbine installation</li> <li>▪ Solar farm installation</li> <li>▪ Tree planting schemes</li> </ul> <p><b>Pipeline Crossings:</b> Where existing roads cannot be used, construction traffic should ONLY cross the pipeline at agreed locations. The pipeline shall be protected, at the crossing points, by temporary rafts constructed at ground level. The third party shall review ground conditions, vehicle types and crossing frequencies to determine the type and construction of the raft required. The type of raft shall be agreed with Cadent prior to installation. No protective measures including the installation of concrete slab protection shall be installed over or near to the Cadent pipeline without the prior permission of Cadent. Cadent will need to agree the material, the dimensions and method of installation of the proposed protective measure. The method of installation shall be confirmed through the submission of a formal written method statement from the contractor to Cadent. A Cadent representative shall monitor any works within close proximity to the pipeline.</p> <p><b>New Service Crossing:</b> New services may cross the pipeline at perpendicular angle to the pipeline i.e. 90 degrees. Where a new service is to cross over the pipeline a clearance distance of 0.6 metres between the crown of the pipeline and underside of the service should be maintained. If this cannot be achieved the service shall cross below the pipeline with a clearance distance of 0.6 metres. A new service</p>		



Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
			<p>should not be laid parallel within an easement strip. A Cadent representative shall approve and supervise any new service crossing of a pipeline. An exposed pipeline should be suitable supported and removed prior to backfilling. An exposed pipeline should be protected by matting and suitable timber cladding. For pipe construction involving deep excavation (&lt;1.5m) in the vicinity of grey iron mains, the model consultative procedure will apply therefore an integrity assessment must be conducted to confirm if diversion is required.</p>		
47	East Lindsey District Council	P2_8	<p>Can I inform you of an error on your locations to see the documents. East Lindsey District Council no longer has its officers at Manby the new offices are located at: The HUB. Mareham Road. Horncastle LN9 6PH</p> <p>Can you please amend your records to reflect the new location.</p>	<p>The Applicant updated their records and issued a correction to the consultees on the 8 June 2023.</p>	
48	East Lindsey District Council	P2_8	<p>Planning Policy</p> <p>The key considerations from East Lindsey District Council’s perspective will relate to the landfall and undergrounding of the cables to support the project.</p> <p>Paragraphs 4.5.7 - 4.5.9 deal with defining the area of search but this does not appear to include a consideration of whether or not other areas of search along the coast were considered as potential sites for the landfall. Previous energy developments have involved the undergrounding of cables and the Triton Knoll scheme made landfall just to the North of Anderby Creek, whereas this project makes landfall just to the south of Anderby Creek. The coast is a valuable asset for wildlife and a tourism resource and there does not appear to be any justification provided for disturbing two areas so close together, particularly given the proximity of both locations to Local Wildlife Sites (LWs).</p> <p>This especially difficult to understand as the cable route for Outer Dowsing joins that for Triton Knoll a little further south, round Hogsthorpe. An additional point of note in respect of this is in paragraph 3.6.4 where the PEIR says that landfall installation may also require some form of beach access for construction vehicles, depending on the preferred method of installation identified and the preferred landfall location. This is already available at the point that the Triton Knoll scheme made landfall but not in the area 80m cable corridor proposed by the Outer Dowsing Scheme so a new access point may need to be created. The 80m and 300m cable corridors are within the Anderby Creek Sand Dunes LWS and creation of an access could potentially disturb the biodiversity of this dune and dune grassland area. Additionally, the dunes form part of the sea defences of the Lincolnshire Coast and there are potential risks if there are works which could undermine their long term stability.</p> <p>Currently, the only access in the 300m Cable corridor is at Wolla Bank and this is a popular carpark for visitors to the Coast and is loss for the lengthy construction period would be undesirable.</p> <p>Paragraph 8.3.20 says that Specific details on LWS within the AoS were not obtained as part of the scoping study however these will be obtained during later stages of the assessment but given that the point of landfall is within a LWS, this is somewhat disappointing. This carries through to table 8.3.4, where it is suggested that habitat loss or damage can be avoided but without a proper</p>	<p>The Applicant has undergone a rigorous site selection and consideration of alternatives process in relation to the adopted Landfall site as outlined in Chapter 4 Site Selection.</p> <p>The Applicant has committed to utilising HDD (horizontal directional drilling technology) at the landfall and siting the compound west of Roman Bank road so the drill will travel underneath the beach, dunes, Anderby Marsh LNR and Roman Bank Road.</p> <p>The Applicant has committed to not taking construction access to the beach and there are no planned construction works less than 300m from the toe of the defence. HDD is a proven technique in the coastal area and has been successfully utilised on the Triton Knoll and Viking Link Projects with no adverse impacts on the sea defences, and the detailed design of the HDD will be based on geotechnical survey data..</p> <p>The Applicant has engaged with Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust (LWT) regarding the proximity of the landfall compound to the Anderby Marsh LNR including several site visits to ensure the appropriate siting of construction areas and any additional mitigation measures are incorporated, including the location of the landfall construction area being set back a minimum of 80m from the Anderby Marsh LWT Reserve and the construction of a 4m high earth bund on three sides of the landfall construction area to provide noise attenuation to mitigate potential disturbance to ornithological receptors at Anderby Marsh LNR (additional to the existing Roman Bank landscape feature). Further details are outlined in Chapter 22 Onshore Ornithology.</p> <p>Impacts on heritage assets have been considered as part of the site selection process and assessed in ES Chapter 20 Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage.</p> <p>Impacts on the Lincolnshire Coastal Path are considered in Chapter 25 Land Use, noting there will be no closure or diversions in relation to this footpath and the Applicant has committed to no construction access to the beach.</p> <p>Impacts in agricultural drainage have been assessed in the Chapter 23 Geology and Ground Conditions, with any relevant impacts or mitigation used to inform</p>	<p>Site Selection (6.1.4) Onshore Ornithology (6.1.22) Geology and Ground Conditions(6.1.23) Land Use (6.1.25)</p>

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
			<p>understanding of the habitat, that is an assumption. There are others better placed than myself to determine whether the list of species is sufficiently comprehensive and if the mitigation methods would be appropriate. Similarly, there are others better placed to assess the baseline of heritage assets for the Historic Environment.</p> <p>Paragraph 8.8.16 should mention the Lincolnshire Coastal Path. All the relevant issues appear to have been scoped in, albeit some of them at a very strategic level, and I do not disagree with most of the issues that have been scoped out. I am slightly concerned that the land use section scoped out drainage in respect of the potential impacts on agricultural drainage systems, which could lead to a loss of agricultural productivity. East Lindsey is a water stressed area and additional water scarcity for agricultural holdings resulting in loss of productivity could undermine viability of agricultural businesses particularly considering the effects of climate change.</p>	<p>the Land Use Chapter where necessary. The Project have also appointed a local drainage contractor to ensure the Project's pre and post construction drainage schemes are designed in a harmonic way with existing drainage systems.</p>	
49	East Lindsey District Council	P2_8	<p>Councillor Simpson: The literature implies that there is only one National Grid cable pylon route being considered should the Lincolnshire Node be chosen. The AONB would be a constraint that would have to be considered in the planning context for the proposals, this is dictated by both local and national policy. Views off the AONB are as valuable as those within the AONB and those towards it contribute to the setting of the AONB.</p>	<p>Following the iterative site selection proposal and the confirmation of the grid connection, the Applicant has determined that the substation location will be at Weston Marsh.</p>	N/A
50	East Lindsey District Council	P2_8	<p>Landscape and Visual Assessment</p> <p>At this stage we do not have details of the final substation location, appearance or extent, however the information as provided for the Phase 2 Consultation has been reviewed by external consultants Terra Loci, with the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The landscape and visual receptors and representative viewpoints need to be submitted and approved prior to the assessment being undertaken.</li> </ul> <p>Supporting Zone of Theoretical Visibility mapping should also be provided to ensure that the proposed study area is sufficient.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The full LVIA methodology, including factors and / or matrices used for determining sensitivity of landscape and visual receptors and magnitude and significance of effects should be submitted and approved prior to the assessment being undertaken. The combination of desk and field-based study can be sufficient to understand the baseline landscape and visual resource, however complete methodologies are required to agree if the method of assessment is sufficient and appropriate.</li> <li>- All visual representation with any submitted Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) should be in line with The Visual Representation of Development Proposals Technical Guidance Note (TGN) 06/19 (Landscape Institute, September 2019) to ensure the assessment of visual impact is accurate and in turn an appropriate judgement of the assessed impacts can be made. Locations for proposed 'photomontage' visualisations, including visualisation types, following TGN 06/19 should be submitted and approved</li> </ul>	<p>The Project has engaged with ELDC in respect of viewpoint selection and study area both through the ETG process and bilateral engagement. Chapter 28 Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment sets out the methodology in full, this chapter also uses National LCAs and Local LCAs in the assessment and presents the effects, including operational effects on the onshore ECC, on the physical elements, landscape character and visual receptors in addition to a cumulative assessment with all relevant existing and future projects. The uncertainty surrounding scoping stage projects and the limited information that is typically available at this early stage means it is difficult to prepare a detailed assessment and therefore where this is the case reference will be made to these projects, however in these instances a full assessment will not be possible.</p>	6.1.28 Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
			<p>prior to being undertaken.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The EIA should include a full assessment of the potential impacts of the development on local landscape character using landscape assessment methodologies. The use of Landscape Character Assessment (LCA), based on the good practice guidelines produced jointly by the Landscape Institute and Institute of Environmental Assessment in 2013 is encouraged. LCA provides a sound basis for guiding, informing and understanding the ability of any location to accommodate change and to make positive proposals for conserving, enhancing or regenerating character, as detailed proposals are developed.</li> <li>- It is recommended that any development proposal explores and applies the Building with Nature standards and achieves an accreditation to highlight what 'good' looks like at each stage of the gastrointestinal lifecycle and strengthen the development and demonstrate the development goes beyond the statutory minima, to create places that really deliver for people and wildlife.</li> <li>- The assessment should refer to the relevant National Character Areas as published by Natural England. Local landscape character areas should be mapped at a scale appropriate to the development site as well as any relevant management plans or strategies pertaining to the area. The EIA should include assessments of visual effects on the surrounding area and landscape together with any physical effects of the development, such as changes in topography and loss or disturbance of vegetation.</li> <li>- In order to foster high quality development that respects, maintains, or enhances, local landscape character and distinctiveness, the LVIA should consider the character and distinctiveness of the area, with the siting and design of the proposed development reflecting local design characteristics.</li> </ul> <p>The Environmental Impact Assessment process should detail the measures to be taken to ensure the building design will be of a high standard, as well as detail of layout alternatives together with justification of the selected option in terms of landscape impact and benefit.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The assessment should also include the cumulative effect of the development with other relevant existing or proposed developments in the area. A list of proposed cumulative schemes should be submitted and approved prior to the assessment being undertaken. Cumulative impact assessment should include other proposals currently at Scoping stage and onwards. Due to the overlapping timescale of their progress through the planning system, cumulative impact of the proposed development with those proposals currently at Scoping stage would be likely to be a material consideration at the time of determination of the planning application.</li> <li>- Operational effects arising from the Onshore ECC and export cable landfall should be scoped into the assessment as there is potential for a loss of vegetation and alteration of the baseline landscape and visual resource which will be longer lasting than the construction phase and the long-term effectiveness of remediation and mitigation proposals should be considered.</li> </ul>		

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
			Other potential effects identified are sufficient, pending the submission and approval of full landscape and visual receptor groups and representative viewpoints.		
51	East Lindsey District Council	P2_8	East Lindsey Council do not have an in-house air quality consultant, however having reviewed the information put forward within the PEIR, the approach taken appears reasonable in the methodology. The Council would expect the following to be complied with during the project installation phase: Burning of waste should be avoided. Any burning of waste deemed strictly necessary should be undertaken in accordance with the relevant waste management exemption issued the Environment Agency, and consideration should be given to the timing of such burning, and the prevailing weather conditions to impact emissions to air and nuisance to offsite receptor's; and Soil stockpiles should be sealed to reduced fugitive dust emissions.	The Project has submitted an Outline Air Quality Management Plan as part of the DCO application which sets out mitigation measures, such as those highlighted by BBC details control measures relating to emissions to air which are required to prevent/avoid or reduce and mitigate potential impacts.	8.1.2 Outline Air Quality Management Plan
52	East Lindsey District Council	P2_8	<p>Onshore Ecology</p> <p>East Lindsey Council do not have an in-house ecologist and the Wildlife Trust may have chosen to comment directly on the content of the consultation at phase 2, however having reviewed the information put forward within the PEIR, the approach taken appears reasonable in the methodology and we have no specific comments to offer other than the importance of achieving a 10% biodiversity net gain for this proposed nationally significant development, in line with The Environment Act 2021. Notwithstanding this we have received detailed comments from the Council Planning Policy Team which are stated in full in the preceding section to this however for ease are summarised as follows and we would like these to be taken into consideration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The coast is a valuable asset for wildlife and a tourism resource and there does not appear to be any justification provided for disturbing two areas so close together, particularly given the proximity of both locations to Local Wildlife Sites (LWSs).</li> <li>- An additional point of note in respect of this is in paragraph 3.6.4 where the PEIR says that "landfall installation may also require some form of beach access for construction vehicles, depending on the preferred method of installation identified and the preferred landfall location". This is already available at the point that the Triton Knoll scheme made landfall but not in the area 80m cable corridor proposed by the Outer Dowsing Scheme so a new access point may need to be created.</li> <li>- The 80m and 300m cable corridors are within the Anderby Creek Sand Dunes LWS and creation of an access could potentially disturb the biodiversity of this dune and dune grassland area.</li> <li>- The dunes form part of the sea defences of the Lincolnshire Coast and there are potential risks if there are works which could undermine their long term stability. Currently, the only access in the 300m Cable corridor is at Wolla Bank and this is a popular carpark for visitors to the Coast and is loss for the lengthy construction period would be undesirable.</li> <li>- Paragraph 8.3.20 says that "Specific details on LWS within the AoS were not obtained as part of the scoping study however these will be obtained during later stages of the assessment" but given that the point of landfall is within a LWS, this is somewhat disappointing. This carries through to table 8.3.4, where it is suggested that habitat loss or damage can be avoided but without a proper understanding of the habitat, that is an assumption. Lastly, temporary</li> </ul>	<p>The Project continues to investigate opportunities for biodiversity net gain, as outlined in the Biodiversity Net Gain Principles and Approach document which has been submitted as part of the DCO application. The Project recognises that temporary construction works can have significant effects and have included a commitment to full remediation and reinstatement within the Outline Landscape and Ecological Mitigation Strategy. The Project understands the importance of the Anderby Marsh LWS for both ecological habitats and tourism. It is for this reason that the Project has committed to installing the electrical cables under the nature reserve and sand dunes using trenchless drilling techniques to avoid disturbance of these important resources.</p> <p>The Project also no longer requires an access to the beach, and no new accesses across the dunes will be constructed. As such, there is no risk to the integrity of the dunes which are important sea defences. Once complete, the land under which the ECC is to be constructed will be fully reinstated, with the exception of the transition joint bays, which will be located on the west of Roman Bank which are proposed to be raised following the construction phase, a number of small link boxes (underground concrete chambers accessed by a man hole cover at ground level), and the area of the OnSS.</p> <p>Regarding the temporary construction works, this is secured through requirement 22 of the DCO which states:</p> <p>22. Any land landward of mean low water springs within the Order limits which is used temporarily for construction of the onshore works and not ultimately incorporated in permanent works or approved landscaping must be reinstated, in accordance with such details as the relevant planning authority in consultation with the relevant highway authority may approve, within twelve months of completion of the relevant stage of the onshore works or such other period as the relevant planning authority may approve.</p>	8.10 Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Strategy, 8.14 Biodiversity Net Gain Principles and Approach



Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
			construction works can have a significant affect and we would therefore welcome a full scheme of remediation and reinstatement after these works have been undertaken.		
53	East Lindsey District Council	P2_8	East Lindsey Council do not have an in-house geologist and the Coal Authority may have chosen to comment directly on the content of the consultation at phase 2, however having reviewed the information put forward within the PEIR, the approach taken appears reasonable in the methodology and we have no specific comments to offer.	The Applicant has noted this comment.	
54	East Lindsey District Council	P2_8	Hydrology, Hydrogeology and Flood Risk Lincolnshire County Council act as Lead Local Flood Authority and may comment directly on the proposed development, as may the Drainage Board and the Environment Agency. Having reviewed the information put forward within the PEIR, the approach taken appears reasonable in the methodology however we would want to ensure that in the laying of cables the integrity of the drains is maintained.	To safeguard the integrity of the existing land drains which will be crossed by the ECC, the Project have employed a local land drainage contractor with considerable experience of field drains in Lincolnshire to advise the Project. The land drainage consultant will work with ODOW's design and construction contractors to undertake preconstruction surveys which will be used to help design the crossings, and also make sure that the land drains are reinstated to their pre-construction condition, resulting in no net change in land drainage as a result of the ECC installation.	
55	East Lindsey District Council	P2_8	Land Use Having reviewed the information put forward, the approach taken appears reasonable in the methodology however we have the following comments to make: - All the relevant issues appear to have been scoped in, albeit some of them at a very strategic level; and - We are concerned that the land use section scoped out drainage in respect of "The potential impacts on agricultural drainage systems, which could lead to a loss of agricultural productivity". East Lindsey is a water stressed area and additional water scarcity for agricultural holdings resulting in loss of productivity could undermine viability of agricultural businesses – particularly considering the effects of climate change.	The Project has appointed a Lincolnshire based land drainage contractor with the specific remit of undertaking detailed land drainage surveys, and working with the construction contractor to ensure that all existing land drains are reinstated to the preconstruction condition. This embedded mitigation will ensure that there is no change in the soil drainage regime as a result of the Project, and thus prevent any deterioration of soil productivity associated with drainage.	
56	East Lindsey District Council	P2_8	Noise and Vibration Having reviewed the information put forward within the PEIR, the approach taken appears reasonable in the methodology and we have the below comments to offer: - The Council should be provided with contact details in the event of complaints to assist in the management of complaints and concerns. - The Council and all relevant noise sensitive receptors in the immediate area to any proposed works are to be informed ahead of these works should they occur outside of normal working hours. - The Council and all relevant vibration sensitive receptions in the immediate area to any proposed works are to be informed ahead of these works. Additionally appropriate monitoring equipment is to be used in the vicinity of works in order to assess the level of vibration propagating from the works site.	Contact details of an appointed representative will be made available to the relevant authorities and local community for the duration of the construction period.  Direct mitigation relating to vibration from construction operations (drilling, piling) is not proposed. However, the following is proposed within the Noise and Vibration Management Plan which will be produced post consent in accordance with the Outline Noise and Vibration Management Plan:  • Prior to any vibration generating works being undertaken the residents of the nearest Vibration Sensitive Receptors would be notified of the nature and proposed duration of the works (BS5228:2014 states that vibration levels up to 1.0mm/s PPV be tolerated if prior warning and explanation has been given to residents)  • If required vibration monitoring would be undertaken at the nearest VSRs during the works to monitor the levels being generated, which would be compared to agreed limits. If the limits are exceeded, then the cause of the exceedance would be determined as far as reasonably practicable and suitable mitigation measures implemented.	
57	East Lindsey District Council	P2_8	Historic Environment Officer	The Project understands from Natural England that the Heritage Coast proposal (for the area north of Mablethorpe) has stalled with no further progress having	6.1.28 Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
			<p>- The location of the at sea turbines feel far enough way not to cause too much concern, but mindful that we did go for Heritage Coast status which was refused due to the turbines at Skegness as they are not natural. But these are somewhat removed from that, but it would still need to be considered any potential negative impact that the development could have on achieving heritage coast status in the future, should the area be reduced.</p> <p>- Concern over long term visual changes so substations and pylons. Especially over the fens and marshland areas which due to their vast flatness causes anything of height to stand out and be seen from much further. This is also true when looking down from the Wolds AONB towards the coast. Any landscape visual assessment for any above ground features and for each to be looked at separately.</p> <p>- National Trust should be consulted as the route passes near Gunby and lands around Sandilands their new nature reserve;</p>	<p>been made and therefore no further weight or consideration needs to be given to the proposal to create a Heritage Coast for Lincolnshire at this time. Chapter 28 Landscape and Visual Assessment assesses the long term visual effects of the onshore substations and other onshore infrastructure taking into account the openness of the fens and marshland landscapes.</p>	
58	East Lindsey District Council	P2_8	<p>Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage Having reviewed the information put forward within the PEIR, the approach taken appears reasonable in the methodology and we have no specific comments to offer other than:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Council would expect and landscape visual assessment for any above ground features and for each to be looked at separately;</li> <li>- The National Trust should be consulted as the proposed route could pass near Gunby and lands around Sandilands and their new nature reserve; and</li> <li>- We would expect a scheme of trail trenching to be included as part of the main planning submission.</li> </ul>	<p>All landscape and visual receptors with the potential to be significantly affected by components of the onshore infrastructure have been assessed in Chapter 28 Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment. The Project has proposed a two phased programme of trial trenching works. The first phase would be undertaken prior to determination and focus on areas of higher risk - either those areas where geophysical anomalies indicate the presence of remains which could be of relatively higher importance or those areas of the scheme where a greater level of disturbance would be incurred. A second phase would be undertaken after consent to further inform mitigation works. This would primarily target areas not previously targeted.</p>	6.1.28 Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment
59	East Lindsey District Council	P2_8	<p>Traffic and Transport Lincolnshire County Council act as highways authority and may comment directly on the proposed development. Having reviewed the information put forward within the PEIR, the approach taken appears reasonable in the methodology and we have no specific comments to offer other than the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The suitability of the rural roads, many of which are in poor condition (e.g. subsidence), to cope with the loading by heavy construction vehicles. What mechanism is in place for any urgent reinstatement. Is a survey of the roads (and any strengthening needed) to be carried out at the commencement of works?</li> <li>- What restrictions will be placed on working hours/days?</li> <li>- What is the procedure in place to deal with complaints from residents regarding access, noise, dust etc.?</li> <li>- Construction compounds and field accesses in the countryside can have a significant affect and we would therefore welcome a full scheme of remediation and reinstatement after the cable/works have been undertaken.</li> </ul>	<p>Road condition surveys will be undertaken pre and post the construction period and this will be secured within the Construction Traffic Management Plan which will be drafted post consent in accordance with the Outline Construction Traffic Management Pla, submitted as part of the DCO application. Construction hours will be included in the Code of Construction Practice, which will be drafted in accordance with the Outline Code of Construction Practice submitted as part of the DCO application and with the exception of the circumstances outlined in the DCO construction of the onshore works and construction-related traffic movements to or from the site of the relevant work shall only take place between 0700 hours and 1900 hours Monday to Saturday with no activity on Sundays or bank holidays. Contact details of an appointed representative will be made available to the relevant authorities and local community for the duration of the construction period. All access points will be reinstated to their prior condition. Regarding construction compounds and field accesses, this is secured through requirement 22 of the DCO which states: 22. Any land landward of mean low water springs within the Order limits which is used temporarily for construction of the onshore works and not ultimately incorporated in permanent works or approved landscaping must be reinstated, in accordance with such details as the relevant planning authority in consultation with the relevant highway authority may approve, within twelve months of completion of the relevant stage of the onshore works or such other period as the relevant planning authority may approve.</p>	Draft Development Consent Order, 8.1 Outline Code of Construction Practice, 8.1.5 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
60	Environment Agency	P2_9	<p>Requirement 16 (Contaminated land and groundwater) – we welcome the inclusion of this requirement in the draft Development Consent Order (DCO) to ensure that an appropriate written scheme is submitted and approved to ensure that any land contamination is dealt with appropriately to protect groundwater.</p> <p>Requirement 23 (Onshore decommissioning) – we request our inclusion as a consultee to the decommissioning plan in order to consider any potential impacts upon flood risk and our assets (e.g., cables under defences).</p> <p>We welcome our inclusion in Schedule 16 and will look to work with you in the coming weeks to agree on Protective Provisions and legal agreements etc. as required to enable us to agree to the modification of the Environmental Permitting Regulations 2016 in Article 7. We note that the drafting indicates including joint provisions for the Environment Agency with those of the drainage authorities. However, as advised during a meeting with your solicitors on 18 July 2023 we would prefer these are separate.</p> <p>Page 95, clause 4: The title of this clause appears to include a typo as it refers to this relating to 'Interpretation of Schedule 16', rather than Schedule 18.</p>	The Applicant has noted these comments. In respect of requirement 24 (onshore decommissioning): the Applicant has included a reference to the onshore decommissioning plan being submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority in consultation with the relevant statutory nature conservation body	3.1 Draft DCO
61	Environment Agency	P2_9	Cable entry and exit points within transition pits and cable junction bays must be sealed with an appropriate waterproofing material to mitigate flood risk. The principle that they will be sealed is a positive, but more detail will be required at a future stage. Adequate sealing must be demonstrated at each crossing point, and we must be provided with evidence that this has been completed to mitigate flood risk.	The Applicant has committed to sealing crossing points with an appropriate waterproofing material and providing appropriate evidence to the Environment Agency.	
62	Environment Agency	P2_9	Decommissioning will require the removal of redundant cable from ducts under EA assets, and sealing of those ducts through permanent means (i.e. not just capping, but filling) to prevent the ingress of water underneath raised defences. Temporary capping of spare ducts may be acceptable but will be subject to risk assessment and response plan.	The Applicant has committed to producing the necessary risk assessments and response plans to be agreed with the Environment Agency .	
63	Environment Agency	P2_9	<p>Para. 24.7.118 confirms that buried onshore cables would be left in place during decommissioning. TJBs and link boxes may be removed (and sites returned to their pre-development state) depending on agreements reached with the landowners and regulatory authorities in place at the time.</p> <p>Decommissioning will require the removal of redundant cable from ducts under Environment Agency assets, and sealing of those ducts through permanent means (i.e. not just capping, but filling) to prevent the ingress of water underneath raised defences. Temporary capping of spare ducts may be acceptable but will be subject to risk assessment and response plan.</p>	The Applicant has noted this response. The Applicant is in contact with the Environment Agency to agree an approach to protection of the Environment Agency's existing infrastructure.	
64	Environment Agency	P2_9	Environment Agency Registered Land: We have compared the route shapefile with the Environment Agency's registered land, and it crosses several parcels of our land, some of which are key to our ongoing projects as well as the need to maintain access for inspections and maintenance. We urge you to start engaging with our Estates team regarding this if you have not already done so.	The Applicant has engaged with the Environment Agency's Estate team throughout the pre-application process.	
65	Environment Agency	P2_9	Table 8 - Part 8: states that 8.1.8 is the Outline Preliminary Crossing Schedule Offshore which aligns with Plan 2.10 and 8.1.9 is the Outline Preliminary Crossing Schedule Onshore which aligns with Plan 2.09. However, within Part 8, document 8.1.8 is the Outline Preliminary Crossing Schedule Onshore and	The Applicant has ensured that any numbering discrepancies have been corrected in the final DCO submission.	N/A

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
			document 8.1.9 is the Outline Preliminary Crossing Schedule Offshore. If this document is to form the basis for any future guide to consultation material this should be corrected.		
66	Environment Agency	P2_9	We have reviewed this chapter in so far as it relates to the risk posed to groundwater and we are satisfied that the risk assessments undertaken to date are appropriate.	The Applicant has noted this comment.	
67	Environment Agency	P2_9	Groundwater: We have reviewed this chapter in so far as it relates to the risk posed to groundwater and we are satisfied that the risk assessments undertaken to date are appropriate.	The Applicant has noted this comment.	
68	Environment Agency	P2_9	<p>There are some errors between the crossing IDs assigned within document 2.09 Draft Onshore Crossings Plan and those within document 8.1.8 Outline Preliminary Crossing Schedule Onshore, as set out below:</p> <p>FDX-7: 2.09 Crossing Schedule Plan (Onshore) shows FDX-7 as part of the East Coast Defences. Asset ID: 531619 is FDX-14 on 2.09 Crossing Schedule Plan (Onshore) Wainfleet Relief Channel</p> <p>FDX-8: 2.09 Crossing Schedule Plan (Onshore) shows FDX-8 as part of the East Coast Defences. Asset ID: 531618 is FDX-15 on 2.09 Crossing Schedule Plan (Onshore) Wainfleet Relief Channel.</p> <p>FDX-9: 2.09 Crossing Schedule Plan (Onshore) shows FDX-9 as part of the East Coast Defences. Asset ID: 504051 is FDX-16 on 2.09 Crossing Schedule Plan (Onshore) Wainfleet Relief Channel.</p> <p>FDX-10: 2.09 Crossing Schedule Plan (Onshore) shows FDX-10 as part of the East Coast Defences. Asset ID: 504071 is FDX-17 on 2.09 Crossing Schedule Plan (Onshore) Wainfleet Relief Channel.</p> <p>FDX-11: 2.09 Crossing Schedule Plan (Onshore) shows FDX-11 on the Willoughby High Drain. Asset ID: 111336 is FDX-18 on 2.09 Crossing Schedule Plan (Onshore) River Steeping.</p> <p>FDX-12: 2.09 Crossing Schedule Plan (Onshore) shows FDX-12 is on the Lymn. Asset ID: 111169 is FDX-19 on 2.09 Crossing Schedule Plan (Onshore) River Steeping.</p> <p>FDX-13: 2.09 Crossing Schedule Plan (Onshore) shows FDX-13 is on the Lymn. Asset ID: 504191 is FDX-20 on 2.09 Crossing Schedule Plan (Onshore) River Steeping.</p> <p>FDX-14: 2.09 Crossing Schedule Plan (Onshore) shows FDX-14 is on the Wainfleet Relief Channel (Asset ID: 531619). Asset ID: 119410 is FDX-21 on 2.09 Crossing Schedule Plan (Onshore) River Steeping.</p> <p>FDX-15: 2.09 Crossing Schedule Plan (Onshore) shows FDX-15 is on the Wainfleet Relief Channel (Asset ID: 531618). Asset ID: 115176 is FDX-22 on 2.09 Crossing Schedule Plan (Onshore) River Steeping.</p> <p>FDX-16: 2.09 Crossing Schedule Plan (Onshore) shows FDX-16 is on the Wainfleet Relief Channel (Asset ID: 504051). Asset ID: 504192 is FDX-23 on 2.09 Crossing Schedule Plan (Onshore) River Steeping.</p> <p>FDX-17: 2.09 Crossing Schedule Plan (Onshore) shows FDX-17 is on the Wainfleet Relief Channel (Asset ID: 504071). Asset ID: 87356 is FDX-24 on 2.09 Crossing Schedule Plan (Onshore) River Steeping.</p> <p>FDX-18: 2.09 Crossing Schedule Plan (Onshore) shows FDX-18 is on the River Steeping (Asset ID: 111336). Asset ID: 509881 is FDX-27 on 2.09 Crossing Schedule Plan (Onshore) on the Haven.</p> <p>FDX-19: 2.09 Crossing Schedule Plan (Onshore) shows FDX-19 is on the River Steeping (Asset ID: 111169). Asset ID: 146306 is FDX-30 on 2.09</p>	The Applicant has noted this response and ensured all numbering discrepancies have been corrected in the final submission.	



Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
			<p>Crossing Schedule Plan (Onshore) on the Haven.</p> <p>FDX-20: 2.09 Crossing Schedule Plan (Onshore) shows FDX-20 is on the River Steeping (Asset ID: 504191). Asset ID: 509761 is FDX-28 on 2.09 Crossing Schedule Plan (Onshore) on the Haven.</p> <p>FDX-21: 2.09 Crossing Schedule Plan (Onshore) shows FDX-21 is on the River Steeping (Asset ID: 119410). Asset ID: 166727 is FDX-31 on 2.09 Crossing Schedule Plan (Onshore) on the Haven.</p> <p>FDX-22: 2.09 Crossing Schedule Plan (Onshore) shows FDX-22 is on the River Steeping (Asset ID: 115176). Asset ID: 496191 is FDX-37 on 2.09 Crossing Schedule Plan (Onshore).</p> <p>FDX-23: 2.09 Crossing Schedule Plan (Onshore) shows FDX-23 is on the River Steeping (Asset ID: 504192). Asset ID: 496211 is FDX-38 on 2.09 Crossing Schedule Plan (Onshore).</p> <p>FDX-24: 2.09 Crossing Schedule Plan (Onshore) shows FDX-24 is on the River Steeping (Asset ID: 87356). Asset ID: 126666 is FDX-40 on 2.09 Crossing Schedule Plan (Onshore).</p> <p>FDX-25: On 2.09 Crossing Schedule Plan (Onshore), FDX-25 is the crossing of the Old Sea Bank (Asset ID: 171638). Asset ID: 504251 is FDX-42 on 2.09 Crossing Schedule Plan (Onshore).</p> <p>FDX-26: On 2.09 Crossing Schedule Plan (Onshore), FDX-26 is on the Haven (Asset ID: 105204). Asset ID: 36270 is FDX-44 on 2.09 Crossing Schedule Plan (Onshore).</p> <p>FDX-27: 2.09 Crossing Schedule Plan (Onshore) shows FDX-27 is on the Haven (Asset ID: 509881). Asset ID: 500385 (Sea Defence (Downstream of Bank Bungalow)) is FDX-45 on 2.09 Crossing Schedule Plan (Onshore).</p> <p>FDX-28: 2.09 Crossing Schedule Plan (Onshore) shows FDX-28 is on the Haven (Asset ID: 509761). Asset ID: 36269 is FDX-46 on 2.09 Crossing Schedule Plan (Onshore).</p> <p>FDX-29: On 2.09 Crossing Schedule Plan (Onshore), FDX-29 is on the Haven (Asset ID: 105203). Asset ID: 500471 is FDX-47 on 2.09 Crossing Schedule Plan (Onshore).</p> <p>FDX-30: 2.09 Crossing Schedule Plan (Onshore) shows FDX-30 is on the Haven (Asset ID: 146306). Asset ID: 130136 is FDX-48 on 2.09 Crossing Schedule Plan (Onshore).</p> <p>FDX-31: 2.09 Crossing Schedule Plan (Onshore) shows FDX-31 is on the River Steeping (Asset ID: 166727). Asset ID: 36268 is FDX-49 on 2.09 Crossing Schedule Plan (Onshore).</p> <p>FDX-32: On 2.09 Crossing Schedule Plan (Onshore), FDX-32 is the crossing of Old Sea Bank (Asset ID: 185486). Asset ID: 507343 is FDX-50 on 2.09 Crossing Schedule Plan (Onshore).</p> <p>FDX-33: On 2.09 Crossing Schedule Plan (Onshore), FDX-33 is the crossing of Old Sea Bank (Asset ID: 154739). Asset ID: 507342 is FDX-51 on 2.09 Crossing Schedule Plan (Onshore).</p> <p>FDX-34: On 2.09 Crossing Schedule Plan (Onshore), FDX-34 is the crossing of Old Sea Bank (Asset ID: 540164). Asset ID: 130137 is FDX-52 on 2.09 Crossing Schedule Plan (Onshore).</p> <p>FDX-35: On 2.09 Crossing Schedule Plan (Onshore), FDX-35 is the crossing of Old Sea Bank (Asset ID: 540203). Asset ID: 130138 is FDX-53 on 2.09 Crossing Schedule Plan (Onshore).</p> <p>FDX-36: On 2.09 Crossing Schedule Plan (Onshore), FDX-35 is the crossing</p>		

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
			of Old Sea Bank (Asset ID: 566621). Asset ID: 130139 is FDX-54 on 2.09 Crossing Schedule Plan (Onshore).		
69	Environment Agency	P2_9	The following are shown on 2.09 Crossing Schedule Plan (Onshore) but are not included within document 8.1.8 - Outline Preliminary Crossing Schedule Onshore: FDX-37: Asset ID: 496191 FDX-38: Asset ID: 496211 FDX-39: Asset ID: 539373 FDX-40: Asset ID: 126666 FDX-41: Asset ID: 84378 FDX-42: Asset ID: 504251 FDX-43: Asset ID: 84426 FDX-44: Asset ID: 36270 FDX-45: Asset ID: 500385 FDX-46: Asset ID: 36269 FDX-47: Asset ID: 500471 FDX-48: Asset ID: 130136 FDX-49: Asset ID: 36268 FDX-50: Asset ID: 507343 FDX-51: Asset ID: 507342 FDX-52: Asset ID: 130137 FDX-53: Asset ID: 130138 FDX-54: Asset ID: 130139	The Applicant has noted this response and ensured all discrepancies have been corrected in the final submission.	
70	Environment Agency	P2_9	Project Onshore Substation: Should any Project Onshore Substation be required at Weston Marsh then this will need to be included within the flood risk assessment as it is likely to be at risk of flooding.	A Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) for the OnSS has been included in the DCO application	6.1.24 Hydrology and Flood Risk, 6.3.24.3 Flood Risk Assessment OnSS
71	Environment Agency	P2_9	Table 2.2 and para. 4.4.5 states that document 8.8 is a Baseline Flood Risk Assessment (FRA). This document does not appear to have been included in this PEIR consultation.	FRAs for the OnSS and onshore ECC have been included in the DCO application.	6.1.24 Hydrology and Flood Risk, 6.3.24.2 Flood Risk Assessment ECC & 400kv 6.3.24.3 Flood Risk Assessment OnSS
72	Environment Agency	P2_9	We welcome the confirmation that a pre-construction drainage plan will be developed and that appropriate permits will be obtained for water discharges.	The Applicant has noted this comment. The principles of managing drainage during construction are included in the Outline Surface Water Drainage Strategy (document reference: 8.1.5) provided as part of the Outline CoCP (document reference 8.1). These will be developed into a final plan in the pre-construction stage.	8.1.5 Outline Surface Water Drainage Strategy 8.1 Outline CoCP
73	Environment Agency	P2_9	We welcome the inclusion of decommissioning considerations in terms of flood risk within the PEIR, as we requested in our response to the scoping opinion. The PEIR also confirms that a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) will be undertaken. We look forwards to working with you further on scoping the FRA for all phases of construction, operation and decommissioning. LN1 - Landfall to A52 Mumby and WM1 - Landfall to A52 Hogsthorpe. The crest level varies across the coastal frontage, however the minimum effective crest level is 7.30m AOD. WM2 - A52 Hogsthorpe to Marsh Lane - Willoughby High Drain please advise where the effective crest level of 3.71m AOD has come from. This value is greater than our data suggests. WM5 - Low Road to Steeping River - Para. 24.4.164: The Steeping please advise where the effective crest level of 4.82m AOD has come from. This value is greater than our data suggests.	The impacts of decommissioning have been considered in Chapter 24 Hydrology Hydrogeology and Flood Risk and FRAs for the OnSS and onshore ECC have been included within the application.	6.1.24 Hydrology and Flood Risk, 6.3.24.2 Flood Risk Assessment ECC & 400kv 6.3.24.3 Flood Risk Assessment OnSS

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
			<p>WM6 - Steeping River to Ivy House Farm/Marsh Yard - Para. 24.4. 186: The Steeping please advise where the effective crest level of 4.82m AOD has come from. This value is greater than our data suggests, even looking further upstream.</p> <p>WM12 - Marsh Road to Fosdyke Bridge - Para. 24.4.321 There is a 3rd party owned defence that runs between Cravens Lane and Pullover Lane. Further discussions on works affecting primary and secondary defences are required.</p> <p>A5 - Ings Drove to Church End Lane - Para. 24.4.485 Southern part of the route falls partly within the maximum extent of flooding from reservoirs when there is also flooding from rivers (wet-day scenario).</p> <p>We support the inclusion of the Decommissioning - Potential for damage to flood defence or surface water drainage infrastructure.</p>		
74	Environment Agency	P2_9	Onshore ECC and OnSS: We support that the Maximum Design Scenario (MDS) will be based on the worst-case scenario (maximum number of cables and assumes disturbance throughout the onshore ECC area and maximum development footprint (temporary and permanent). The impact of construction on the floodplain and within flood flow routes (e.g. temporary compounds, excavation and materials within the floodplain) must be considered and if required, mitigated.	These impacts have been considered within Chapter 24 Hydrology and Flood Risk and the FRAs included within the Appendices.	6.1.24 Hydrology and Flood Risk, 6.3.24.2 Flood Risk Assessment ECC & 400kv 6.3.24.3 Flood Risk Assessment OnSS
75	Environment Agency	P2_9	Trenchless drilling works: It is not clear from the statement in this section that all Main River Crossings must be trenchless. All main river crossings must be trenchless as we have previously advised.	The Applicant has confirmed that all main river crossings will be crossed utilising trenchless techniques as outlined in the Outline CoCP.	6.1.3 Project Description 8.1 Outline CoCP
76	Environment Agency	P2_9	This table only includes decommissioning for the OnSS. Should other elements of the works be included?	The Applicant has noted this comment. Updated information has been included throughout the ES in respect of the Project parameters.	
77	Environment Agency	P2_9	<p>Construction Method Statement: We welcome further discussion on the detailed design and approach to the Main River and defence crossings, including any relevant permits/agreements required for any ground investigations.</p> <p>The PEIR advises that document No: 8.1.8: Outline Preliminary Crossing Schedule Onshore will form part of the Code of Construction Practice to be submitted as part of the DCO Application. Please see our comments on this document below. This section of the table refers to watercourse crossings, but it should also include flood defence crossings. We would welcome further discussions on the detailed design and approach to the Main River and defence crossings.</p>	The Applicant has and will continue to engage with stakeholders in respect of the detailed design and approach to the Main River defence crossings. An updated Onshore Crossing Schedule has been included as document reference which includes the crossing of flood defences as well as watercourse crossings.	6.3.3.2. Appendix 2 Onshore Crossing Schedule
78	Environment Agency	P2_9	Flood risk: All Main River Crossings and defence crossings must be trenchless (excluding secondary defences where specified in our advice to date).	The Project has confirmed that all main river crossings will be trenchless	
79	Environment Agency	P2_9	Any stockpiles along the onshore ECC are mentioned with regard to surface water runoff. However, some of these are also likely to fall within the floodplain. The impact of these on the floodplain and flood flows should be addressed and mitigated.	These impacts have been considered within Chapter 24 Hydrology and Flood Risk and the appendices. A Flood Management and Response Plan will be produced prior to construction.	6.1.24 Hydrology and Flood Risk, 6.3.24.2 Flood Risk Assessment ECC & 400kv 6.3.24.3 Flood Risk Assessment OnSS
80	Environment Agency	P2_9	Further embedded or additional mitigation measures may be required to manage and mitigate the potential effects of the development on flood risk to people and property. The impact on tidal and fluvial floodplains, flood flow routes and main rivers and defences must be considered and mitigated. There may be issues with tidal inundation during construction which must be considered, particularly with regard to the pits. The drive pit passing under the	These impacts have been considered within Chapter 24 Hydrology and Flood Risk and the appendices. A Flood Management and Response Plan will be produced prior to construction.	6.1.24 Hydrology and Flood Risk, 6.3.24.2 Flood Risk Assessment ECC & 400kv 6.3.24.3 Flood Risk Assessment OnSS

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
			sea defences will need to be bunded to the 0.5% (97.5%) still water level, as a minimum.		
81	Environment Agency	P2_9	Further consideration and information should be provided on the decommissioning. The removal and reinstatement work to remove redundant infrastructure may potentially take place within areas at risk of flooding or impacting our assets. The flood risk of these activities will need to be assessed and mitigation measures put in place. We would want to ensure any elements left in situ would not impact our future maintenance or improvement works.	Flood risk impacts have been considered within Chapter 24 Hydrology and Flood Risk and the relevant appendices. A Flood Management and Response Plan will be produced prior to construction. Further information on decommissioning will be provided within the Decommissioning Plan.	6.1.24 Hydrology and Flood Risk, 6.3.24.2 Flood Risk Assessment ECC & 400kv 6.3.24.3 Flood Risk Assessment OnSS
82	Environment Agency	P2_9	In addition to accessing flood risk to the proposed development, the FRA must consider flood risk from the works (permanent and temporary) and set out any mitigation required.	Flood risk impacts have been considered within Chapter 24 Hydrology and Flood Risk and the appendices. A Flood Management and Response Plan will be produced prior to construction.	6.1.24 Hydrology and Flood Risk, 6.3.24.2 Flood Risk Assessment ECC & 400kv 6.3.24.3 Flood Risk Assessment OnSS
83	Environment Agency	P2_9	In terms of flood risk, high sensitivity/importance has been assigned to development classified as highly vulnerable to flood risk (under NPPF) and narrow floodplain where a small increase in volume results in a relatively large increase in flood levels. We would suggest that additional criteria are included for those areas of the floodplain that are protected by tidal/sea defences and raised fluvial embankments. These defences are critical to managing flood risk in the area.	Flood risk impacts have been considered within Chapter 24 Hydrology and Flood Risk and the appendices. A Flood Management and Response Plan will be produced prior to construction.	6.1.24 Hydrology and Flood Risk, 6.3.24.2 Flood Risk Assessment ECC & 400kv 6.3.24.3 Flood Risk Assessment OnSS
84	Environment Agency	P2_9	Should this be high, medium, low and negligible as per Tables 24.26 and 24.27 rather than major, moderate, minor and negligible?	The Project has noted this comment and the terminology has been updated within the Environmental Statement	
85	Environment Agency	P2_9	We have highlighted gaps within the proposed embedded mitigation, the need for further assessment (likely through the FRA) and the potential for further embedded or additional mitigation measures. On this basis, and that no FRA has yet been undertaken/included, and the design and methods of works are still to be undertaken, we are unsure how the conclusions on the significance of effect for the elements of the works in terms of flood risk throughout Section 24.7 have been made.	Flood risk impacts have been considered within Chapter 24 Hydrology and Flood Risk and the appendices. A Flood Management and Response Plan will be produced prior to construction.	6.1.24 Hydrology and Flood Risk, 6.3.24.2 Flood Risk Assessment ECC & 400kv 6.3.24.3 Flood Risk Assessment OnSS
86	Environment Agency	P2_9	Where possible, all works should be located outside of Flood Zones 2 and 3. If this is not possible the applicant should consider the nature of the risk and ensure there is suitable mitigation in place. Works should also be sufficiently set back from any main river and or the toe of any flood defences.	Flood risk has been a guiding influence on the siting of the onshore infrastructure and the Applicant has undertaken sequential testing in relation to Flood Zones 2 and 3 as discussed in sections <b>Error! Reference source not found.</b> (OnSS) and <b>Error! Reference source not found.</b> (Onshore ECC) of Chapter 4 Site Selection. Exceptions Tests are included in the Flood Risk Assessments submitted with Chapter 24 Hydrology and Flood Risk.  The Applicant has also considered of the proximity of works in relation to main rivers and existing flood defences in their siting considerations	6.1.24 Hydrology and Flood Risk, 6.3.24.2 Flood Risk Assessment ECC & 400kv 6.3.24.3 Flood Risk Assessment OnSS 6.1.4 Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives.
87	Environment Agency	P2_9	Main River and defence crossings: Discussions regarding the main river crossings and defence crossings are continuing. Please note that some secondary and tertiary defence lines in the Wash are regulated under the Environmental Permitting Regulations 2016 and the Environment Agency will need to approve any works within the usual qualifying distances of these; either under those Regulations or Protective Provisions if they are disapplied under the DCO.  The potential impacts of the construction of the scheme and the risks associated with the crossing of the tidal/sea defences and large watercourses with raised embankments will need to be addressed. These risks will steer the appropriate mitigation (e.g. trenchless crossings), in addition to any other measures that are identified as necessary, such as bunding the pits for sea defences, tidal defences	The Applicant has noted this response and engaged with the Environment Agency throughout the pre-application phase both through the EPP and bilateral engagement as set out in Chapter 6 Technical Consultation including in respect of Protective Provisions and the	



Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
			and highland carriers etc. There are likely to be constraints unique to each crossing and we will be able to provide further advice as the proposals are considered and refined. There may be issues with tidal inundation during construction so this should be taken into consideration, especially with regard to the pits.		
88	Environment Agency	P2_9	<p>Impact on Environment Agency assets and flood risk management works: You are aware of our concerns that the onshore, offshore and landfall locations have the potential to impact the delivery and costs of our flood risk management works, particularly with regards to Lincolnshire Beach Management, the East Coast and Wainfleet defences. Discussions on these matters are ongoing, but close liaison and further discussions will be required. We will want to ensure additional measures are in place to guarantee the continued protection of our assets. In line with other similar development proposals, a legal agreement will need to be completed with us in this respect.</p> <p>We would like to remind you that the landfall area receives an artificial sediment supply through our beach renourishment campaigns. We can offer no assurances to the future approach to flood risk management in this area and it remains the applicants responsibility to ensure that there is sufficient coverage of your cables in the intertidal area and any localised re-profiling of the beach to the design profile occurs after the cables are laid.</p>	Flood risk impacts have been considered within Chapter 24 Hydrology and Flood Risk and the appendices. A Flood Management and Response Plan will be produced prior to construction. The Project continues to engage with stakeholders regarding the provision of Protective Provisions. The Project has noted all comments regarding future approach to flood risk management.	6.1.24 Hydrology and Flood Risk, 6.3.24.2 Flood Risk Assessment ECC & 400kv 6.3.24.3 Flood Risk Assessment OnSS
89	Environment Agency	P2_9	<p>Environmental Permitting Flood Risk Activities: There are several references to protected provisions throughout the PEIR and draft DCO. We would welcome further discussion of protective provisions should the disapplication of the Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2016 be pursued.</p> <p>Under these Regulations, permission must be obtained from the Environment Agency for any proposed activities which will take place: in, over, under or within 8 metres of a main river (16 metres if tidal); on or within 8 metres of a flood defence structure or culvert (16 metres if tidal); on or within 16 metres of a sea defence; within 16 metres of any main river, flood defence (including a remote defence) or culvert for quarrying or excavation; in a flood plain more than 8 metres from the river bank, culvert or flood defence structure (16 metres if tidal) if planning permission has not already been granted for the works.</p> <p>Further guidance and advice are available on our website: <a href="https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-activities-environmental-permits">https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-activities-environmental-permits</a>.</p> <p>Environmental permitting for the flood risk activities will be complex and we look forward to continuing our discussions on this topic in advance of the DCO application submission.</p>	The Applicant continues to engage with stakeholders regarding the provision of Protective Provisions and the disapplication of EP Regulations in addition to flood risk modelling and flood defences as set out in Chapter 6 Technical Consultation.	6.1.6 Technical Consultation
90	Environment Agency	P2_9	The Environment Agency's contractors have a sinker line used for the beach nourishment works buried at Wolla Bank, which lies within works area 11. Further discussions may be required to prevent any issues arising in respect of this. We are also the landowner of the track to Wolla Bank, works area 13 – discussions with our Estate team will be required regarding this, as we must retain it.	The Applicant has engaged extensively with the Environment Agency in respect of the EA Beach Nourishment works including through the review of SIMOPS as set out in Chapter 6 Technical Consultation.	6.1.6 Technical Consultation

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
			<p>Works area 16 would necessitate trafficking plant and equipment over the Anderby Creek tunnel outfall, this will not be permitted. Alternative routes (around the end or using a pullover to the south of the tunnel) must be sought. We will need to retain access to the beach for nourishment and multiple surveys throughout the year. We also inspect the defences and beach for which access must be retained.</p> <p>Any road closures between the red line site boundary (principally the temporary works area) and Anderby pullover must ensure that the nourishment depot remains fully operational and we can move our staff and operational plant north and south of our depot using this local road network. Please advise where the haul road between the site temporary works area and beach access at Anderby is. This area is not within the red line boundary.</p> <p>Fosdyke Bridge (PP1-ODOW-DEV-CS-PLN-0001 – Plans 22/23) – The proposed vehicle access and temporary works areas are located either on or adjacent to formal flood defences. Details should be provided (possibly through the permit discussions), which show that the proposals will have no impact on the flood defences in this location. The Environment Agency also owns land in this area, and we recommend discussions regarding access are undertaken with our Estates team.</p>		
91	Environment Agency	P2_9	There are some errors between the crossing IDs assigned within this document and those within document 8.1.8 Outline Preliminary Crossing Schedule Onshore. Please see comments on Part 8, document 8.1.8	The Applicant has noted this comment and discrepancies have been updated throughout the ES.	
92	Environment Agency	P2_9	Flood Risk: On the whole, this chapter aligns with our previous discussions to date. However, in certain areas, discussions are ongoing and/or further detail is required. Some points are also replicated within other chapters (e.g. Chapter 3: Project Description) so our comments apply to those as well.	The Applicant has noted this comment	
93	Environment Agency	P2_9	<p>Landfall: The crossing of the primary defences will need to be discussed, particularly with regard to depths. In a future worst-case scenario, we may have to pile the toe (for defence maintenance/improvements) and the length of the pile is unknown, so we will need to ensure there is a sufficiently safe distance below the maximum pile length to enable a safe working environment that does not interrupt/sever your proposed cables.</p> <p>This section states that temporary access is required which will cross beach areas and may include a crossing of the Main Drain outfall pipe. Access for plant can only occur at a recognised pullover. Anderby is the proposed pullover. However, this would involve the trafficking of plant and machinery over the Anderby Creek Tunnel, which is unacceptable. Wolla Bank pullover is south of the proposed landfall location and would not involve trafficking over any outfall tunnels, so consideration should be given to using Wolla Bank or Chapel six Marshes as alternative pullover locations onto the beach.</p> <p>The Environment Agency is also the landowner of the Wolla Bank access road. We must retain this and discussions with our Estates team will be required if this is used for this operation. This access is also used frequently during the beach nourishment works, and therefore any access will need to be agreed beforehand. It may be necessary to reinforce the existing pullover if it is the dune frontage.</p>	<p>The Applicant has engaged with the Environment Agency regarding the ‘worst case’ scenario for future coastal defence works. The applicant has discussed with the EA the cable installation depth in relation to possible sheet piling and the applicant considers that the cables are unlikely to present a constraint to any option that the EA may adopt in the future.</p> <p>The applicant does not plan to carry out any work on the beach (other than the pre and post construction surveys stipulated by the Environment Agency) but will agree arrangements for access for surveys and ‘unplanned events’ with the Environment Agency, as part of the pre-construction plans to be approved by the Environment Agency.</p> <p>The applicant has engaged with the environment agency to scope out the plans that will require pre-construction approval and survey requirements.</p>	

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
			For the beach and dunes, we will require a pre-commencement survey, regular survey (if in dune), post-construction survey and remediation plan. Settlement monitoring and a remediation plan for the defences will also be required after the construction is complete.		
94	Environment Agency	P2_9	<p>In addition to assessing flood risk to the temporary work areas, the FRA must consider flood risk from these and set out any mitigation required.</p> <p>Onshore ECC Installation – Impact 2, Onshore Substation Construction - Impact 4, Trenchless Drilling Works –Impact 6, Landfall Installation – Impact 8, Onshore Substation - Impact 10 and Permanent Landfall Site Infrastructure – Impact 12. With regard to the significance of effect, these sections advise that the sensitivity of the receptor is considered to be minor, and the magnitude of the impact is deemed to be negligible. Please see our comments above on Table 24.27 and Para. 24.7 Impact Assessment. Given the significant areas protected by raised defences, which are critical to managing flood risk, any impact on the defences could be significant and the sensitivity of the receptor (floodplain) is likely to vary depending on where the works are being undertaken. 4.42 These sections mainly focus on surface water and drainage with limited consideration of tidal/fluvial flood flows and the floodplain. Also, residual flood risk has not been raised or considered. This must be considered within the FRA. Any essential infrastructure should remain operational during a 0.1% event (2115 scenario) and appropriate mitigation measures/flood-resilient construction techniques should be incorporated into the development.</p>	The Applicant has included Flood Risk Assessments for the ECC & 400kv Cable Corridors and the OnSS.	6.1.24 Hydrology and Flood Risk, 6.3.24.2 Flood Risk Assessment ECC & 400kv 6.3.24.3 Flood Risk Assessment OnSS
95	Environment Agency	P2_9	In addition to assessing flood risk to the temporary work areas, the FRA must consider flood risk posed by these to third parties or the surrounding areas and set out any potential mitigation required.	As set out in the FRA ECC & 400kv cable corridor (document reference 6.3.24.2) the Applicant does not consider that there will be an increase in flood risk as a result of temporary works carried out along the onshore ECC route affecting a number of smaller agricultural land drains and watercourses.	6.3.24.2 Flood Risk Assessment ECC & 400kv
96	Environment Agency	P2_9	We welcome the acknowledgement in Para 24.7.100 that search areas are located within tidal and fluvial flood zones and flood risk will be assessed in more detail in the FRA.	The Applicant has considered fluvial flood zones and flood risk in detail in the FRA ECC & 400kv	6.3.24.2 Flood Risk Assessment ECC & 400kv
97	Environment Agency	P2_9	This section confirms that the temporary working area would be restored to its former land. However, the Transition Joint Bays (TJBs) could be raised above ground level. Would this land raising also be required during construction? If so, the following comments apply to this too. Para. 24.7.110 confirms that the maximum increase above the existing ground level would be 1.5m with a maximum raised area of 1.8ha. This is a significant amount of land being raised and will likely have an impact on the floodplain and flood flow routes. This would need to be assessed and considered, if proposed.	Following further consultation with the Environment Agency, the Project no longer proposes to raise the TJBs above ground level.	
98	Environment Agency	P2_9	Flood Risk Assessment: The FRA must identify and assess the risks from all sources of flooding, to and from the development including residual risk. The FRA must demonstrate how these flood risks will be managed to ensure that the development remains safe throughout its lifetime, taking climate change into account, without increasing flood risk elsewhere and where possible reducing flood risk overall. The FRA must assess flood risk to and from the permanent and temporary works for all phases of construction, operation, and decommissioning, and set out any mitigation required.	The Applicant has included Flood Risk Assessments for the Onshore ECC & 400kv Cable Corridors (document reference 6.3.24.2) and the OnSS (document reference 6.3.24.23).	6.3.24.2 Flood Risk Assessment ECC & 400kv 6.3.24.3 Flood Risk Assessment OnSS

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
99	Environment Agency	P2_9	Residual flood risk has not been identified within the PEIR. This must be considered within the FRA.	Residual flood risk has been identified and assessed within the FRAs.	6.3.24.2 Flood Risk Assessment ECC & 400kv 6.3.24.3 Flood Risk Assessment OnSS
100	Environment Agency	P2_9	For development defined as Essential Infrastructure, the development should be designed and constructed to remain operational and safe in times of extreme flood (0.1%).	As outlined in the FRA OnSS a hydraulic model has been used to simulate a range of extreme flood events up to and including the 0.1% tidal event. The site is not considered to be at risk of flooding in the event that the existing flood defences are overtopped.	6.3.24.3 Flood Risk Assessment OnSS
101	Environment Agency	P2_9	The Revised Draft National Policy Statement for Overarching Energy (NPS EN-1) (2023) is referred to within Chapter 24. Paragraph 4.9.11 of EN-1 states that Applicants should demonstrate that proposals have a high level of climate resilience built-in from the outset and should also demonstrate how proposals can be adapted over their predicted lifetimes to remain resilient to a credible maximum climate change scenario. Paragraph 4.9.12 goes on to state that Where energy infrastructure has safety critical elements (for example parts of new gas-fired power stations or some electricity sub-stations), the applicant should apply a credible maximum climate change scenario. It is appropriate to take a risk-averse approach with elements of infrastructure which are critical to the safety of its operation. Please see Flood risk assessments: climate change allowances - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk) for further advice on Flood Risk and the credible maximum scenario for any sub-station assessments.	As outlined in the FRA the Applicant has allowed for climate change and submitted a technical note to the EA, to confirm the climate change assumptions, prior to undertaking the detailed modelling.	6.3.24.2 Flood Risk Assessment ECC & 400kv 6.3.24.3 Flood Risk Assessment OnSS
102	GTC	P2_10	Processing your plans and details I have deduced that the onshore scoping boundary includes a lot of GTC assets within it. Is this area going to be developed or is just the off shore red line site boundary where construction will occur? Please see the attached the images showing all of the GTC networks within the scoping boundary area.  Please note there are no GTC assets in the offshore red line boundary.  If you would require the onshore asset plans please let us know and we can forward them to you.	The Applicant provided GTC with their refine Project Boundary and they confirmed there were <b>no</b> assets within the order limits of the onshore part of the windfarm project.	
103	Historic England	P2_11	Geophysical Survey (Terrestrial) Consultation on the terrestrial geophysical survey has been positive. This work has we understand now commenced (too late for inclusion in the PEIR) hence cannot be discussed at length here. We would note how ever the importance of a nuanced approach to the deployment of survey techniques in particular on the cable run along the coastal silts where within those areas of low potential there are evident areas of more solid ground with medieval and later archaeological features which should be targeted in their geomorphological context (ie not just the features visible on lidar but the dry landscape component as a whole). It will be important to test blank areas for methodological rigor in addition to positive targets.	Geophysical survey has targeted the parts of the Order Limits within areas west of historic high-water marks. These areas in the northern and central parts of the Order Limits (ECC1-ECC10) are considered to hold archaeological potential due to their historic location within areas not characterised by permanent inundation or tidal conditions for part of or all of the periods between the Late Mesolithic period and the medieval period. Areas of drier land in these parts of the Order Limits, which may have persisted as habitable or semi-habitable places within areas being affected by the historic fluctuations in high water marks and coastal flooding, have been identified by the electromagnetic survey.  The geophysical report is annexed to the DBA (annex 19). The anomalies recorded and areas highlighted as being dry (as well as their immediate proximities/interactions with wet land) will be targeted by post EIA trial trenching. Works are set out within the OWSI.	6.3.20.1 Appendix 1 Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage DBA
104	Historic England	P2_11	Deposit Modelling (Terrestrial) In the Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage section (Chapter 20, Outer Dowsing Document No: 6.1.20) the authors make reference in paragraph 20.4.6 (and elsewhere) to a deposit model that was prepared. This is provided in Volume 2, Appendix 20.1: Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage Desk-Based Assessment as Annex 23A. The	An updated deposit model has been submitted as Annex 18 of the DBA including updates in reference to a monitored programme of Site Investigations undertaken post PEIR. Further updates to modelling are referenced within the OWSI.	6.3.20.1 Annex 18 ODOV Geotechnical Investigation Monitoring and Deposit Model Report



Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
			assessment has been produced by AOC and appears substantially more robust than the offshore version. It is worth noting, however, that this terrestrial deposit modelling assessment is a desk based report only. We understand there were plans to monitor a small number of geotechnical boreholes and update the model with these in the spring (see paragraph 6.19 of chapter 20), it is regrettable that update does not appear yet to have been provided. It would be better to have started to ground truth and fill in gaps in the model now, but what has provided for the onshore is significantly superior to the offshore work.		
105	Historic England	P2_11	Trial Trenching (Terrestrial) The sooner the results of geophysical survey can be integrated with desk-based assessment and deposit modelling, and targets taken forwards for trial trenching the better. To restate a point made in previous discussion, it is never possible to identify all features of archaeological interest in evaluation but one can manage down the risk of the discovery of multiple sensitive, complex and time consuming remains being encountered during works and the associated inefficiencies in mitigation and delivery. In particular an understanding of the detail of the historic coast and inlets / points of entry will assist greatly to identify both potential in channels and on dry land sites which articulated with such points (we attach a final pre-publication copy of Caitlin Green's Coastal Landscape Report in this regard).	Dr Caitlin Green's publication was gratefully received and has been referenced within the DBA. The use of electromagnetic survey, identifying areas of drier ground alongside possible channels will inform trial trenching which is being undertaken post EIA as referenced within the OWSI (document reference 8.9). This will inform on mitigation works with due regard to conclusions of the DBA and ES that no significant impacts are predicted where preservation in situ cannot be secured.	8.9 OWSI
106	Historic England	P2_11	Preservative - Regarding the understanding and management of impacts upon buried wet remains (intersected by the cable corridor) we highlight our detailed preservation guidance. It is important to stress that where the works are likely to affect the burial environment of important remains any solution involving avoidance / excavation etc needs to be grounded in a sound understanding of the burial environment the preservation of the remains and the mechanisms for effect from the works (which may act over distance depending upon the hydrology).  <a href="https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/environmental-archaeology-2nd/">https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/environmental-archaeology-2nd/</a> < <a href="https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/preserving-archaeological-remains/">https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/preserving-archaeological-remains/</a> >	The presence of the tidal mudflats in-particular is acknowledged as providing an area within which organic remains may be present. The Historic England publication referenced (Environmental Archaeology 2011) has been referenced within the Outline Archaeological WSI Onshore. The hydrological environment of the footprint of disturbance and the effect of changes has been acknowledged as far as possible within Chapter 20 Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage with reference to the findings in Chapter 24 Hydrology and Flood Risk	6.1.20 Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage, 6.1.24 Hydrology and Flood Risk, 8.09 Outline Archaeological WSI Onshore
107	Historic England	P2_11	Sampling (Terrestrial)  <a href="https://historicengland.org.uk/advice/technical-advice/archaeological-science/environmental-archaeology/">https://historicengland.org.uk/advice/technical-advice/archaeological-science/environmental-archaeology/</a>	The Outline Archaeological WSI Onshore includes reference to research objectives relevant to the potential impacts of the Project. Reference is also made to the Historic England publication referenced (Environmental Archaeology 2011) and also the East Midlands Research Framework.	8.09 Outline Archaeological WSI Onshore
108	Historic England	P2_11	Values/Significance/Importance - In NPS / NPPF / PPG terms it is helpful to consider the above terms to be nested, with values being the socially constructed view of assets, significance being the structured assessment (professional assessment) there-of and importance the relative worth (including designation by the state). Whilst the use of language is further complicated in the context of EIA by the use significant as an adjective, it remains useful to avoid further ambiguity in terminology. At para 5.6 second bullet for instance highest level of significance would read better as highest level of importance	Ambiguity in terminology – specifically the term 'significance' – has been reviewed at EIA where possible. It is acknowledged EIA references the term 'significance' to describe effects whereas Chapter 16 of the NPPF references the term 'significance' to infer importance. The term importance is used more widely at EIA.	
109	Historic England	P2_11	Setting - We welcome the initial approach to setting set out in PEIR Heritage Statement in particular the flexible approach to consideration based upon judgement in preference to overly rigid radii. As explored in section 5 of the onshore cultural heritage and archaeology section of the PEIR there is much good analysis, but this could be enhanced with stronger reference to a structured understanding of the shifting historic landscape and the contemporary siting of features there in (see the	Historic Landscape Character has been assessed as part of the Environmental Statement and is outlined in the Heritage Statement Appendix and Annexes.	6.3.20.2 Heritage Statement

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
			attached report by Caitlin Green). Weight should be given to the experience of historic places as the aggregate of phases of landscape change in addition to specifically contemporaneous relationships - see our GPA 3. < <a href="https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/gpa3-setting-of-heritage-assets/heag180-gpa3-setting-heritage-assets/">https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/gpa3-setting-of-heritage-assets/heag180-gpa3-setting-heritage-assets/</a> >		
110	Historic England	P2_11	Draft DCO - structure of requirements (Terrestrial) - We welcome the structural arrangement of an outline Written Scheme of Investigation for approval in the DCO process and subordinate WSI for submission post-consent and approval by the LPA's advised by their archaeological advisors and Historic England.	The Outline Archaeological WSI will provide a framework for subordinate WSIs.	8.09 Outline Archaeological WSI Onshore
111	Historic England	P2_11	It is important for the effective control of environmental impacts that the sites of ancillary facilities are addressed within the scope of the ES whether to be used by the principal contractor or subcontractors or suppliers. There should be robust mechanisms in place to ensure that secondary / unplanned for additional facilities are nevertheless sited and managed in accordance with the ES. It is our experience that such facilities on linear projects can become detached from the strategies for the management of risk set out in the ES hence the need for particular attention to this point.	The location of all works compounds have been included within the Order Limits subject to assessment at EIA.	Order Limits
112	Historic England	P2_11	Duck decoys - As noted in the PEIR decoys that survive late enough to appear on OS 1:2500 mapping or as extant earthworks form only a fraction of the extent of such features once present (compare the OS1 and accounts such as the link below) a systematic approach to assessment in areas of survival is likely to identify additional features and water management systems. < <a href="https://archive.org/details/bookofduckdecoys00paynega">https://archive.org/details/bookofduckdecoys00paynega</a> >	Geophysical survey and historic map regression undertaken at EIA and presented within the DBA has included the assessment of the Order Limits adjacent to the scheduled duck decoy. A possible water management feature associated with the monument is shown on historic mapping crossing the Order Limits, but this is a drainage feature planned for avoidance through trenchless works.	6.3.20.1 Appendix 1 Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage DBA
113	Historic England	P2_11	Medieval Settlements remain inc. Slackholme The unscheduled remains believed to comprise the medieval village of Slackholme are potentially of equivalent importance to a scheduled monument and in the first instance options to avoid should be pursued, potential to pass through / under on a route at a point of least apparent survival are challenging given the inherent uncertainty of the relationship between surface expression and below ground survival and the risk of being 'locked in' to a line revealed later to be undesirable. The desirability and effectiveness of such a 'surgical' solution would depend to a large extent upon the degree to which early detailed understanding could be secured. Consideration to collateral impacts of vehicle movements, hydrological severance etc should also be considered. Overall, avoidance or direct drill options would be much preferable for identified high importance features both for the reduction of avoidable harm and the husbanding of archaeological resource to mitigate impacts revealed later which cannot so readily be avoided.	The footprint of the asset recorded by the HER and all associated earthworks would be avoided through the use of trenchless works. This is secured through commitment COM_150. It is anticipated that directional drilling achieving a depth of 5m BGL will avoid the base of cut features. Furthermore, no works associated with haul roads are proposed within the asset.	8.13 Schedule of Mitigation
114	Historic England	P2_11	Crash Sites and Military Remains - Consideration of terrestrial crash sites / military remains / UXO should be given alongside that afforded offshore (given the extensive aviation heritage of the area). < <a href="https://www.gov.uk/guidance/aviation-archaeology">https://www.gov.uk/guidance/aviation-archaeology</a> > < <a href="https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/military-aircraft-crash-sites/milaircsites/">https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/military-aircraft-crash-sites/milaircsites/</a> > < <a href="https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/military-aircraft-">https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/military-aircraft-</a> >	The EIA baseline does not reference any crash sites or military remains within the Order Limits. Nevertheless, a protocol has been included within the OWSI.	8.9 OWSI

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
			crash-sites/milaircsites/>		
115	Historic England	P2_11	Roman - Early Medieval Coast - Assumptions as to the loss of Roman Coastal features due to post-Roman inundation should be treated with caution pending the testing of survival given limited data. Localised unexpectedly good preservation should be allowed for. Portable Antiquities Scheme data may assist in this regard and should be consulted.	Baseline assessment presented within the DBA, including deposit modelling provides data on the depth of Roman land surfaces. Portable Antiquities Scheme data (PAS) has been referenced within the DBA.	6.3.20.1 Appendix 1 Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage DBA
116	Historic England	P2_11	Waterlogged prehistoric and later remains - timber - Considerable prior thought should be given to the handling and conservation of waterlogged wood revealed, past experiences of linear schemes have involved large wooden artefacts being sat exposed for significant period due to the lack of an in place plan for extraction and wet storage and assessment in conservation controlled conditions.	A broad strategy for effective short-term measures and timely long-term solutions for the preservation of waterlogged timbers has been drawn into the OWSI. These will also be referenced in any subordinate WSIs.	6.3.20.1 Appendix 1 Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage DBA
117	Historic England	P2_11	Ridge and Furrow - The archaeological potential of extant ridge and furrow to reveal sequence (of intercutting strips / reorganisation) or in stratigraphic relation to earlier and later boundaries should not be underestimated. There is potential for buried land surfaces to be preserved under the centre line of ridges. Where/if Ridge and Furrow is extant and to be bisected by the cable then it should be reinstated to profile.	No areas of extant ridge and furrow would be disturbed within the Order Limits.	
118	Historic England	P2_11	Saltings - The relationship of saltings of all periods to contemporary topography and water levels is crucial, prospection based upon geophysical (mag) survey and deposit modelling (often sited on rodens as dry ground) is of high importance, scientific dating strategies are clearly important as is a careful approach to excavation to identify the often ephemeral traces of contemporary seasonal (?) occupation in association with the more obvious productive remains themselves.	The presence/absence of saltings and their anticipated levels of importance are set out within the DBA. Geophysical survey has identified some potential salterns and these will be targeted by the trial trenching as referenced within the OWSI	8.9 OWSI
119	Historic England	P2_11	Scheduled Monument inc. Abbey Hills 1016044 - All direct impacts upon scheduled monuments should be regarded as avoidable and designed out. We note that the line of the causeway from Abbey Hills to Friskney appears to be crossed by the PEIR - there is a clear need for further investigation and discussion of options with HE as a feature of high importance (directional drill?).	A proposed access track to the north of the monument and a secondary compound to the west of the monument are shown within the Order Limits. The potential for the preservation in situ of remains of national importance present within the construction parameters associated with these activities is set out within the Schedule of Mitigation (document reference 8.13). These acknowledge that the results of fieldwork will inform detailed design. Mitigation through preservation in situ informed by archaeological evaluation is referenced within the OWSI.	8.13 Schedule of Mitigation
120	Historic England	P2_11	We hope the advice above is of assistance in refining the approach as set out in the PEIR - we remain engaged with you in an ongoing process of extended advice - pre-submission of your DCO application. We refer you also to the expertise of our local government curatorial colleagues and to the regional research framework <a href="https://researchframeworks.org/emherf/">https://researchframeworks.org/emherf/</a>	The Applicant has noted this comment.	
121	Historic Environment Officer	P2_12	The location of the at sea turbines feel far enough way not to cause too much concern, but mindful that we did go for Heritage Coast status which was refused due to the turbines at Skegness as they are not natural. But these are somewhat removed from that, but it would still need to be considered any potential negative impact that the development could have on achieving heritage coast status in the future, should the area be reduced. Concern over long term visual	The Project understands from Natural England that the Heritage Coast proposal (for the area north of Mablethorpe) has stalled with no further progress having been made and therefore no further weight or consideration needs to be given to the proposal to create a Heritage Coast for Lincolnshire at this time. Chapter 28 Landscape and Visual Assessment assesses the long term visual effects of the	6.1.28 Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
			changes so substations and pylons. Especially over the fens and marshland areas which due to their vast flatness causes anything of height to stand out and be seen from much further. This is also true when looking down from the Wolds AONB towards the coast. Any landscape visual assessment for any above ground features and for each to be looked at separately. National Trust should be consulted as the route passes near Gunby and lands around Sandilands their new nature reserve.	onshore substations and other onshore infrastructure taking into account the openness of the fens and marshland landscapes.	
122	Huttoft Parish Council	P2_13	There also appears to be discrepancies between the Scoping Document and the PEIR regarding the height of the proposed substation. Table 3.5.3 in the scoping document states a maximum building height of 25m and a lightening mast height of 30m we are concerned that the visual representation of the substation may be misleading.	The Project has confirmed that the visualisations have been based on the heights of the converter halls and not the lightening masts as these are fine metal structures that do not add to the perceived height of the building.	6.1.28 Landscape and Visual Assessment
123	Huttoft Parish Council	P2_13	The Parish Council is concerned that the proposed project is part of a wider plan by National Grid to build a number of future phases, that will significantly increase the size and scope of the currently proposed Lincolnshire Node substation. To properly assess the onshore proposal for the Outer Dowsing Offshore wind project substation location, the Parish Council and other interested parties should be made aware of all proposed future phases, planned by National Grid and these phases (even if in outline) together with the location of any pylons should form part of a single consultation. It is important that any consultation is transparent, and all the facts are shared.  Our concerns and objections stem from the proposals detailed in Pathway to 2030 published by the National Grid in June 2022	The Project is to connect in to the vicinity of the overhead lines at Weston Marsh. The Project is not seeking development consent for overhead lines and is not part of or reliant on the National Grid proposals.	N/A
124	Huttoft Parish Council	P2_13	b. Noise from the substation  The scoping document states the baseline sound levels are very low and mentions this could lead to 'potential impacts from operational substation noise, especially the potential low frequency level'. Within table 8.7.2 'centres of human population' are mentioned as Mablethorpe (approximately 8 miles from the development), Alford, Trusthorpe, Sutton on Sea and Sandilands, there is no mention Huttoft, just over a mile from the proposed site, with a population of about 600 or Silsby, Mumby or Asserby who have a combined population of about 900 and are less than two miles of the proposed substation.  Where Huttoft and Silsby are mentioned in 8.9.23 they are described as 'small, nucleated villages.'  The prevailing winds tend to blow west to east meaning even the slightest noise from the substation will be carried toward Huttoft village.  We have concerns about the impact on tourism, there are several caravan and camping sites within the scoping area that could be detrimentally affected by this onshore development especially in an area where opportunities are limited in other areas of work.  There is also no recognition of St Margarets Church in Huttoft, a Grade 1 Listed building.	The Applicant notes this comment, however due to the iterative site selection process and the grid connection confirmation the Lincolnshire Node OnSS is no longer part of the development proposals and the issues no longer need to be addressed.  Camping and caravan sites have been considered as tourism asset receptors and assessed within Chapter 29 Socioeconomics	6.1.3 Site Selection 6.1.29 Socioeconomics



Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
125	Huttoft Parish Council	P2_13	<p>Traffic disruption - Over the past 7 years there has been travel disruption for residents with the development of Triton Knoll and the Viking link.</p> <p>The proposed Lincolnshire Node substation is in a very rural area of Lincolnshire. The impact of a 3-year plus construction programme on the road infrastructure in and around the proposed substation site will be significant, with heavy construction vehicles damaging the narrow country lanes and traffic diversions through small villages etc., disrupting the daily lives of residents.</p> <p>If the Lincolnshire Node is chosen there will continue to be traffic accessing the site for maintenance and if the site is developed, as described by National Grid in the Pathway to 2030, heavy construction vehicles and oversized loads will be using the unsuitable road infrastructure for the foreseeable future.</p>	The Project notes this comment, however due to the iterative site selection process and the grid connection confirmation the Lincolnshire Node OnSS is no longer part of the development proposals and the issues no longer need to be addressed. There will still be traffic along the same route, the impacts of which have been examined in Chapter 27 Traffic and Transport (document reference 6.1.27).	6.1.27 Traffic and Transport
126	King's Lynn & West Norfolk Borough Council	P2_14	<p>It is assumed that the relevant ecological and environmental reports will be completed to ascertain the full impacts of the proposal and how these impacts can be mitigated.</p> <p>The Borough Council has no comment to make on the proposal at this stage, provided the relevant ecological and environmental reports are prepared to ascertain the full impacts of the proposal and how these impacts can be mitigated. Can you please ensure that the Borough Council of Kings Lynn and West Norfolk are advised when the application is submitted for determination.</p>	The full impacts of the Project have been assessed in the Environmental Statement submitted as part of the DCO application	Environmental Statement Volumes 1-3
127	Lincolnshire County Council	P2_15	Cumulative landscape and visual impacts are considered from paragraph 28.6.61, where the definition references NatureScot's guidance; 'Assessing the Cumulative Impact of Onshore Wind Energy Developments' (2021).	The Applicant has noted this comment.	
128	Lincolnshire County Council	P2_15	In support of the visualisations, appendix (28.1) considered below, the narrative describes from paragraph 28.6.78 the process of selection, and appraisal of visualisations from viewpoints to assess the impact of the onshore sub-station (OnSS). Proposed mitigation is included within the visualisations. Each viewpoint is assessed by contrasting the baseline with year one (opening) conditions and year 15, when the mitigation planting is expected to have matured.	The Applicant has noted this comment.	
129	Lincolnshire County Council	P2_15	Section 28.7 considers in detail the effect of the OnSS on different elements of the physical landscape, this includes coastal land, Agricultural land, Hedgerows, Tall Hedgerows and Hedgerow trees and Trees. For each, the baseline is determined, before defining sensitivity, magnitude of change and significance of effects. It is useful to have a detailed analysis of each element but the descriptions are lengthy and repetitive and would benefit from streamlining to clarify the main landscape and visual issues.	The Project has noted this comment. A full and detailed assessment of the effect on physical elements is required in the Environmental Statement however the main conclusions of the assessment have been highlighted in a summary table.	6.1.28 Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment
130	Lincolnshire County Council	P2_15	An assessment of the landscape character considers the impact of the OnSS across the Landscape Character Areas within the study area. The methodology follows the same format as the previous section and does provide a detailed analysis. In line with previous comments, a tabular summary of the research would have provided a more succinct method of presenting the information. The three prospective substation sites are considered in turn, across the LVIA.	The Project has noted this comment. A full and detailed assessment of the effect on physical elements is required in the Environmental Statement however the main conclusions of the assessment have been highlighted in a summary table.	6.1.28 Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment
131	Lincolnshire County Council	P2_15	The impact on visual amenity (section 28.9) considers the magnitude of change for the 14no. viewpoints across the three OnSS sites, this reinforces the content of the visualisation appendix. Each viewpoint is assessed in turn across a methodology that describes the baseline, sensitivity, magnitude of change to	The Project has noted this comment. A full and detailed assessment of the effect on physical elements is required in the Environmental Statement however the main conclusions of the assessment have been highlighted in a summary table.	6.1.28 Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
			determine the significance of effects. In common with previous comments, this section is lengthy and would benefit from a tabular summation.		
132	Lincolnshire County Council	P2_15	The impacts associated with decommissioning, in regards onshore elements, are considered in section 28.10. the process is anticipated to be of a timeframe comparable to construction and involve similar impacts, culminating in the restoration of land to agricultural use and the reinstatement of hedgerows. At this stage the specific methodology is not determined and would be confirmed at the end of the lifetime of the operation facility. It would be prudent to detail an approach that would guide the specific approach at the time of specific decommissioning licencing and consenting. The scale of the decommissioning process is too significant to have a vague approach at time of application.	The Project's decommissioning approach is set out in Chapter 28 Landscape and Visual Impacts with the limitations relating to future events clearly set out.	6.1.28 Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment
133	Lincolnshire County Council	P2_15	Table 28.10 provides a preliminary assessment of the cumulative developments considered of relevance. Three residential developments are considered as potential for significant cumulative effects in regards the onshore ECC. Two have been scoped out due to separation distances. West End, Hogsthorpe (an outline application for 89 dwellings) however is considered to have cumulative effects due to the close proximity to the ECC. No cumulative effects on landscape character are considered due to the small scale of construction, and its limited impact on the overall character. The ECC is defined as an 80m working width to be located within a 300m wide search corridor. Given that, at this stage, the exact location is not determined, there is some ambiguity to this assertion. It would benefit all parties to undertake a dialogue to help determine an optimum route of the ECC to minimise the impact. This approach would follow the principles of 'avoidance' before 'mitigation' as detailed within the LEDPP document.	The Applicant has continued to engage with LCC throughout the pre-application phases including the EPP, ETGs, bilateral engagement and further consultation undertaken under section 42 of the 2008 Act as outlined in the Consultation Report	5.1 Consultation Report
134	Lincolnshire County Council	P2_15	In conclusion, the LVIA is a thorough document, but the readability is reduced as a result of the lengthy narrative and would benefit from succinct tables rather than lengthy text, that is subsequently summarised to clearly illustrate the key landscape and visual matters. Table 28.12, within the conclusions does provide a succinct summation, but rather than locating together at the end it would have been more useful being located within the relevant sections of the text. The approach does follow best practice guidelines and follows a logical approach to assessing the impacts. It is useful that the three potential OnSS sites are kept separate throughout the LVIA, particularly in regards the character area and viewpoint assessments. The assessment of decommissioning impacts is vague, with a reliance upon this being formulated towards the end of the operation phase. Whilst there is merit in this, there is a necessity to gain acceptance of the restoration objectives at the onset during the application stage. This would provide a basis for determining a strategy at the relevant time and give all parties some certainty at the application stage.	The Project has noted this comment. Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment Third Edition (2013) at paragraph 3.33 states the importance of using narrative over tables and matrices to enable non experts in their understanding of the assessment, however in response to this comment the Project has included summary tables at the end of each section. The Project's decommissioning approach is set out in Chapter 28 Landscape and Visual Impacts with the limitations relating to future events clearly set out.	6.1.28 Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment
135	Lincolnshire County Council	P2_15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Appendix 28.1 is split over two documents, landscape and visual assessment, visualisations wirelines, dated June 2023, Rev 1.0.</li> <li>A total of 14 viewpoint and visualisation are detailed. Viewpoints for the three sites proposed for the sub-stations are presented within this document. The methodology for the photography and visualisation process is detailed and complies with GLVIA3. The sub-station is represented as a structure with a maximum height of 12m, with associated infrastructure including masts having a maximum height of 30m, although given the slender nature of these, these are not included in the overall consideration of maximum infrastructure height</li> </ul>	The Project has noted this comment. Following confirmation of the substation location as part of the Autumn Consultation the Project has refined the design envelope and Chapter 28 Landscape and Visual Impacts focuses on the visual impacts of the selected substation site.	6.1.28 Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
			<p>in the LVIA.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The document confirms that use of the block model is based on the ‘Rochdale Envelope’ approach, reference is made to Planning Inspectorate Advice Note Nine to support this approach. At this stage in the design process the precise location of the sub-station is not fixed and could be adjusted different to the images presented here.</li> <li>Mitigation planting is included within each visualisation. Growth rate of species is predicted to provide a mature coverage, at year 15, to a height of 7-10m. With this in mind the visualisations show mitigation at a middle height of 8.5m.</li> <li>The document is clear and concise with each potential sub-station considered in order. The plan presents the location and orientation of each view and the three images for each viewpoint present the baseline, the proposal at year one and year 15 with mitigation established, these clearly present the basis of assessment. The document is supported by a detailed assessment of each viewpoint within the LVIA document.</li> </ul>		
136	Lincolnshire County Council	P2_15	<p>Document number 8.7 Author: SLR, June 2023 V1.0</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This is an outline document, setting out the principles that will be followed when finalising landscape and ecology mitigation, compensation and enhancement measures, for both the proposed sub-station (three separate options assessed) and three onshore export cable .</li> <li>The document is to be read in conjunction with the Project description, chapter 3, the LVIA, chapter 28 and supplemented with onshore ecology and onshore ornithology, chapters 21 and 22 respectively.</li> <li>The role of an Ecological Clerk of Works is introduced as a principle component of the mitigation aspects within the document. The role and skills of the incumbent will demonstrate adherence to the document policies and methodology.</li> <li>Throughout the document, various mitigation models are proposed and these are distinguished between the landfall, the cable route and the sub-station.</li> <li>The initial approach to mitigation, defined as primary mitigation, addresses the approach whereby physical landscape constraints like woodland, hedgerows, alongside landscape character and amenity have been considered to identify a range of potential sites. By considering sites against the baseline conditions the document a pre-selection criterion is applied to identify the most appropriate options for further assessment. Utilising this approach, the PEIR stage identified three sub-station sites, which are explored in detail through the LVIA and the LVIA visualisations.</li> <li>Upon site selection, the second approach to mitigation is construction mitigation, defined as restrictions imposed on the working areas including the sensitive siting of compounds away from sensitive receptors.</li> </ul>	The Applicant has noted this comment.	

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Operational mitigation is the third defined approach to mitigation, encompassing the replacement of removed vegetation and additional planting in association with all three of the project elements; landfall, the cabling and the sub-station. At the PEIR stage, the exact location of landfall has not yet been determined, however, paragraph 6.3.3 collates the over-riding principles of mitigation to be employed, these include reinstating lost vegetation features including hedgerows, the restoration of all temporary work sites, and the protection of trees during construction. In regards the cabling site, the onus is on reinstatement including returning disturbed ground to agricultural use. In regards the sub-stations, each of the current options are located within arable farmland, within areas where enclosure has been eroded and field amalgamation has contributed to an open and exposed baseline character.</li> <li>Given the open character of the three consideration sites, coupled with the scale of the sub-stations, the proposed mitigation incorporates proposed planting of hedgerows, trees and woodlands. To provide screening from key visual receptors including rural farmsteads and properties, the rural road network and Public Rights of Way users. The use of planting will aim to reduce the scale and mass of the sub-stations as well as seeking to enhance biodiversity. Connecting hedgerows will create a green network for wildlife. It is proposed that advance planting will be undertaken at the earliest opportunities during the construction of the sub-station to facilitate establishment and develop screening in readiness for completion and operation.</li> <li>Section 7 considers in detail the approach employed in considering mitigation. This includes avoidance, mitigation, compensation and enhancement as headline approaches used throughout the LVIA and the LEDPP. Avoidance is through site selection, mitigation reduces or remedies a specific negative impact in situ. Compensation relates to measures take to offset residual effects, especially in areas where mitigation in situ is not possible. Enhancement relates to the biodiversity benefits introduced as a result of the scheme and are defined as additional to mitigation or compensatory measures.</li> <li>Sections 7.2 and 7.3 explore the detail of the mitigation proposals including the consideration of protecting specific designated species throughout all project stages including site selection. 9 policies are introduced to mitigate the loss of priority habitats, culminating in a policy relating to monitoring and management, these policies are robust and with scrutiny could form a basis for ensuring compliance with the overall mitigation policies.</li> </ul>		
137	Lincolnshire County Council	P2_15	<p>It is helpful to see a draft Development Consent Order at this stage and whilst the Council will reserve its position to make further recommendations to the wording of the DCO to those included in this response initial observations on the draft DCO are as follows:</p> <p>In the interpretations schedule the definition of relevant planning authority should include LCC and some suggested wording is as follows:-</p> <p>“relevant planning authority means</p>	<p>It is not considered necessary or standard practice to define “relevant planning authority” in this way. LCC will be referred to (i.e., as the relevant highway authority or lead local flood authority) or specifically named in relevant articles or requirements where this is appropriate to ensures that it is clear when LCC are the approving authority under a DCO provision and who they are to consult with and when they are to be consulted by another approving authority (such as the relevant planning authority).</p> <p>Turning to each of the provisions listed, the ‘access to works’ provision is Article 14 and the approving authority in Article 14 is the relevant highway authority</p>	Draft Development Consent Order



Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
			Lincolnshire County Council for the purposes of article 15 (access to works) and the following requirements in Schedule 2 (requirements) to this Order— (i) requirement 8; (ii) requirement 9; (iii) requirement 10; (iv) requirement 15; (v) requirement 17; (vi) requirement 20; (vii) requirement 21 (viii) requirement 22”.	<p>(i.e., LCC). Under Article 14, the relevant highway authority is required to consult with the relevant planning authority.</p> <p>With respect to Requirement 8 (detailed onshore design parameters), Requirement 9 (provision of landscaping), Requirement 10 (implementation and maintenance of landscaping) and Requirement 22 (restoration of land used temporarily for construction), it is appropriate for the relevant planning authority (i.e., the district planning authority) to be the approving authority. (However, for each of these requirements, the Project has committed to include LCC as a consultee, noting that LCC is already a consultee under requirement 22 as the relevant highway authority.)</p> <p>For Requirement 15 (operational drainage management plan), the LLFA must be consulted by the relevant planning authority prior to approval.</p> <p>Requirement 17 (onshore archaeology) requires approval by LCC in consultation with the relevant planning authority.</p> <p>Finally, Requirements 20 (traffic) and 21 (public rights of way) require approval by the relevant highway authority in consultation with the relevant planning authority, and therefore LCC will be the approving authority in respect of these provisions.</p> <p>It is considered that the approach taken for each provision is appropriate and ensures plans and documents are being considered by the most appropriate authority in consultation with other relevant authorities.</p>	
138	Lincolnshire County Council	P2_15	In respect of draft requirement 26 include an obligation to consult with LCC.	It is not considered appropriate to name LCC as a consultee on every single amendment, and indeed, in some cases LCC will be the approving authority and so it would not make sense for the requirement to be drafted in a way that would require LCC as approving authority to consult with LCC [however Requirement 26 will be amended to require consultation on amendments with any person that the approving authority is required to consult under the relevant requirement].	
139	Lincolnshire County Council	P2_15	<p>An additional requirement as follows:</p> <p>Skills, supply chain and employment</p> <p>27.—(1) No part of the authorised development may commence until a skills, supply chain and employment plan in relation to that part has been submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority for that part or, where the part falls within the administrative areas of multiple planning authorities, each of the relevant planning authorities following consultation with Lincolnshire County Council.</p> <p>(2) The skills, supply chain and employment plan must be substantially in accordance with the outline skills, supply chain and employment plan.</p> <p>(3) Any plan under this paragraph must identify opportunities for individuals and businesses to access employment and supply chain opportunities associated with that part of the authorised development and the means for</p>	<p>Requirement 27 has been amended to the following;</p> <p>(1) No stage of the authorised development may commence until a skills, supply chain and employment plan in relation to that stage has been submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority following consultation with Lincolnshire County Council.</p> <p>(2) Any plan submitted in accordance with this requirement must identify opportunities for individuals and businesses to access employment and supply chain opportunities associated with that stage of the authorised development and the means for publicising such opportunities.</p> <p>(3) The skills, supply chain and employment plan must be implemented as approved.</p>	Draft Development Consent Order

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
			publicising such opportunities.  (4) The skills, supply chain and employment plan must be implemented as approved.		
140	Lincolnshire County Council	P2_15	In relation discharge requirements the Council does not object to the principle of including a deemed discharge provision, however, 42 days is an unreasonably short time period. A period of 10 weeks would be more realistic and the applicant should be required to notify relevant consultees to save any delay in this regard.	<p>Schedule 18 – procedure for discharge of requirements currently provides that the discharging authority must make a decision before the end of the decision period, that period being 56 days from the day immediately following that on which the application is received by the discharging authority. The 42 days referred to applies where further information is requested by the discharging authority and runs from the day immediately following that on which the further information has been supplied by the undertaker. The schedule also allows the discharging authority and the undertaker to agree a longer period in writing,</p> <p>We would be willing to increase the period for reviewing further information from 42 days to 56 days in line with other offshore wind DCOs such as the Norfolk Boreas Offshore Wind Farm Order 2021 and the Hornsea Four Offshore Wind Farm Order 2023.</p> <p>Schedule 18 does not include any deemed approval provisions.</p> <p>It is standard in offshore wind DCOs that the duty to consult with other consultees is with the discharging authority rather than the undertaker. We are not proposing to change this.</p>	Draft Development Consent Order
141	Lincolnshire County Council	P2_15	<p>The discharge Schedule should include standard drafting provisions in relation to fees for discharge applications as follows:</p> <p>(1) Where an application is made to the relevant planning authority for written consent, agreement or approval in respect of a requirement, the fee prescribed under regulation 16(1)(b) of the Town and Country Planning (Fees for Applications, Deemed Applications, Requests and Site Visits) (England) Regulations 2012(a) (as may be amended or replaced from time to time) is to apply and must be paid to the relevant planning authority for each application.</p> <p>(2) Any fee paid under this Schedule must be refunded to the undertaker within four weeks of -</p> <p>(a) the application being rejected as invalidly made; or</p> <p>(b) the relevant planning authority failing to determine the application within the decision period as determined under paragraph 26(1), unless within that period the undertaker agrees, in writing, that the fee is to be retained by the relevant planning authority and credited in respect of a future application.</p> <p>The Council will continue to engage with this project and therefore any further queries, please do not hesitate to get in contact.</p>	<p>The Project has included this requirement in the draft Development Consent Order submitted as part of the DCO application. In light of the response provided in relation to the definition of “relevant planning authority”, the Project has amended the requirement to also refer to Lincolnshire County Council.</p>	
142	Lincolnshire County Council	P2_15	Public Health – no comments to make at this stage.	The Applicant has noted there are no comments in respect of Public Health .	
143	Lincolnshire County Council	P2_15	A report by the Councils consultants Landscape, is attached to the response and this provides details on what the Council would expect to see in the ES in respect of Agriculture Land Classification (ALC).	The site specific ALC survey will occur post consent, pre-construction to inform the construction method statements. The survey spacing is proposed to be every 100m or 1 per field if there are multiple fields within the 100m interval. In addition, the this the project has committed to doing British standard testing on	6.1.25 Land Use

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
			<p>In summary the conclusions are:-</p> <p>a) Predictive verses Actual ALC</p> <p>The ALC report is not fully in line with the MAFF 1988 guidance, which recommends auger borings at 1 hectare intervals, and soil pits dug in representative soils types. The report relies on existing published data which is not site specific.</p> <p>b) Farming Circumstance and Impact on Land Holdings</p> <p>There is no mention of the impact on farm holdings or land structures affected by the proposal. From local knowledge there are numerous landowners, or occupiers, but the report does not outline the impact on any of these occupiers or the nature of the tenure of their holdings. In considering the impact on the overall farming enterprises both locally and across the District or County, it may be necessary to seek additional information on the impact on the individual farms themselves.</p>	<p>both topsoil and subsoil.</p> <p>The concerns regarding individual farms have been noted and the Project has continues to engage with landowners in particular regarding information on particular crops being produced are being sought. Impacts relating to the location of the ECC in relation to restricting access and/or severage of fields has been being reviewed and considered in Chapter 6.1.25 Land Use</p>	
144	Lincolnshire County Council	P2_15	<p>Public Rights of Way / Environment – understand the need for renewable energy but feel the infrastructure for each new offshore windfarm has been delivered in isolation. With a coordinated approach the impact could have been greatly reduced. This is particularly pertinent within the Coastal County Park as this is the landfall point for Triton Knoll and now Outer Dowsing concentrating the impact into one small area and there is a risk that future projects may follow a similar onshore cable route.</p> <p>Welcome the proposed directional drilling between Roman Bank and the Sea as this area is of high ecological value. It is vital that the drilling here does not inadvertently drain water from wetland nature reserves in this area.</p>	<p>The Project has noted this comment. To the extent that sufficient information is available in the public domain the Project has taken into account all existing or proposed projects within the cumulative assessment.</p>	
145	Lincolnshire County Council	P2_16	<p>Based on the Socio-Economic section of the Socio Economic, Recreation and Tourism chapter what is considered and the methodology in this section of the PEIR appears reasonable at the current stage. Although what is included in the PEIR looks reasonable, would be keen to see benefits to the local host communities and economy explored when the grid connection point and cable route corridor has been determined, particularly with regards to local energy, as current growth data indicates that there may be local primary substation headroom deficits in the area during the construction phase and early operational phase of this project. Also like to take this opportunity to highlight that the impact of highway works during tourism season needs to be considered and agreed in the future.</p>	<p>The Applicant continues to be committed to bringing benefits to the local host communities and developing a Community Benefit Fund. Proposals as to suggested themes and criteria for the Community Benefit Fund were included within January's Community Liaison Group meetings and suggestions invited for projects that the Applicant can pursue pre-consent that are aligned with these. The Applicant has taken into account all comments made regarding the potential impacts of highway works on tourism, these have been examined and addressed in Chapter 29: Socioeconomics, Recreation and Tourism. The Applicant has also submitted an Outline Construction Transport Management Plan and Outline Travel Plan containing protocols and principles to be adhered to during the construction phase of the Project.</p>	<p>6.1.29 Socioeconomics Recreation and Tourism 8.15 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan, 8.16 Outline Travel Plan,</p>
146	Lincolnshire County Council	P2_16	<p>The Draft DCO appears to give the applicant Statutory Undertaker powers still subject to the 1991 Act. It is understood this to mean that they would be able to act like other utility companies in the Highway but still need to obtain necessary permitting consents from LCC Streetworks and Permitting Team. There is also a section relating to Powers for TROs to implement temporary speed limits this needs further consideration as the Council would still want to approve these as well. In addition, please note that the Council will be undertaking re-surfacing works to Ingoldmells Road (Ashington End) in November 2023. Whilst it is acknowledged that if the Consent Order is granted it will still be sometime before construction works commence but if construction traffic is significant,</p>	<p>The DCO would give the Project the statutory rights required by the 1991 Act to carry out the street works specified in the DCO and as such the Project would not require a street works licence from LCC, but would follow the statutory process for notifying LCC of any notifiable works for which LCC is the street authority.</p> <p>The imposition of speed restrictions and the making of TROs under the DCO would be subject to the consent of the traffic authority in whose area the road concerned is situated. Pre and post construction surveys have been committed to within the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan submitted as part of the DCO application.</p>	<p>3.1 Draft DCO</p>

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
			the Council will need to consider whether issuing a notice under S.59 of the Highways Act 1980 will be appropriate Highways Act 1980 (legislation.gov.uk) with regards to any damage caused. Pre-condition and post-condition highway surveys will be required although this may be captured as part of the submitted Construction Traffic Management Plan.		
147	Lincolnshire County Council	P2_16	The PEIR submission relating to Landscape and visual matters is very detailed with a comprehensive LVIA, viewpoint visualisations and a Landscape and Ecology Design Principles Plan. These documents are reviewed in this response , it is noted however there has been limited project discussion with the developer and their appointed landscape consultants to help develop the project particularly the viewpoint selections. The Council would encourage, moving forward, a higher level of interaction such as focussed landscape and visual workshops, guided site visits or discussions with AAH/LCC, prior to the submission.	A site visit was held on the 25 September 2023 with representatives from AAH/LCC and the Project's landscape specialist, after which a list of view points was issued for agreement. The Project has taken into account all comments made during and after the site visit [CONFIRM]	
148	Lincolnshire County Council	P2_16	The proposed development is subject to EIA, and a Scoping Report was issued by the developer: Outer Dowsing Offshore Wind Scoping Report, Prepared by GoBe Consultants Ltd, July 2022, which contained detailed sections on both offshore and onshore environment. The onshore landscape and visual impact assessment section detailed aspects such as study area, baseline conditions, the onshore components, designated sites, the methodology, and next steps including guidance for consultees.	The Applicant has noted this comment.	
149	Lincolnshire County Council	P2_16	The precise location of the onshore sub-station (OnSS) remains undecided, and consequently three potential sites are considered within the PEIR LVIA, these include a minimum of four viewpoints presented as year one and year 15 wireframe visualisations. The LEDPP presents a detailed methodology for site selection and the objectives of landscape mitigation measures. The detail presented within this document is welcomed and is robust, but as noted above, it has been developed without direct consultation.	The Applicant noted this comment.	
150	Lincolnshire County Council	P2_16	It is requested that further landscape and visual consultation is carried out between AAH, District Authority landscape specialists and the developer team following the conclusion of this formal consultation phase. This would likely cover the PEIR comments as well as development proposals and mitigation scheme, including the cable route corridor and location of any larger structures or buildings such as the substations, extent of vegetation loss for highways works, and also subsequent knock-on effects such as any requirement for additional viewpoints or AVRs.	The Applicant has continued to engage with AAH, the District Authority landscape specialists and the developer team through both the ETG and bilateral engagement including arranging site visits. There have been three other ETGs held in respect of LVIA on the 27 July 2023, 22 September 2023 and 20 November 2023 during which further information has been shared. Key comments and agreements are included in Chapter 28 LVIA.  Comments raised during and after the site visits have been taken into account. A full assessment of potential landscape and visual impacts is assessed in Chapter 28 LVIA	6.1.28 Landscape and Visual Assessment
151	Lincolnshire County Council	P2_16	The methodology for the LVIA is considered within section 28.6. Complying to GVLIA3 the methodology considers visual effects, landscape effects and cumulative effects and combines field surveys with desk-based assessment. The approach to assessment is considered from section 28.6.11 which details the steps used to determine the scope of change within the LVIA. The description is lengthy and would benefit from streamlining to assist the reader and highlight the key points more effectively. The sequence of evaluation is described, it would benefit from tabular summaries to avoid lengthy paragraphs. In its current form it may be off-putting for the general reader.	The presentation of the methodology in Chapter 28: Landscape and Visual Impacts has been reviewed and summarised where possible.	
152	Lincolnshire County Council	P2_16	Significance and effects are described from paragraph 28.6.36, as a combination of sensitivity and magnitude of change. The definition of what constitutes as a significant or not significant effect is discussed, and a significant effect is defined	The Project has noted this comment.	



Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
			as a major loss or irreversible effect over an extensive area or landscape character, affecting landscape elements, characteristics, that are key to a nationally valued landscape. By contrast, non-significant effects are considered as those where the character of the receptor continues to be characterised by the baseline characteristics. The text confirms that the methodology used complies with the EIA regulations. Table 28.7 is used to guide the assessment, highlighting that moderate impact may or may not be considered significant, whilst major/ moderate and major are considered significant. Factors such as geographical extent, duration and reversibility are described as factors that impact on the scale of effect.		
153	Lincolnshire County Council	P2_16	The ZTV is confirmed as providing a starting point in the assessment process, providing a worst-case scenario that informs the viewpoint selection to assess the extent of impact.	The Project has noted this comment.	
154	Lincolnshire County Council	P2_16	Commencing at paragraph 28.6.44 viewpoint analysis is described at length including assessing the value of the view and the sensitivity to change. The process complies with good practice methodology in accordance with GLVIA3. Paragraph 28.6.51 details the different factors that contribute to the calculation of size of change, these include size, scale, field of view, contrast, and nature of visibility.	The Project has noted this comment.	
155	Lincolnshire County Council	P2_16	Concerned with some aspects of this Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) particularly in its limited approach to evaluation targeting only known high risk and areas of greatest potential, and are disappointed to see a number of the same issues in approach and detail that we've already responded to in our scoping opinion response of the 17th of August 2022.	The Applicant has noted this comment.	
156	Lincolnshire County Council	P2_16	While some of the desk based assessment (DBA) is very thorough there are significant sources which have not been included in the current or proposed work.	The Applicant has noted this comment	
157	Lincolnshire County Council	P2_16	The proposed limiting of trial trenching to areas where archaeology has already been identified would create a confirmation bias in the resulting evidence base. While this would inform the mitigation strategy for those areas where archaeology is already known, the lack of trenching anywhere else increases the risk of unexpected archaeology being identified during the work programme.	The Applicant has noted this comment.	
158	Lincolnshire County Council	P2_16	There are also a few issues with consistency within the PEIR of specific aspects of work, for example, the PEIR references a LiDAR assessment (section 20.4.8) but there are only three references to LiDAR in the desk based assessment (plates, 7, 16 and 17) and unable to find any LiDAR or air photo report.	A LiDAR assessment was annexed to the PEIR DBA. A LiDAR assessment is included within the Environmental Statement.	6.3.20.1 Annex 17 Lidar Assessment and Aerial Photography Review
159	Lincolnshire County Council	P2_16	In the Council's scoping opinion response of the 17th of August 2022: 'It's vital that a competent full desk based assessment be completed at the earliest opportunity, as this along with a full Air Photo/LiDAR assessment and the geophysical survey results across the impact zone are all required to inform the trial trenching strategy which is necessary to determine the archaeological potential within the impact zone.'  Section 20.4.7 says 'The following data sources will be included as necessary within an updated Archaeological DBA at EIA: A targeted map regression; potential original aerial photographic review; historic England's Aerial Archaeology Mapping Explorer, for mapped archaeological earthworks and other features identified by the aerial investigation unit; geophysical survey; and archaeological trial trenching.'	The EIA has included a full map regression including reference to historic Ordnance Survey and pre-Ordnance Survey maps including Tithe Maps and Inclosure Maps. These are discussed and illustrated within the DBA. The EIA has also included a full LiDAR Assessment. This is annexed to and referenced throughout the DBA. The results of LiDAR also influenced the targeting of geophysical survey in areas not otherwise selected for geophysical survey.  The EIA has not included a full aerial photographic assessment. This is not considered to render the DBA 'incompetent'. The selection of baseline survey techniques presented within the DBA has taken into account the depositional environment of the Order Limits and the position of the Order Limits in reference to historic coastlines. The use of geophysical survey using magnetometer and electromagnetic survey techniques is considered to be a more useful and effective tool in determining archaeological potential in this	6.3.20.1 Desk Based Assessment and Annex 17 Lidar Assessment and Aerial Photography Review

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
			<p>This is not entirely in accordance with data sources listed in the Council’s scoping opinion response which included an assessment of all available air photos: ‘A full competent LiDAR and air photo analysis, interpretation and assessment is required with full aerial photo coverage using all available oblique and vertical air photos including the Historic England Archive and Cambridge University Collection of Air Photos as well as RAF and Ordnance Survey photos including those held by Lincolnshire County Council.’</p> <p>Map regression of the full impact zone is required which should include all available maps to provide a reasonable understanding of the development and time depth of the site.</p> <p>There are several references in the PEIR to work being undertaken ‘as necessary’ and ‘where necessary’ including the above section 20.4.7 and section 20.4.9. This is unhelpful and these listed sources and more are necessary as stated in the Council’s scoping response as well as in standard archaeological practice and national guidance.</p>	<p>instance. Nevertheless, sample areas of aerial photography assessment referencing the most extensive collections of aerial photographs held at the Historic England archives have been undertaken within the Order Limits to provide some reassurance that a dual application of geophysical survey and aerial photographic assessment is not necessary to illustrate archaeological potential. This is presented within the DBA.</p>	
160	Lincolnshire County Council	P2_16	<p>Welcome tree planting and other activities with depths of disturbance extending to the subsoil and natural geology which is below the depth of any surviving archaeology, referenced in Table 20.3 under section 20.5.3. Areas of mitigation works particularly including woodland shelter belts will need to be included in the evaluation phases including intrusive field evaluation.</p>	<p>Areas of tree planting are anticipated to disturb to depths of 0.4-0.5m. The areas of tree planting are proposed at the southern end of the Order Limits within areas not anticipated from coastline regressions to be within areas of particular archaeological potential. Nevertheless, the Project anticipates that areas of extensive planting would be included for evaluation through trial trenching to be undertaken as set out within the Outline Archaeological WSI Onshore</p>	8.09 Archaeological WSI Onshore
161	Lincolnshire County Council	P2_16	<p>Please confirm whether an outline Written Scheme of Investigation has been produced.</p> <p>There are multiple references in the PEIR to an outline WSI for archaeological evaluation, such as in section 6.4: ‘A broad methodology is presented in an outline WSI (SLR Consulting 2023). This will form a basis for detailed methodologies to be set out in full agreement with the Lincolnshire Historic Environment Officer and Historic England.’ Unable to find it in the PIER documents.</p> <p>On the other hand section 20.8.2 states that ‘an outline Written Scheme of Investigation to be submitted with the final DCO application. The Outline WSI to be submitted with the final DCO application is anticipated to reference potential additional geophysical survey, geoarchaeological boreholes and trial trenching in the first instance with site specific mitigation set out thereafter.’</p> <p>If this is the case given that field evaluation including trial trenching must be undertaken in accordance with an approved Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) the production of the outline WSI as part of the DCO submission would mean trial trenching would take place post-determination or at least post-submission.</p> <p>This doesn’t agree with section 20.12.3 which states that ‘Evaluation fieldwork undertaken prior to application will clarify these potential impacts’ for potentially significant direct and indirect impacts on non-designated heritage assets or section 20.12.5 which states that ‘Where potential significant effects through direct impact are referenced, fieldwork undertaken prior to application</p>	<p>Trial trenching has not been undertaken as part of EIA light of the indicative onshore infrastructure as set out in the Schedule of Mitigation which accommodates the preservation in situ of remains of national importance along the onshore ECC between the TJB and the OnSS and the findings of the DBA submitted as part of the PEIR&lt;the necessity for fieldwork was not considered necessary to further evaluate the significance of potential archaeology. Further investigations and fieldwork will be carried out post consent prior to construction to support the preservation in-situ commitment. Trial trenching proposals are set out in the Outline Archaeology WSI Onshore.</p>	8.09 Archaeological WSI Onshore 8.13 Schedule of Mitigation

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
			will clarify the level of potential impact.' For the avoidance of doubt, strongly recommend that there be a robust trial trenching programme pre-determination.		
162	Lincolnshire County Council	P2_16	Standard archaeological practice for evaluation consists of a competent desk-based evaluation followed by a reasonable and appropriate level of field evaluation by geophysical survey and trial trenching across the full impact zone. The trenching strategy would need to follow the production of the air photo/LiDAR assessment and other outstanding desk based evaluation as well as the geophysical survey results, as these along with the deposit model would inform the trenching strategy.	Analysis of the Project's baseline has included LiDAR, targeted geophysical survey and aerial photographic assessment responsive to archaeological potential and the depositional environment of the Order Limits. Trial trenching has not been undertaken as part of EIA. The Project has committed to accommodating preservation in situ along the onshore ECC between the TJB and the OnSS and the findings of the DBA submitted as part of the PEIR< the necessity for fieldwork was not considered necessary to further evaluate the significance of potential archaeology. Further investigations and fieldwork will be carried out post consent prior to construction to support the preservation in-situ commitment. Trial trenching proposals are set out in the Outline Archaeology WSI Onshore.	8.09 Archaeological WSI Onshore
163	Lincolnshire County Council	P2_16	Volume 2, appendix 20.1 Archaeological Desk Based Assessment includes a section on Predetermination Fieldwork (section 6.0). Section 6.1 begins 'With reference to any uncertainty over the importance of archaeological remains, an understanding of archaeological importance can be evidenced through field evaluation where necessary.' While the relative importance of archaeological remains can be informed by the results of trial trenching, it is also essential for the presence or absence of archaeological remains to be determined.  Section 6.2 states 'It is anticipated that field evaluation undertaken at EIA should be undertaken in response to identified risk.' While this will be a step in dealing effectively with known archaeological areas already known to be of high importance also need evaluation of so-called 'blank areas'.	Trial trenching has not been undertaken as part of EIA. The Project has committed to accommodating preservation in situ along the onshore ECC between the TJB and the OnSS and the findings of the DBA submitted as part of the PEIR< the necessity for fieldwork was not considered necessary to further evaluate the significance of potential archaeology. Further investigations and fieldwork will be carried out post consent prior to construction to support the preservation in-situ commitment. Trial trenching proposals are set out in the Outline Archaeology WSI Onshore.	8.09 Archaeological WSI Onshore
164	Lincolnshire County Council	P2_16	Trial trenching is required not only across known or suspected archaeology to determine their presence or absence, depth, extent and significance but also across the 'blank' areas to obtain baseline evidence where previous evaluation techniques have not identified archaeological remains. This is required to get a full understanding of the archaeology which will be impacted across the full impact zone and will inform the archaeological mitigation strategy which must be undertaken as part of the EIA.  Again, as stated in the Council's scoping opinion response in August 2022 'Following geophysical survey a programme of trial trenching is required, not only across known or suspected archaeology to determine their presence or absence, depth, extent and significance but also across the 'blank' areas to obtain baseline evidence where previous evaluation techniques have not identified archaeological remains. This is required to get a full understanding of the archaeology which will be impacted across the full impact zone and will inform the archaeological mitigation strategy which must be undertaken as part of the EIA.'	Trial trenching has not been undertaken as part of EIA. The Project has committed to accommodating preservation in situ along the onshore ECC between the TJB and the OnSS and the findings of the DBA submitted as part of the PEIR< the necessity for fieldwork was not considered necessary to further evaluate the significance of potential archaeology. Further investigations and fieldwork will be carried out post consent prior to construction to support the preservation in-situ commitment. Trial trenching proposals are set out in the Outline Archaeology WSI Onshore.	8.09 Archaeological WSI Onshore
165	Lincolnshire County Council	P2_16	Other standard archaeological evaluation techniques are proposed but again skewed as with geophysical survey: 'Predetermination geophysical survey is planned for areas of the highest potential for the presence of remains.' (section 6.5) Again this increases the level of archaeological risk in the post-consent phase: section 6.5 goes on to state that 'in most circumstances it is anticipated	Trial trenching has not been undertaken as part of EIA. The Project has committed to accommodating preservation in situ along the onshore ECC between the TJB and the OnSS and the findings of the DBA submitted as part of the PEIR< the necessity for fieldwork was not considered necessary to further evaluate the significance of potential archaeology. Further investigations and	8.09 Archaeological WSI Onshore

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
			that the results of the predetermination geophysical survey will provide for an understanding of post consent trial trenching requirements and subsequent mitigation strategies which would be set out under separate cover.'	fieldwork will be carried out post consent prior to construction to support the preservation in-situ commitment. Trial trenching proposals are set out in the Outline Archaeology WSI Onshore.	
166	Lincolnshire County Council	P2_16	<p>Section 6.6 clearly lays out the strategy which is proposed across this PEIR: 'The higher risk areas proposed for predetermination geophysical survey are primarily considered to be the parts of the PEIR boundary where dryland persisted to facilitate settlement activity - whether that be of an occupational, industrial or funerary nature and of medieval date or earlier. In this instance, post medieval remains and remains of an agricultural nature are generally not considered to be high risk i.e., they would not require avoidance or particularly onerous mitigation strategies. Fieldwork involving evaluation and mitigation in these instances could reasonably be delayed as a condition of consent unless there is evidence to indicate otherwise.'</p> <p>As their evaluation strategy targets only known high risk areas this moves evaluation of the full scheme and mitigation for the full scheme to post-consent condition. The Council does not agree with this approach, it is against national policy and guidance and professional standards where reasonable steps are taken to identify potential as well as known archaeology and for the evaluation phases to inform appropriate and fit for purpose mitigation.</p> <p>Sufficient timely evaluation results are essential for effective risk management and to inform programme scheduling and budget management. Failing to do so could lead to unnecessary destruction of heritage assets, potential programme delays and excessive cost increases that could otherwise be avoided.</p>	<p>Trial trenching has not been undertaken as part of EIA. The Project has committed to accommodating preservation in situ along the onshore ECC between the TJB and the OnSS and the findings of the DBA submitted as part of the PEIR&lt; the necessity for fieldwork was not considered necessary to further evaluate the significance of potential archaeology. Further investigations and fieldwork will be carried out post consent prior to construction to support the preservation in-situ commitment. Trial trenching proposals are set out in the Outline Archaeology WSI Onshore.</p>	8.09 Archaeological WSI Onshore
167	Lincolnshire County Council	P2_16	The provision of sufficient baseline information to identify and assess the impact on known and potential heritage assets is required by Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (Regulation 5 (2d)), National Planning Statement Policy EN1 (Section 5.8), and the National Planning Policy Framework.	The Applicant has noted this comment.	
168	Lincolnshire County Council	P2_16	The EIA will require the full suite of comprehensive desk-based research, non-intrusive surveys, and intrusive field evaluation for the full extent of proposed impact. The results should be used to minimise the impact on the historic environment through informing the project design and an appropriate programme of archaeological mitigation.	The Project baseline has been established in accordance with policy. The lack of trial trenching undertaken prior to the submission of the DCO application has been set out with a phased programme of trial trenching which has been proposed and discussed at the ETGs.	N/A
169	Lincolnshire County Council	P2_16	<p>Sufficient information on the archaeological potential must include evidential information on the depth, extent and significance of the archaeological deposits which will be impacted by the development. The results will inform a fit for purpose mitigation strategy which will identify what measures are to be taken to minimise or adequately record the impact of the proposal on archaeological remains which must be submitted with the EIA.</p> <p>This is in accordance with The Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 which states "The EIA must identify, describe and assess in an appropriate manner...the direct and indirect significant impacts of the proposed development on... material assets, cultural heritage and the landscape." (Regulation 5 (2d))</p>	The full citation for (Regulation 5 (2d)) provides that the paragraph cited is in reference to 'significant effects' only. The ES chapter supported by a DBA has not predicted significant impacts where preservation in situ is not possible. Preservation in situ to prevent any impacts which could be significant is secured through commitment COM_151, Figure 4.7 and the OWSI (document 8.9). Of the two locations where preservation in situ is not possible, the OnSS and the TJB, only the TJB is located within an area where significant archaeology could be present and geophysical survey has demonstrated that this is unlikely.	8.9 OWSI
170	Lincolnshire County Council	P2_16	<p>PEIR 6.1.24 – Hydrology and Flood Risk</p> <p>This is fairly high level assessment for ES purposes and concludes that the impact on flood risk will be minor to negligible. Reference is made to</p>	The Project has submitted an Outline Surface Water and Drainage Strategy as part of the Outline Code of Construction Practice in the DCO application.	8.1.5 Outline Surface Water and Drainage Strategy



Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
			Construction Method Statement which will be produced and temporary management of flood risk during construction. These principles are agreed, but there is little detail at this stage such as a drainage strategy of CMS to actually review and comment on.		
171	Lincolnshire County Council	P2_16	LCC is the planning authority for minerals and waste planning matters within Lincolnshire as well as for its own development which includes schools and highway developments.  The Development Plan for the area affected by the project includes the Lincolnshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan (currently under review). In respect of minerals no mineral safeguarding areas are affected or waste allocations or assets.	The Project has noted this comment.	
172	Lincolnshire County Council	P2_16	PEIR 6.1.27 Transport Assessment This document is 4400 pages long and primarily includes survey data and accident data. There is an estimate of construction traffic provided and the proposed routings, showing percentage increases during construction. However, mitigation that may be necessary such as passing places has not been identified at this stage (Table 3-4 acknowledges that these may be necessary and will be assessed later).  Annex 07 of the TA includes the site construction access locations, but these are at present dots on the plans. Again, more detail will need to be provided in the form of access drawings, swept paths, visibility splays etc for us to be able to review and advise if satisfactory.	The design of the accesses and haul road crossings has been undertaken. The applicant's lead Traffic Consultant) attended a meeting with Ian Field at LCC on the 8th September 2023 to discuss these and other improvements (passing place schemes).  The Project has provided LCC with a package of information (design drawings and trip generation) for review prior to the submission of the DCO application. Initial feedback has been received stating the mitigation proposals are acceptable in principle. Additional information and responses to LCC comments was sent to LCC on the 10th January 2024.  The confirmed construction access locations are shown in Figure 27.3.1 to 27.3.9 of Volume 2, Chapter 27 (document reference 6.2.27.2), with a General Arrangement (GA) drawing of each access provided in Annex F of Volume 3, Appendix 27.1 (document reference 6.3.27.1) showing the visibility splays, based on 85 <sup>th</sup> percentile speeds.  Swept path analyses of the local construction vehicle access routes are provided in Annex M of Volume 3, Appendix 27.1 (document reference 6.3.27.1).	Traffic and Transport Assessment (6.3.27.1)
173	Lincolnshire County Council	P2_16	Overall, the methodology and assessment in the TA (Transport Assessment) is accepted, but it is still at a high level (there are still options being considered). It does not yet provide adequate detail that the Council would expect to support a typical outline planning application.	The Traffic and Transport Assessment has been updated for the selected onshore ECC route and provides the level of detail required for a typical outline planning application.	Traffic and Transport Assessment (6.3.27.1)
174	Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	P2_17	LWT will consider endorsement of ODOW provided that the above concerns are addressed appropriately. LWT request a meeting with ODOW to discuss the issues detailed in this response. LWT will continue to work with the developers during the planning process to ensure the correct data is gathered and assessed in order to address our concerns.	The Applicant has engaged with LWT throughout the pre application phase through bilateral engagement and participation in the EPP and ETGs as set out in the Consultation Report.	5.1 Consultation Report
175	Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	P2_17	Schedule 15 of the Environment Act 2021 makes provision about biodiversity gain in relation to development consent for nationally significant infrastructure projects (NSIPs), but implementation details are not yet clear and not likely to come into force until November 2025. LWT urges all developers, whether working on local developments or NSIPs, to follow the net gain approach and demonstrate at least a 10% measurable net gain in biodiversity within proposals for developments. LWT would urge proper, detailed assessment of BNG (terrestrial, intertidal and marine), using the appropriate metrics, going forward. For reference, the main requirements for BNG include:	The Project continues to investigate opportunities for biodiversity net gain, as outlined in the Biodiversity Net Gain Principles and Approach document which has been submitted as part of the DCO application.	8.14 Biodiversity Net Gain Principles and Approach

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
			<p>Minimum 10% gain required, calculated using the Biodiversity Metric Approval of a biodiversity plan</p> <p>Habitat is secured for at least 30 years via planning obligations and/or conservation covenants.</p> <p>We will be monitoring assessment and delivery of BNG (terrestrial, intertidal and marine) going forward.</p>		
176	Moulton Parish Council	P2_21	<p>After speaking to councillors, they have no comments to submit but they would be looking at some sort of compensation for the Parish. Section 106.</p>	<p>The Applicant has continued to develop a Community Benefit Fund which will be launched post consent.</p>	
177	National Farmers' Union	P2_22	<p>The NFU understands from the PEIR Volume 1, Chapter 3: Onshore Cable Route that the maximum cable depth will be 3m with the minimum cable depth at 1m. Please can you confirm what the depth from the top of the protective tile to the surface of the soil is? It is imperative that the cables are laid at a minimum depth of 1.2m to the top of the tile to ensure there is sufficient distance between the cables and farming operations to minimise risk. It states in the Project Description at Table 3.27 that minimum cable trench depth could be 0.9m. The NFU would only want to see this happen in areas where there are exceptional engineering reasons.</p>	<p>The Project has committed to a minimum cable burial depth of 1.2m.</p>	6.1.3 Project Description
178	National Farmers' Union	P2_22	<p>It is stated that there will also be up to 700 link boxes along the cable corridor, that most of the land above the link boxes will be reinstated, and that they may require manhole covers for access during the operational phase. Table 3.28 states that a link box could be 4.5m (width)x 4m(length) x 2.5m(depth). However, it is not clear whether this is the overall size or the manhole cover area, which will be at ground surface and affect agricultural operations going forward. Please could you provide clarity on this? The NFU would also like to see that landowners are consulted on the location of the link boxes to minimise the impact on agricultural operations. Any link boxes located within agricultural fields that are at ground level, must be marked appropriately in consultation with the landowner/occupier to avoid further disruption to agricultural operations. Above ground infrastructure within fields would increase the area of land taken out of agricultural production due to machinery having to work around them.</p>	<p>The impacts set out in Chapter 25 Land Use on BMV agricultural land during operation has included the permanent land lost to the link boxes</p>	6.1.25 Land Use
179	National Farmers' Union	P2_22	<p>It states in the PEIR 6.13 Project Description that the working corridor will be 80m wide for construction and will reduce to 60m wide post-construction. The NFU is pleased to hear that Outer Dowsing has committed to trenchless construction methods for Internal Drainage Board (IDB) and Environment Agency (EA) maintained infrastructure. However, point 3.4.10 mentions that where trenchless techniques are needed, a wider working width may be needed. Please could you provide more detail on the upper limits of width that may be required for trenchless techniques?</p>	<p>The Applicant has submitted an updated Project Description outlining all of the proposed Project parameters.</p>	6.1.2 Project Description
180	National Farmers' Union	P2_22	<p>The NFU is pleased to see that the Outer Dowsing project has begun to liaise with landowners affected by the indicative 300m corridor, both by sending introductory letters and following up with in-person meetings to discuss route feasibility. It is also good that the project team has had three meetings with the landowner interest group and the NFU understands that discussions are ongoing, with the intention to try to finalise voluntary head of terms.</p> <p>Our members have raised concerns that three route corridors are still being consulted on due to no decision by National Grid as to which substation Outer</p>	<p>The Applicant engaged extensively with landowners throughout the pre-application phase. The Applicant were unable to confirm the grid connection option until this was provided by the National Grid (See section <b>Error! Reference source not found.</b>). The confirmation of the Project's grid connection option was announced publicly in August 2023 in addition to being communicated to all stakeholders and those who had participated in the preceding rounds of consultation. Details on the Project's landowner engagement is detailed in Section 9 of the Consultation Report (document reference 5.1).</p>	Consultation Report (5.1)

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
			Dowsing will connect to for the final transmission. Please can you keep the NFU informed of any decision on the final connection point, as members still do not know whether they will be affected.		
181	National Farmers' Union	P2_22	The Project Description states that an onshore export cable corridor will link the landfall with the newly constructed onshore substations, with two options being considered: Option 1, approximately 1.5km south of the village of Wainfleet All Saints; and Option 2 approximately 1.5km north of the village of Fosdyke. Please can you keep the NFU informed in regard to the development of the substation. With both options covering an area of approx. 180,000m2 and requiring new access roads, Outer Dowsing should already be in full negotiations with landowners affected by the proposed sites for both options, and if not, should make such engagement a priority.	The Applicant engaged extensively with landowners throughout the pre-application phase. The Applicant were unable to confirm the grid connection option until this was provided by the National Grid (See section 1.2). The confirmation of the Project's grid connection option was announced publicly in August 2023 in addition to being communicated to all stakeholders and those who had participated in the preceding rounds of consultation. Details on the Project's landowner engagement is detailed in Section 9 of the Consultation Report (document reference 5.1).	
182	National Farmers' Union	P2_22	Section 3.1.36 Non-Technical Summary outlines that the Project has an indicative operational life of 35 years. Please can you confirm the length of easement you are seeking from landowners through voluntary agreements? The NFU strongly feels that the easement term should not exceed the operational lifetime of the scheme as no more rights should be taken than are necessary for the lifetime of the project.	Permanent rights have been sought for infrastructure and the Project continues to engage with landowners in these negotiations.	
183	National Farmers' Union	P2_22	While there are multiple options within the PEIR for the Onshore Export Cable corridor, some of the outlined routes are located within a significant amount of Grade 1 agricultural land, as outlined in Figure 25.1 in 6.1.25 of the 'Land Use' section. In particular, 90% of the route to Weston Marsh via South of the A52, between Low Road and Church End Lane pass through Grade 1 agricultural land, with the alternative route North of the A52 consisting of 24% Grade 1 agricultural land.  The Lincolnshire Node onshore substation zone is also located within 100% Grade 3 agricultural, land, while the two Weston Marsh substation options are located within 100% Grade 1 agricultural land. This area of land will be acquired permanently and removed from agricultural production.  While the NFU understands the difficulties in the case of linear schemes (where there in a fixed end point), we would still want to see infrastructure schemes avoiding best and most versatile (BMV) land.  Due to the amount of BMV agricultural land being impacted (especially Grade 1 land on both the Weston Marsh routes, but particularly the southern route), the reinstatement and aftercare of the soils must be carried out to a high specification and at the right time to achieve favourable results. Also, during construction, the impact of dust on the high value vegetable crops could be significant. The control of dust, especially from the haul road, must be identified in detail in the outline code of construction.	The evolution of the design is set out in Chapter 3 Project Description and Chapter 4 Site Selection and Considerations of Alternatives. The effects of onshore infrastructure associated with the Project on Best and Most Versatile (BMV) agricultural land and the potential impact and subsequent reinstatement and aftercare of soils has been considered in Chapter 24 Hydrology and Flood Risk and Chapter 25 Land Use.  Handling and protection of soils, including measures such as the separate storage of topsoil and subsoil, and ceasing work during wet weather, will be managed through the Outline Soil Management Plan (document reference 8.1.3), which has been produced and submitted with the DCO application. The control of dust and air quality is considered within Chapter 19 Onshore Air Quality	6.1.23 Geology and Ground Conditions 6.1.24 Hydrology and Flood Risk 6.1.25 Land Use, 8.1.3 Outline Soil Management Plan 6.1.19 Onshore Air Quality
184	National Farmers' Union	P2_22	Some of the land that the cable corridor will go through has high value vegetable crops grown on them and will likely feature sub-surface irrigation pipes. It is essential that Outer Dowsing takes this into consideration in both route selection and when working on construction to minimise the impact on agricultural businesses and to replace these if compromised as part of construction.	Potential impacts on ground conditions as a result of the cable route construction are assessed in the Geology and Ground Conditions chapter and appropriate mitigation measures, and these will be outlined and secured through the final Soil Management Plan. An Outline Soil Management Plan has been submitted as part of the Project's application and considers mitigations as well as the reinstatement and aftercare of marine silts.	6.1.23 Geology and Ground Conditions 8.1.3 Outline Soil Management Plan

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
			The NFU would welcome greater detail on how Outer Dowsing proposes to deal with drainage to minimise impact on agricultural businesses. It is essential and a preference that you appoint a local drainage consultant as the ALO will only be able to coordinate works with the consultant, contractor and the farmer.	The Project have appointed a local drainage contractor for the project to ensure pre and post construction drainage schemes are designed in a harmonic way with the current drainage systems.	
185	National Farmers' Union	P2_22	The pre-condition survey also mentions that it will consider the existing private water supplies. Please provide further information regarding the potential interruption to private water supplies from construction, and detail of how Outer Dowsing proposes to mitigate this in order to minimise disruption to agricultural activities.	Private water supplies, as with other underground utilities, have been considered in the Land Use assessment outlined in Chapter 25 Land Use. The Project has continued to engage with landowners to minimise impacts to ongoing agricultural activities and impacts on agricultural drainage systems have been assessed in Chapter 23 Geology and Ground Conditions. The Project have also appointed a local drainage contractor to ensure pre and post construction drainage schemes are designed in a harmonic way with the current drainage systems.	6.1.23 Geology and Ground Conditions 6.1.25 Land Use
186	National Farmers' Union	P2_22	<p>We note that the pre-construction survey will include information on pre-existing soil conditions, and that Section 3 includes information on soil monitoring during the process and reinstatement. The NFU is pleased to see that this section has been included but the detail is lacking on what will be needed in a pre-soil statement. This work is essential, and the NFU has specific wording that it would like to see agreed, which covers practical matters and forms an interface document.</p> <p>Due to the routes of the proposed cable route corridors crossing very high-grade land it is essential that Outer Dowsing cover within the Outline Code of Construction how the impact of dust on high value crops will be dealt with.</p> <p>The NFU would welcome the opportunity to engage with Outer Dowsing on this and for the wording to be included within the Outline Code of Construction, so that it is taken forward and becomes binding on contractors under the Code of Construction. The NFU wording covers the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Role of an Agricultural Liaison Officer</li> <li>b) Records of Condition</li> <li>c) Biosecurity</li> <li>d) Irrigation</li> <li>e) Agricultural Land Drainage</li> <li>f) Treatment of Soils</li> <li>g) Agricultural Water Supplies</li> </ul>	The impact and subsequent reinstatement and aftercare of soils has been considered in Chapter 25 Land Use and Chapter 23 Geology and Ground Conditions. The Outline Soil Management Plan considers mitigations as well as the reinstatement and aftercare of BMV land and will be updated in line with the comments received from the NFU and other consultees.	6.1.23 Geology and Ground Conditions 6.1.25 Land Use 8.1.3 Outline Soil Management Plan
187	National Farmers' Union	P2_22	<p>The significant impact the project will have on agricultural businesses must be considered in the development of the project. Table 25.30 of section 6.1.25 of the PEIR (Land Use) states that where required and practical, crossing points will be used so that livestock and vehicles can cross with working width of the ECC. This will be essential where vegetable crops are grown, especially the time between picking and the pack house.</p> <p>It states there would be final reinstatement at the end of the works. Does this mean that reinstatement of field drainage and soils will take place at the end of the 36 month period for laying the cables or will sections of the cable route be reinstated as works progress? There must be discussions with landowners and occupiers on timings of construction, including how access will be achieved across the working strip so that agricultural businesses maintain access to all land on the holding. This will help to reduce disruption to Agri holdings.</p>	<p>Crossing points have been included as an embedded mitigation measure within Chapter 25 Land Use.</p> <p>The Applicant has also been in consultation with landowners/businesses which could be impacted to agree an appropriate compensation to offset further disruptions to their businesses post-construction and reinstatement. The final reinstatement of field drainage and soils would occur following the implementation of each section of cable route.</p> <p>Agri-environmental schemes have been considered within Chapter 25 Land Use. The Applicant will request farmers notify their respective Countryside Stewardship advisor if their scheme agreement is impacted by the Proposed Development</p>	6.1.25 Land Use



Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
			We note that there is no mention of consideration of land parcels managed under agri-environmental agreements within the Land Use section. The NFU would like Outer Dowsing to take into consideration the impact of construction on agri-environmental schemes and aim to avoid these areas where possible and consider what notification could be given to landowners/occupiers where derogations may be needed.	Land parcels managed under agri-environmental agreements have been identified in six ECC route segments (ECC 1, 3, 4, 5, 7, and 8), as detailed in section <b>Error! Reference source not found.</b> , and have been assessed in Chapter 25.	
188	National Farmers' Union	P2_22	The PEIR, (Chapter 6: Cumulative Effects Assessment) outlines that ten projects have the potential to have cumulative effects with Outer Dowsing. The NFU is pleased to see that these projects will be further investigated in the full cumulative effect assessment in the Environmental Statement. The project should explore options to work collaboratively with other infrastructure projects in the area to reduce the overall cumulative effect, especially the overall impact on agricultural land and operations.	The Applicant has noted this comment. The Applicant has engaged extensively with other infrastructure owners in the area although there are currently no opportunities for works to be undertaken collaboratively.	
189	National Farmers' Union	P2_22	The NFU understands from the Non-Technical Summary at 3.2.16 that the alternative route corridor Weston Marsh North has been added to the Project design following feedback to the first consultation. The feedback highlighted concerns over the impact the Weston Marsh South route would have on land which is Best and Most Versatile Grade 1, growing high value multiple vegetable crops which are all on contract. The NFU is disappointed that this concern has not been stated more clearly and that it only states that the cable corridor should not give rise to significant adverse environmental impacts and minimise disturbance from construction as far as practical. The impact on agriculture and food production have not been stated in the non-technical summary and the NFU would like to see this addressed.	<p>The Applicant has undertaken an iterative site selection process incorporating feedback received during the consultation phases.</p> <p>The Environmental Statement assessment has concluded that there would be no significant effects on the ALC grade of the land as a result of the cabling due to the limited scale and duration of activities - which is considered to be of relevance to long-term food security. Food security and the businesses/supply chain impacted by disruptions is further discussed in Chapter 29 Socio-economic Characteristics</p>	6.1.29 Socioeconomics, Recreation and Tourism
190	National Farmers' Union	P2_22	<p>Heat dissipation, which can impact the land for the lifetime of the project, is a concern among farmers affected by the scheme. We have seen examples of heat dissipation on previous underground cable schemes, and they can have a significant impact on the crops growing in affected fields, such as crops growing at different rates, significantly complicating agricultural operations.</p> <p>The PEIR 6.1.3 Project Description, section 3.8.34 does mention the issue of mutual heating effect of one onshore cable on another, but not does mention the impact of subject of heat dissipation from the onshore cables on crops growing in affected fields.</p> <p>Please can you confirm whether the effect of heat dissipation on soils has been addressed and the measures that will be taken to reduce the impact of heat dissipation from the scheme?</p>	Impacts of cable heat dissipation have been considered in the operational phase assessment set out in Chapter 25 Land Use	6.1.25 Land Use
191	National Farmers' Union	P2_22	<p>The NFU notes in Section 1.4.1 within 8.3 Biodiversity Net Gain Principles and Approach of the PEIR that Outer Dowsing has voluntarily committed to having regard to the good practice in respect of BNG and will align where possible with the ten principles developed by CIEEM, IEMA and CIRIA'. Principle 5 is to make a measurable Biodiversity Net Gain contribution, while principle 8 is to ensure net gain generates long-term benefits. Please can you confirm how Outer Dowsing is intending to deliver Biodiversity Net Gain on the project?</p> <p>Section 1.5.18 of the same document states that Mitigation/compensation for permanent impacts has yet to be determined but is anticipated to be included at the OnSS area and potentially discrete areas elsewhere along the onshore ECC;'. The NFU does not support compulsory acquisition of any agricultural land</p>	A Biodiversity Net Gain Project Principles and Approach Statement (has been produced and submitted alongside the ES	9.5 Biodiversity Net Gain Project Principles and Approach

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
			<p>for the purposes of delivering biodiversity net gain. If the project needs to acquire additional land to deliver such gain, then this should be acquired through voluntary negotiations.</p>		
192	National Highways	P2_23	<p>It is unlikely that the traffic generated by this proposal both during the construction period nor when the site is fully operational, will adversely impact the SRN.</p> <p>That aside it is noted that a final Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) will be submitted as part of the DCO application (Q1 2024). This should inform the vehicle trips that are likely to be generated during construction and the routes which are likely to be used.</p> <p>To understand the full traffic impacts of the proposal and to demonstrate that the SRN will not be impacted, the CTMP should:</p> <p>Present the anticipated average two-way daily traffic numbers associated with the construction phase of the project (deliveries and construction staff vehicles). Provide an hourly breakdown of vehicle trips with a separate breakdown for the SRN peak hours, i.e.08:00-09:00 (AM peak hour) and 17:00-18:00 (PM peak hour).</p> <p>Provide details of arrangements for routing of construction vehicles to and from the site.</p> <p>Provide details of any special or abnormal deliveries or vehicular movements. It is noted that abnormal loads will normally be transported by sea and then utilise previously agreed routes by road no impact on SRN.</p> <p>Provide site contact details for person(s) responsible for Health &amp; Safety and handling of complaints.</p> <p>A Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) may also be prepared although the Local Highway Authority can advise on this issue as the SRN will not be impacted. This can be combined with the CTMP and in addition to the above would normally include details of:</p> <p>Measures to prevent debris, mud and detritus being distributed onto the Local highway and SRN.</p> <p>Mitigation measures in respect of noise and disturbance during the construction phase including vibration and noise limits, monitoring methodology, screening, a detailed specification of plant and equipment to be used.</p> <p>A scheme to minimise dust emissions arising from demolition/construction activities on the site. The scheme shall include</p> <p>Details of all dust suppression measures and the methods to monitor emissions dust arising from the development.</p> <p>Waste management.</p> <p>Protection measures for hedgerows and grasslands.</p>	<p>The Outline CTMP (document reference 8.15) submitted with the DCO application is an outline version as the final version will be prepared by the appointed Principal Contractors post consent and prior to commencing construction works which will be discussed with LCC and National Highways and agreed and approved by LCC.</p> <p>The outline CTMP, which has been updated from the version submitted at PEIR, sets out the details required by National Highways.</p>	
193	National Highways	P2_23	<p>The SRN in this instance namely the A1, A46 and M180 is in excess of 30 miles from the proposed site and is likely to be utilised purely to gain access to the Local Road Network (LRN) which will then be used to reach the site. Because of the distance to the site from the SRN it is likely that any impact by construction vehicles will have dissipated during the journey to site, and as such the LRN network in this area has not been included in the study area. The site is proposed to be accessed from several locations on the LRN which is managed</p>	<p>The Applicant has noted this comment.</p>	

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
			and operated by Lincolnshire County Council. As such National Highways has no comments to make about the proposed access.		
194	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Comment - Horizontal Direction Drilling (HDD) at landfall - Natural England notes that there were unforeseen complications and impacts that occurred during the installation of the Triton Knoll offshore windfarm cables at the landfall location at Anderby Creek.</p> <p>Natural England advises that similar incidents in the intertidal and immediate subtidal should be avoided as much as possible by ODOW.</p> <p>Recommendation - Natural England advises working with RWE to undertake a lessons learnt exercise and implement measures to avoid impacts occurring. A more detailed plan of landfall construction methodology should be defined and any refinement to the Project Description assessed in the ES.</p>	<p>The Applicant has employed an onshore engineer who worked with RWE on the Triton Knoll project as the lead Civil Engineer and is now employed by Outer Dowsing in the same role and has worked closely with stakeholders on the design of landfall drill. The Applicant has been considering the lessons learned from Triton Knoll &amp; Viking Link, and similar projects.</p> <p>The landfall design has been refined following PEIR and is detailed in ES Chapter 3 Project Description (document reference 6.1.3). The refinements have taken account of feedback in relation to potential frack out and impacts on environmental receptors. The drilling methodology will consider lessons learned from similar project through detailed engineering. Aspects such as the placement of temporary steel casing down to competent ground, the review of the down hole mud design, mud management, drill press and drilling methods are all to be scrutinized for the drill operations.</p>	
195	Natural England	P2_25	This advice is offered without prejudice and relates to high level positions on the impacts of the development on landscape, and visual effects associated with the statutory purposes of the LW AONB, the special character of the SP HC, and their landscape settings.	The Applicant has noted this comment.	
196	Natural England	P2_25	We advise that close attention is paid to the comments and advice of our local partners, in this instance, particularly the LW AONB Partnership and, Lincolnshire County Council and East Riding of Yorkshire County Council, who will be able to provide site specific landscape advice in respect of the LW AONB and SP HC respectively.	Following the iterative site selection proposal and the confirmation of the grid connection, the Project has determined that the substation location will be at Surfleet Marsh.	6.1.4 Site Selection
197	Natural England	P2_25	The current route planning option, focussing on a grid connection at a proposed Lincs Node Sub Station site which involves the siting of a substation within the setting of the LW AONB, presents Natural England with strong concerns for the impact that this will have on the statutory function of the LW AONB site. Further to this, we advise that the installation of additional infrastructure necessary with the development of a substation in this location would likely constitute a significant adverse effect and compromise the statutory function of the LW AONB.	<p>Following the iterative site selection proposal and the confirmation of the grid connection, the Applicant has determined that the substation location will be at Surfleet Marsh.</p> <p>The proposed location for the OnSS at Lincolnshire Node is no longer being considered and potential effects on the Lincolnshire Wolds AONB have been scoped out of the assessment as described in Chapter 28 Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA)</p>	6.1.4 Site Selection 6.1.28 LVIA
198	Natural England	P2_25	We have therefore advised that the positioning of the Lincs Node, and the associated development projects which should it be developed would connect to it, will likely compromise the statutory function of the LW AONB. Although the development of a National Grid Connection hub is larger than the focus of this Environmental Statement (ES), the impacts are relevant to this project if the Lincs Node is selected as the connection point. These impacts would need to be considered in combination with any connecting infrastructure associated with ODOW, as well as cumulative effects with existing infrastructure. Natural England have developed a joint working response alongside the Lincolnshire Wolds AONB partnership on the implications of the proposed Lincs Node development (please see Annex H). We advise that the project considers and reflects this statement within its ES.	Following the iterative site selection proposal and the confirmation of the grid connection, the Project has determined that the substation location will be at Surfleet Marsh.	6.1.4 Site Selection
199	Natural England	P2_25	Comment - Natural England advise that our concern is the effect on the Lincolnshire Wolds AONB (LW AONB) from the siting of the Lincs Node substation within close proximity to the designated area. In addition, the connections from this substation to the National Grid necessitating pylons and other structures down the coastal marshes potentially having a significant	Following the iterative site selection proposal and the confirmation of the grid connection, the Project has determined that the substation location will be at Surfleet Marsh.	6.1.4 Site Selection

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
			<p>adverse effect on the Lincolnshire Wolds AONB.</p> <p>Recommendation - Natural England fundamentally disagrees with the impact that the siting of the substation within the Lincolnshire Wolds AONB will be not significant, as it will compromise some of the special qualities the area is managed for. For further information on this point, please see our joint working response with the LW AONB partnership (Annex H)</p>		
200	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Comment - Section 28.8.37 suggests that the substation would be sited against a baseline context of other existing energy infrastructure and this provides for a moderate susceptibility of the AONB to the Onshore Sub-Station (OnSS). However, this also needs to be assessed and presented in terms of the cumulative effects of existing infrastructure and the new scheme (and transmission infrastructure) adding to a further industrialisation of the flat and extensive coastal plain, and what that would mean for the special qualities of the AONB.</p> <p>Recommendation - The Applicant needs to assess the cumulative effect of the OnSS and existing energy infrastructure in the setting of the AONB on the designated area and its statutory purpose. This assessment should be presented in the submitted Environmental Statement (ES)</p>	Cumulative effects have been assessed in detail throughout the Environmental Statement submitted as part of the DCO application.	
201	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Comment - Natural England notes that the project has assessed the effect of the OnSS on the Literary/artistic special quality as: 'There is no potential for this Special Quality to be affected as it is a physical feature of the AONB and cannot be affected by the indirect visual influence of the OnSS.'</p> <p>Natural England disagrees with this statement. We advise that there is a clear link between cultural heritage and sense of place / poetry of place, with a number of writers and artists drawing inspiration from the Lincolnshire Wolds as an area of unbounded land and unbounded sky (Pers. Comm. With Linc Wolds AONB Partnership)</p> <p>The project should not disassociate the importance of the views both to and from the LW AONB from its special qualities, especially the importance of the juxtaposition of the Wolds with the very flat and low-lying Lincolnshire Coast and Marshes (NCA 42), and similarly the equally flat Central Lincolnshire Vale (NCA 44) to the west.</p> <p>Natural England considers the outward views to the east are in important component of the character of the Lincolnshire Wolds AONB, and that they are especially sensitive to change.</p> <p>Given the above, the statement that the special quality of Expansive sweeping views would not be significantly affected (28.8.41) should be revisited.</p> <p>Recommendation - Natural England advises the project revisits and reassess the effects of the OnSS on the two AONB special qualities of: Literary / artistic, and expansive sweeping views. An updated assessment should be presented in the submitted ES.</p>	The proposed location for the OnSS was not progressed following the confirmation of the Grid Connection location at Weston marsh and potential effects on the Lincolnshire Wolds AONB have been scoped out of the assessment as described in Chapter 28 LVIA	6.1.28 LVIA



Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
202	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Comment - Air Quality - Natural England welcomes the project's commitment to comply with the Environment Agency's Air Quality Guidance for Developments and the precautionous nature of the assessment of the impacts of dust from the development.</p> <p>We note that the project has stated that the critical load for nitrogen deposition caused by the project is not likely to be breached. Whilst we might agree that this is the likely conclusion, we cannot commit to this until we have seen the background values which contributed to this assessment.</p> <p>Recommendation - We would request that additional information on the background figures used to calculate critical loads for nitrogen deposition are included within the ES chapter for the air quality. We would expect to see, process contribution value, background concentration and predicted environmental concentrations. Each of which should be expressed as a percentage of the critical load.</p>	<p>The air quality assessment with respect to sensitive ecological designations has been undertaken in accordance with the latest relevant guidance (as detailed in the ES chapter).</p> <p>With respect to the construction road traffic dispersion modelling exercise, the pollutant process contribution (PC) has been predicted at each sensitive ecological designation requiring assessment (i.e. those located with the study area). Where relevant (i.e. at locations where the PC cannot be considered insignificant), the predicted environmental concentration (PEC) has been calculated. This includes the consideration of background datasets. Full details are provided in Volume 3, Appendix 19.4: Road Traffic Dispersion Modelling.</p>	6.1.19 Onshore Air Quality, 6.3.19.4 Road Traffic Dispersion Modelling,
203	Natural England	P2_25	<p>We acknowledge that a matrix approach to determining the significance of effects on ecological features, is commonly used. However, this method often relies on value- rather than evidence-based judgements. The subjective evaluation of magnitude of impact and sensitivity/importance of receptors through expert judgement has led to many impact magnitudes and receptor importance/sensitivities being downgraded across topics in the PEIR. We also note that any effect that is concluded to be of moderate or major significance in the PEIR, is deemed to be significant in EIA terms, whereas effects concluded to be of negligible or minor significance, are deemed not significant in EIA terms. This cut-off could exclude any effect concluded to be less than moderate, in turn, this could lead to errors in assessing cumulative effects adequately.</p>	<p>The Applicant has used the matrix approach in assessment of significance of effect and takes into account Natural England's notes on the risk of error and downgrading of impact magnitudes and receptor importance/sensitivities. Due to the refinement of the red line boundary and the confirmation of the substation location the significance of effect assessed in the PEIR will not be lifted directly into the Environmental Statement assessment which has been carried out using the refined red line boundary and a full field survey data set which will give accurate results and minimise the chance for error when assessing cumulative effects.</p>	N/A
204	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Comment - Evidence Gaps - There is a large amount of outstanding survey work still to be completed which are due to conclude prior to the submission of the Environmental Statement.</p> <p>We advise that without the results and interpretations provided by a complete set of baseline data, we are unable to provide any comment on the conclusions drawn by the Project on the impacts that the development may have on onshore ecological receptors.</p> <p>We have therefore restricted our advice to high level comments on data requirements and mitigation strategies which we believe the project will require to incorporate into their Environmental Statement.</p> <p>Recommendation - Provide relevant impact assessments based on full completion of data to the ETG (Expert Topic Group) to discuss and resolve any issues. Where it is not possible to review prior to the Application submission there are risks issues will not be satisfactorily resolve within the examination time limits.</p>	<p>The Applicant has continued to utilise the EPP to inform stakeholders of the results of the impact assessments.</p>	
205	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Comment - Protected Species - Natural England notes the identification of protected species within the onshore PEIR boundaries. Water Vole (<i>Arvicola amphibius</i>), Otter (<i>Lutra lutra</i>), Various Bat Species and Badger (<i>Meles meles</i>) as identified from initial surveys.</p>	<p>Chapter 21 Onshore Ecology presents an assessment of impacts in line with Standing Advice provided by Natural England. The OLEMS (Document Reference 8.10) presents mitigation and management measures for impacts that have been identified.</p>	6.1.21 Onshore Ecology 8.10 OLEMS

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
			<p>Natural England has produced standing advice<sup>1</sup> to help planning authorities understand the impact of developments on protected species. We advise you to refer to this advice. Natural England will only provide bespoke advice on protected species where they form part of a Site of Special Scientific Interest or in exceptional circumstances.</p> <p>As surveys are ongoing, it is not possible to provide detailed advice on the conclusions that the project has made on the significance of its impact on these species.</p> <p>Recommendation - We advise that the ES should assess impacts on protected species in line with Natural England's standing advice. Any departures from standing advice will need to be clearly justified and associated risks should be assessed and appropriately mitigated. The Project should clearly demonstrate how it has complied with the mitigation hierarchy for minimising the impacts when presenting conclusions for the Environmental Statement.</p> <p>In addition to this, we would expect to see a mitigation management plan presented for each of the at-risk species within the Outline Ecological and Landscape Management Strategy (OLEMS) document submitted with the Environmental Statement.</p> <p>We further advise that if Natural England Wildlife Licencing Service (NEWLS) team are contacted directly (copying in the NE case team) to gain the required Letter Of No Impediment (LONI). We advise that, to reduce the risk to the project, this is secured prior to the applicant submitting their formal proposal to PINS (Planning Inspectorate). For NEWLS to provide a LONI, the project will need to provide documented evidence of compliance with best practice and adoption of suitable mitigation measures.</p>	<p>Shadow licences will be prepared and submitted to Natural England where predicted impacts suggest these are required to obtain a LONI.</p>	
206	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Comment - Nesting Birds - Natural England advises that there is a requirement for the project to produce a plan to demonstrate how they will mitigate the effects it may have on suitable nesting habitat for ground nesting birds.</p> <p>Recommendation - We advise that this plan is included within an OLEMS upon submission of the project into examination.</p>	<p>Mitigation measures for nesting birds has been included in the OLEMS. This builds on and refines the range of measures included in PEIR. Additional specific measures to avoid the risk of significant effects on ground nesting birds have also been included.</p>	8.10 Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Strategy
207	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Comment - Tree and Hedgerows - Whilst we defer the majority of responses on trees and hedgerows to the Local Planning Authority. We provide the following advice based upon our remit to advise on supporting habitat for protected species and sites.</p> <p>Natural England advise that the project commits to ensuring that the minimum width of hedgerows are removed during construction of the onshore cable route and associated infrastructure. Further, where hedgerows are acting as a foraging flight line for bat species, the project should commit to ensuring that these flight lines are not disrupted during the construction and until full restored through suitable mitigation measures.</p>	<p>Extensive use of trenchless techniques along the onshore ECC and 400kV cable corridor has minimised impacts on hedgerows. A mitigation and compensation strategy for trees, with specific reference to ancient and veteran trees, is set out in the OLEMS.</p> <p>All hedgerow restoration will have the target of establishing an effective hedgerow within 5 years, which is the stated time to condition in BNG Metric 4 for native shrubby hedgerows without trees in moderate condition.</p> <p>Management and monitoring requirements will be detailed in the OLEMS</p>	8.10 Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Strategy

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
			<p>Natural England defers our advice on the appropriate native hedgerow and tree species to contribute to restoration following completion of construction to the LPA. We further advise that any Trees removed for the purposes of cable installation, which cannot be directly replaced on completion of construction, should be replaced within the red line boundary at a greater number than have been removed.</p> <p>Where hedgerows have been assessed as providing functional habitat for protected species, we advise that older plants with appropriate deer protection should be used to restore these functions in the shortest achievable time and as part of Biodiversity Net Gain gaps in Hedgerows could be filled.</p>		
208	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Comment - Ancient Woodlands - Any impacts on ancient woodland and ancient and veteran trees in line with paragraph 180 of the NPPF. Natural England maintains the Ancient Woodland Inventory which can help identify ancient woodland. Natural England and the Forestry Commission have produced standing advice for planning authorities in relation to ancient woodland and ancient and veteran trees.</p> <p>Natural England will only provide bespoke advice on ancient woodland, ancient and veteran trees where they form part of a Site of Special Scientific Interest or in exceptional circumstances.</p> <p>Recommendation - We advise that the Applicant has due regard to this advice within the Application and when finalising management plans prior to DCO (Development Consent Order) requirement discharge.</p>	<p>A mitigation and compensation strategy for trees, with specific reference to ancient and veteran trees, is set out in the OLEMS .There is no areas of ancient woodland within the Proposed Order Limits. The closest area of ancient woodland is located at Welton, approximately 5.5km west from the cable route. The Project will not impact upon any ancient woodland.</p>	8.10 Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Strategy
209	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Comment - Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) - We note that Biodiversity Net Gain will be mandatory for terrestrial NSIP (Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects) projects consented under the Planning Act (2008) as of 2025. We would welcome a commitment by the project to ensure that biodiversity net gain is applied to the intertidal zone as well.</p> <p>We welcome the inclusion of the high-level outline document (8.3 Biodiversity Net Gain Principles and Approach.). However, we advise that further detail is required on the specifics of the BNG measures which will be considered for this project.</p> <p>Recommendation - Please provide further project specific detail so that the project's commitment to BNG can be fully assessed at examination.</p> <p>Natural England's Environmental Benefits from Nature tool may be used to identify nature and to avoid and minimise any negative impacts. It is designed to work alongside Biodiversity Metric 4.0 and is available as a beta test version.</p> <p>The development should provide BNG in line with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) paragraphs 174(d), 179 and 180. Development also provides opportunities to secure wider environmental gains, as outlined in the NPPF (paragraphs 8, 73, 104, 120,174, 175 and 180). We advise you to follow the mitigation hierarchy as set out in paragraph 180 of the NPPF and firstly consider what existing environmental features on and around the site can be retained or enhanced or what new features could be</p>	<p>The Project is exploring opportunities to deliver on the recent legislation that requires future NSIPs to provide 10% BNG and is actively engaging with organisations and environmental bodies local to the Project's footprint to identify potential collaboration opportunities.</p> <p>A Biodiversity Net Gain Project Principles and Approach Statement has been produced and submitted</p>	9.5 Biodiversity Net Gain Principles and Approach

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
			<p>incorporated into the development proposal. Where onsite measures are not possible, you should consider off site measures. Opportunities for enhancement might include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Restoring a neglected hedgerow.</li> <li>- Creating a new pond as an attractive feature on the site.</li> <li>- Planting trees characteristic to the local area to make a positive contribution to the local landscape.</li> <li>- Using native plants in landscaping schemes for better nectar and seed sources for bees and birds.</li> <li>- Incorporating swift boxes or bat boxes into the design of new buildings.</li> <li>- Designing lighting to encourage wildlife.</li> <li>- Adding a green roof to new buildings.</li> </ul>		
210	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Comment - Biodiversity Metric 4.0 - Natural England note that the project has stated the use of Metric 4.0 for its BNG assessments.</p> <p>Recommendation - Natural England advises that there is a requirement to commit to using the latest version of the metric, as is relevant at the time of assessment. Natural England's Biodiversity Metric 4.0 may be used to calculate biodiversity losses and gains for terrestrial and intertidal habitats and can be used to inform any development project. For small development sites they Small Sites Metric may be used. This is a simplified version of Biodiversity Metric 4.0 and is designed for use where certain criteria are met. We advise that the full metric is currently being developed and should be used if available at the time of assessment. We will continue to work closely with the project to advise on the relevant metric once they are able to begin calculations.</p>	The Biodiversity Metric 4.0 has been adopted by the Project, as set out in the Biodiversity Net Gain Project Principles and Approach Statement	9.5 Biodiversity Net Gain Principles and Approach
211	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Comment - Multifunction of Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) - Natural England advises that there is a need to embrace multifunctionality of BNG, and consider the design of this project holistically with other project design principles. These include Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS; CIRA (2015)) and Green Infrastructure (Green Infrastructure Home (naturalengland.org.uk)).</p> <p>Recommendation - Natural England advises that the project provides a narrative to describe how it will meet the multifunctional aspect of BNG.</p>	Biodiversity Net Gain Project Principles and Approach Statement has been produced as part of the ES.	9.5 Biodiversity Net Gain Principles and Approach 8.1.4 Outline PPEIRP 8.1 Outline CoCP
212	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Comment - Invasive Non-Native Species (INNS) - We note that the presence of New Zealand Pygmy Weed (<i>Crassula helmsii</i>) has been recorded within the PEIR boundary.</p> <p>Recommendation - Natural England advises that a biosecurity management plan is required as a mitigation measure to ensure that the risk of the project spreading the species is minimised as far as could be considered practicable.</p>	The Applicant has included procedures for the management of INNS within the OLEMS.	8.10 OLEMS
213	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Comment - Chapel Point to Wolla Bank SSSI - The Chapel Point to Wolla Bank SSSI is a site designated for its glacial sedimentary geological features and is located within the Red Line Boundary for the Project.</p> <p>Recommendation - Natural England advise that further clarification is required from the project on whether they will avoid impacting on this site. As per our advice for the Sea Bank Clay Pits SSSI, our advice is that the use of HDD would not be considered as avoidance given the site's designation. We advise that any potential impacts (including the use of trenchless drilling techniques) will require a management plan to ensure that features are not impacted.</p>	<p>Following refinement of the Project boundary, Chapel Point to Wolla Bank SSSI outside of the revised Project boundary. Where the project makes landfall, it will not cross under the SSSI. The SSSI has therefore been mitigated against by avoidance.</p> <p>The baseline data and receptors are described and the impacts to be assessed are set out in Chapter 23 Geology and Ground Conditions.</p>	6.1.23 Geology and Ground Conditions



Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
214	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Comment - The Wash SPA and Ramsar - We advise that the red line boundary of the onshore cable corridor crosses land that is considered as functionally linked to designated features of The Wash SPA including but not exclusively pink footed geese (PFG).</p> <p>Recommendation - We advise that the assessment of 2 years of survey data on the distribution of passage and overwintering Annex I birds from The Wash SPA and Ramsar is required to inform any impact assessment and mitigation measures in order to ascertain the risk of AEol occurring. We advise that there is a risk of further examination and/or determination delays if this critical data is not available at the time of Application. We further advise that we expect to see an Outline Annex I species mitigation management plan for designated features of the SPA which have been identified as foraging outside of the SPA within the Project's Red Line Boundary. NB: This advice is consistent with advice provided on all other NSIPs potentially impacting on interest features of Coastal SPAs.</p>	<p>The Applicant notes these comments. The Year 1 winter bird survey data are presented and assessed within the ES. A summary of the season two non-breeding bird survey results for the period September 2023 to early March 2024 is presented in Appendix 7 Winter Bird Survey 2023-2024 Preliminary Summary. Data from outwith the 400m buffer of the Order Limits has helped to inform the relative importance of the cable corridor with the surrounding habitats.</p> <p>Mitigation measures for SPA qualifying features have been included in the OLEMS. This builds on and refines the range of measures included at PEIR. Additional, specific measures to avoid the risk of significant effects on Annex 1 birds have also been included.</p>	6.3.22.7 Appendix 7 Winter Bird Survey 2023-2024 Preliminary Summary 8.10 OLEMS
215	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Comment - King Charles III England Coast Path (ECP) - Natural England is concerned with the impact the project may have on protected bird species which utilise land located between the proposed development and stretches of both existing and proposed King Charles III England Coastal Path. We advise that the project should look to minimise impacts through design and phasing of the project.</p> <p>Recommendation - Natural England would welcome inclusion of additional information on how the ECP has been considered within the assessment.</p>	Impacts on King Charles III England Coastal Path are considered in Chapter 25 Land Use (document reference 6.2.25), noting there will be no closure or diversions in relation to this footpath and the Applicant has committed to no construction access to the beach.	8.17 Outline Public Access Management Plan 6.1.25 Land Use
216	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Comment - Paragraphs 100 and 174 of the NPPF highlights the importance of public rights of way and access.</p> <p>Recommendation - We advise that the development should consider potential impacts on access land, common land, rights of way and coastal access routes in the vicinity of the development. Consideration should also be given to the potential impacts on the any nearby National Trails. The National Trails website provides information including contact details for the National Trail Officer. Appropriate mitigation measures should be incorporated for any adverse impacts.</p>	<p>The potential impacts of construction traffic generated by the Project on Public Rights of Way (PRoW), including National Trails are set out in Chapter 27 Traffic and Transport. An Outline Public Access Management Plan (PAMP) has been prepared to set out the main principles for the management of access on PRoW and National Trails during construction of the Project.</p> <p>Access land, common land, PRoWs and coastal margins have been identified and assessed in Chapter 25 Land Use</p>	6.1.27 Traffic and Transport, 8.17 Outline Public Access Management Plan 6.1.25 Land Use
217	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Comment - Water Quality - On water quality impacts, we will defer our advice to the technical expertise of the Environment Agency for the majority of our comments. However, as per our advice on recent offshore wind projects (see our advice at examination on SEP/DEP), we advise the project provides a Bentonite Outbreak Management Plan for any areas where the project intends to use horizontal directional drilling (HDD) to mitigate the impacts to water crossings.</p> <p>Recommendation - Natural England advises that a Bentonite Outbreak Management Plan is included within the OLEMS document.</p>	Principles for bentonite breakout management included in an Outline Pollution Prevention and Emergency Incident Response Plan (PPEIRP) (document reference 8.1.4) provided as part of the Outline CoCP	8.1.4 Outline PPEIRP 8.1 Outline CoCP
218	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Comment - Sea Bank Clay Pits SSSI - Natural England note that, where the project makes landfall, it will cross under the Sea Bank Clay Pits SSSI via HDD. This SSSI is predominantly designated for hydrological features which can be susceptible to changes in the water table caused by trenchless crossing.</p> <p>The main risk to this site from the proposed development is considered to be</p>	Following further design refinement, the Landfall HDD has been redesigned so that it does not cross underneath the Sea Bank Clay Pits SSSI. However, acknowledging the sensitivity of the receptor, a Groundwater Risk Assessment has been included within the DCO application.	6.3.24.1 Groundwater Risk Assessment

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
			<p>the impacts or changes to the hydrology, specifically quantity and quality of the water that currently feeds the site. This includes changes to ditches and waterbodies in the immediate vicinity.</p> <p>Recommendation - We advise that the project should provide further site-specific survey data on the hydrographic conditions which maintain the designated features within the site.</p> <p>Further to this, we advise that the Project will need to use the results of this survey to provide a detailed method statement to show that it has reduced the risk of this work impacting on the notified features of this site. Natural England advises that the project also provides a site-specific management plan to demonstrate the measures which will be taken to further reduce the risk of impacts to the site which cannot be ruled out through the design phase.</p>		
219	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Comment - Countryside Stewardship - We advise that it is the responsibility of landowners with an agreement to manage land within a Higher Tier Countryside Stewardship scheme to ensure that their agreement is not compromised by cables crossing the land being managed.</p> <p>Recommendation - We advise that Landowners should contact their relevant Countryside Stewardship advisor (whether that is with the Rural Payments Agency or Natural England). The project could help facilitate this by including prompts to discuss Countryside Stewardship with landowners in their landowner engagement plan.</p>	<p>Land parcels managed under agri-environmental agreements have been identified in Chapter 25 Land Use. The Applicant has notified farmers to consider whether they have land affected under such a scheme and to notify their respective Countryside Stewardship advisor.</p>	6.1.25 Land Use
220	Natural England	P2_25	<p>Comment - Assessing Best most Versatile Land - We defer our response to local planning authorities (LPA) on agricultural land classifications. However, we offer the following advice in addition to that provided by the LPA. Best and most versatile (BMV) soils include those graded by the ALC from grades 1 to 3. The provisional ALC surveys do not split grade 3 into 3a (BMV) and 3b (not BMV) and instead the project has adopted a precautionary approach in assuming all land assessed as grade 3 to be classed as grade 3a.</p> <p>Recommendation - We advise that further detailed soil surveys are required to provide detailed understanding of soil quality within the cable corridor and to cover potential areas of permanent loss. These surveys should be in-line with the ALC guidelines (Agricultural Land Classification of England and Wales: Revised criteria for grading the quality of agricultural land - ALC011 (naturalengland.org.uk)).</p> <p>Natural England are required to consider BMV soils where permanent loss for a development is over 20ha and therefore the approach adopted by the Project of WCS (Worst Case Scenario) assumptions is not viable assessing potential soil quality impacts.</p> <p>We further advise that the detailed soil surveys are required by the project for assessing options for Biodiversity Net Gain. BMV should ideally be kept available for farming should it be required, with lower grade land more suited for BNG projects.</p>	<p>The Project have committed to undertaking ALC surveys across the cable route and substation locations in line with ALC guidance. The Project has also committed to undertaking British Standard testing on topsoil and if required, subsoil every 100m and additionally if fields are missing by the spacing. These surveys will take place post consent, pre-construction. The commitment to testing will be contained within the Soil Management Plan which will be drafted in accordance with the Outline Soil Management Plan submitted as part of the Code of Construction Practice.</p>	6.1.25 Land Use, 8.1.3 Outline Soil Management Plan

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
221	NatureScot	P2_27	<p>Thank you for your e-mail about the Outer Dowsing Offshore Wind Project.</p> <p>We do not wish to offer any comment on the proposal.</p>	The Applicant has noted this response.	N/A
222	Network Rail	P2_28	<p>Key concerns will be how the scheme impacts on the railway operations in terms of the management of construction works around the operational railway and details such as boundary treatments, any lighting and drainage schemes that may impact on the operational railway.</p> <p>With these points in mind, at this stage the information supplied is not sufficiently detailed to fully assess potential impacts of the scheme on the railway and further information will be required to properly respond on the likely impacts of the proposed scheme.</p> <p>In order to ensure that the scheme does not impact on operational railway safety, the developer must liaise closely with Network Rail Asset Protection to ensure that the haulage routes into the site are appropriate, and the design and construction of the new facility and associated infrastructure will not have an adverse impact on railway operations. It is therefore assumed that a condition of the Order would be that detailed specifications of the proposed scheme, its construction and traffic management plans are to be provided and agreed in writing before development can commence.</p> <p>Please note that if the intention is to install cabling/equipment in support of the project through railway land, the developer will need an easement from Network Rail and we would recommend that they engage with us early in the planning of their scheme in order to discuss and agree this element of the proposals. Our Easements and Wayleaves Team can be contacted at <a href="mailto:easements&amp;wayleaves@networkrail.co.uk">easements&amp;wayleaves@networkrail.co.uk</a>.</p>	Within the draft DCO, Requirement 8 (detailed onshore design parameters) and Requirement 20 (Traffic) of Schedule 1 Part 3 (Requirements) deal with the highlighted matters.	Draft Development Consent Order (3.1)
223	Norfolk County Council	P2_29	<p>Thank you for sending this information to us. However, we consider this development (off the coast of Lincolnshire) to be out of scope for the Norfolk Coast AONB and will not be submitting any comment.</p>	The Applicant has noted this response.	
224	NSIP HSE	P2_31	<p>According to HSE's records, the proposed DCO application boundary for this Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project falls into the outer consultation zone of a Major Accident Hazard Site [MAHS'] and the consultation zones of two Major Accident Hazard Pipelines [MAHP']. This is based on the site boundary downloaded in the onshore GIS shapefiles from <a href="https://www.outerdowsing.com/downloads/">https://www.outerdowsing.com/downloads/</a> on 16th June 2023.</p> <p>The major accident hazard site is John Parsons Marketing Ltd, Port of Fosdyke, Boston, Lincolnshire HSE reference 3763.</p> <p>The major accident hazard pipelines are:</p> <p>National Grid, 7 Feeder Gosberton/North Level Main Drain, HSE reference 6905, Transco ref. 1180.</p> <p>InterGen (UK), NTS to Spalding Energy PS Pipeline, HSE reference 11622.</p>	The Applicant is in discussions with the asset owners to determine requirements if necessary for protective provisions.	

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
			<p>The Applicant should make contact with the above operators, to inform an assessment of whether or not the proposed development is vulnerable to a possible major accident. There are three particular reasons for this:</p> <p>i) The pipeline operator may have a legal interest in developments in the vicinity of the pipeline. This may restrict developments within a certain proximity of the pipeline.</p> <p>ii) The standards to which the pipeline is designed and operated may restrict major traffic routes within a certain proximity of the pipeline. Consequently, there may be a need for the operator to modify the pipeline or its operation, if the development proceeds.</p> <p>iii) To establish the necessary measures required to alter/upgrade the pipeline to appropriate standards.</p>		
225	NSIP HSE	P2_31	<p>HSE's Land Use Planning advice is dependent on the location of areas where people may be present. Based on the information in the phase 2 consultation documents [<a href="https://www.outerdowsing.com/phase-2-consultation/">https://www.outerdowsing.com/phase-2-consultation/</a>], is unlikely that HSE would advise against the development. Please note that the advice is based on HSE's existing policy for providing land-use planning advice [<a href="https://www.hse.gov.uk/landuseplanning/methodology.htm">https://www.hse.gov.uk/landuseplanning/methodology.htm</a>]. HSE's advice in response to a subsequent planning application may differ should HSE's policy or the scope of the development change by the time the Development Consent Order application is submitted.</p>	The Project has noted HSE's comments.	
226	NSIP HSE	P2_31	<p>Based on the phase 2 consultation documents at <a href="https://www.outerdowsing.com/phase-2-consultation/">https://www.outerdowsing.com/phase-2-consultation/</a>, it is not clear whether the applicant has considered the hazard classification of any chemical substances that may be proposed to be present at the development. This may be because there are none due to the nature of the scheme.</p>	As far as the Applicant is aware there are no chemical substances expected to be present at the development, however the Construction Environment Management Plan, which will be produced will set out protocols for if unexpected contamination is encountered.	N/A
227	NSIP HSE	P2_31	<p>The HSE would like to highlight that hazardous substances consent [HSC] is required to store or use any of the Categories of Substances or Named Hazardous Substances set out in Schedule 1 of The Planning (Hazardous Substances) Regulations 2015 as amended, if those hazardous substances will be present on, over or under the land at or above the controlled quantities. Also, there is an 'addition rule' in Part 4 of Schedule 1 for below-threshold substances. Further information on HSC should be sought from the relevant Hazardous Substances Authority.</p>	The Applicant notes the requirement for hazardous substances consent which will be sought if required. It does not anticipate that any of the listed substances will be required.	N/A
228	NSIP HSE	P2_31	<p>Regulation 5(4) of the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 requires the assessment of significant effects to include, where relevant, the expected significant effects arising from the proposed development's vulnerability to major accidents. HSE's role in NSIPs is summarised in Advice Note 11 working with public bodies in the infrastructure planning process' Annex G on the Planning Inspectorate's website [Advice notes   National Infrastructure Planning (<a href="http://planninginspectorate.gov.uk">planninginspectorate.gov.uk</a>)] - Annex G The Health and Safety Executive. This document includes consideration of risk assessments under the heading Risk assessments•.</p>	The Applicant has noted this response.	
229	NSIP HSE	P2_31	<p>In the phase 2 consultation documents, it was not clear if there was consideration of risk assessments arising from the development's vulnerability to major accidents. We would advise this is considered further in line with</p>	The Applicant has noted this response. Risk assessments have been carried out throughout the chapters of the Environmental Statement and mitigation measures, best practices and protocols are secured in the Outline Code of	



Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
			Advice Note 11 Annex on the Planning Inspectorate's website - Annex The Health and Safety Executive taking account of the following: it may be beneficial for applicants to undertake a risk assessment as early as possible to satisfy themselves that their design and operation will meet the requirements of relevant health and safety legislation as design of the Proposed Development progresses.	Construction Practice (CoCP). Contractors will be required to prepare a Health, Safety and Environment plan for onshore works.	
230	NSIP HSE	P2_31	The HSE response considering Explosives Sites:  The Explosives Inspectorate for Outer Dowsing Offshore Wind Farm remains the same as previous response in August 2023: CEMHD 7's response is no comment as there are no HSE licenced explosives sites in the vicinity of the proposed development.	The Applicant has noted this comment.	
231	RSPB	P2_33	The RSPB is concerned about the implications of the construction (and operation) of the cable route on a number of wintering, passage and breeding bird species with significant populations in The Wash SPA / Ramsar and the Greater Wash SPA. When two years of survey data are made available the RSPB. will want to explore in detail the potential implications of construction disturbance on these species through the relevant Expert Working Group, considering areas of potential sensitivity and any mitigation that may be necessary.	The Project continues to investigate opportunities for biodiversity net gain, as outlined in the Biodiversity Net Gain Principles and Approach document which has been submitted as part of the DCO application. The potential impacts to RSPB Frampton Marsh and Freiston Marsh have been assessed within Chapter 22 Onshore Ornithology and continues to engage with the RSPB regarding potential impacts arising from the Project. The ES assesses the impact, mitigations proposed and/ or remediation of any potential adverse effects on the local area from both an environmental and social perspective.	6.1.22 Onshore Ornithology, 8.14 Biodiversity Net Gain Principles and Approach
232	RSPB	P2_33	At the initial scoping stage consultation (see PEIR, Vol.2, Ch. 22, Table 22.2) the RSPB highlighted the significance of its Frampton Marsh and Frieston Shore reserves, both functionally linked to The Wash SPA/Ramsar site, and the obvious importance of the Greater Frampton Vision Landscape Recovery Project. That project, supported by Defra, aims to use land to the south east of Boston to expand the habitats that have developed so successfully at Frampton Marsh and Freiston Shore. Based on the information set out in the PEIR, we consider there is potential for the cable route to affect both the reserve and the Landscape Recovery Project.  Therefore, we would welcome further detailed discussions and consultation with the Outer Dowsing project team, to ensure that the cable routing avoids these reserves and any land that is key to the objectives of the Landscape Recovery Project	The Project has continued to engage with the RSPB including in relation to the Greater Frampton Vision projects and opportunities for the Project to support and contribute to these projects. The RSPB Reserves at Frampton Marsh and Freiston Shore have been taken into consideration during the design process to ensure these sites are avoided.	
233	South Holland District Council	P2_34	Onshore Ecology South Holland District Council do not have an in-house ecologist and the Wildlife Trust may have chosen to comment directly on the content of the consultation at phase 2, however having reviewed the information put forward within the PEIR, the approach taken appears reasonable in the methodology and we have no specific comments to offer other than the importance of achieving a 10% biodiversity net gain for this proposed nationally significant development, in line with The Environment Act 2021. Lastly, temporary construction works can have a significant affect and we would therefore welcome a full scheme of remediation and reinstatement after these works have been undertaken.	The Project continues to investigate opportunities for biodiversity net gain, as outlined in the Biodiversity Net Gain Principles and Approach document which has been submitted as part of the DCO application.	8.14 Biodiversity Net Gain Principles and Approach
234	South Holland District Council	P2_34	Landscape and Visual Assessment  At this stage we do not have details of the final substation location, appearance or extent, however the information as provided for the Phase 2 Consultation has been reviewed by external consultants Terra Loci, with the following	The Project has engaged with ELDC in respect of viewpoint selection and study area both through the ETG process and bilateral engagement. Chapter 28 Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment sets out the methodology in full, this chapter also uses National LCAs and Local LCAs in the assessment and presents the effects, including operational effects on the onshore ECC, on	

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
			<p>comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The landscape and visual receptors and representative viewpoints need to be submitted and approved prior to the assessment being undertaken. Supporting Zone of Theoretical Visibility mapping should also be provided to ensure that the proposed study area is sufficient.</li> <li>- The full LVIA methodology, including factors and / or matrices used for determining sensitivity of landscape and visual receptors and magnitude and significance of effects should be submitted and approved prior to the assessment being undertaken. The combination of desk and field-based study can be sufficient to understand the baseline landscape and visual resource, however complete methodologies are required to agree if the method of assessment is sufficient and appropriate.</li> <li>- All visual representation with any submitted Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) should be in line with The Visual Representation of Development Proposals Technical Guidance Note (TGN) 06/19 (Landscape Institute, September 2019) to ensure the assessment of visual impact is accurate and in turn an appropriate judgement of the assessed impacts can be made. Locations for proposed 'photomontage' visualisations, including visualisation types, following TGN 06/19 should be submitted and approved prior to being undertaken.</li> <li>- The EIA should include a full assessment of the potential impacts of the development on local landscape character using landscape assessment methodologies. The use of Landscape Character Assessment (LCA), based on the good practice guidelines produced jointly by the Landscape Institute and Institute of Environmental Assessment in 2013 is encouraged. LCA provides a sound basis for guiding, informing and understanding the ability of any location to accommodate change and to make positive proposals for conserving, enhancing or regenerating character, as detailed proposals are developed.</li> <li>- It is recommended that any development proposal explores and applies the Building with Nature standards and achieves an accreditation to highlight what 'good' looks like at each stage of the GI lifecycle and strengthen the development and demonstrate the development goes beyond the statutory minima, to create places that really deliver for people and wildlife.</li> <li>- The assessment should refer to the relevant National Character Areas as published by Natural England. Local landscape character areas should be mapped at a scale appropriate to the development site as well as any relevant management plans or strategies pertaining to the area. The EIA should include assessments of visual effects on the surrounding area and landscape together with any physical effects of the development, such as changes in topography and loss or disturbance of vegetation.</li> <li>- In order to foster high quality development that respects, maintains, or</li> </ul>	<p>the physical elements, landscape character and visual receptors in addition to a cumulative assessment with all relevant existing and future projects. The uncertainty surrounding scoping stage projects and the limited information that is typically available at this early stage means it is difficult to prepare a detailed assessment and therefore where this is the case reference will be made to these projects, however in these instances a full assessment will not be possible.</p>	

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
			<p>enhances, local landscape character and distinctiveness, the LVIA should consider the character and distinctiveness of the area, with the siting and design of the proposed development reflecting local design characteristics. The Environmental Impact Assessment process should detail the measures to be taken to ensure the building design will be of a high standard, as well as detail of layout alternatives together with justification of the selected option in terms of landscape impact and benefit.</p> <p>- The assessment should also include the cumulative effect of the development with other relevant existing or proposed developments in the area. A list of proposed cumulative schemes should be submitted and approved prior to the assessment being undertaken. Cumulative impact assessment should include other proposals currently at Scoping stage and onwards. Due to the overlapping timescale of their progress through the planning system, cumulative impact of the proposed development with those proposals currently at Scoping stage would be likely to be a material consideration at the time of determination of the planning application.</p> <p>- Operational effects arising from the Onshore ECC and export cable landfall should be scoped into the assessment as there is potential for a loss of vegetation and alteration of the baseline landscape and visual resource which will be longer lasting than the construction phase and the long-term effectiveness of remediation and mitigation proposals should be considered. Other potential effects identified are sufficient, pending the submission and approval of full landscape and visual receptor groups and representative viewpoints.</p>		
235	South Holland District Council	P2_34	<p>Air Quality</p> <p>The Council's Environmental Health Officer has reviewed the information put forward and the following comments are provided:</p> <p>- Burning of waste should be avoided. Any burning of waste deemed strictly necessary should be undertaken in accordance with the relevant waste management exemption issued the Environment Agency, and consideration should be given to the timing of such burning, and the prevailing weather conditions to impact emissions to air and nuisance to offsite receptor's; and</p> <p>- Soil stockpiles should be sealed to recued fugitive dust emissions</p>	<p>The Project has submitted an Outline Air Quality Management Plan as part of the DCO application which sets out mitigation measures, such as those highlighted by BBC details control measures relating to emissions to air which are required to prevent/avoid or reduce and mitigate potential impacts.</p>	8.1.2 Outline Air Quality Management Plan
236	South Holland District Council	P2_34	<p>Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage</p> <p>No comments have been received from the Council's Archaeological and Cultural Heritage consultant, however having reviewed the information put forward within the PEIR, the approach taken appears reasonable in the methodology and we have the below comments to offer:</p> <p>- The Council would expect a detailed landscape and visual assessment for any above ground features and for each to be looked at separately pending the final location and scale of the substation and other large scale above ground features; and</p>	<p>The Applicant has proposed a two phased programme of trial trenching works. The first phase would be undertaken prior to determination and focus on areas of higher risk - either those areas where geophysical anomalies indicate the presence of remains which could be of relatively higher importance or those areas of the scheme where a greater level of disturbance would be incurred. A second phase would be undertaken after consent to further inform mitigation works. This would primarily target areas not previously targeted. A detailed landscape and visual assessment for the onshore substation is set out in Chapter 28 and will be accompanied by viewpoint visualisations representative of local visual receptors. A detailed landscape and visual assessment has been included in respect of the potential effects during the construction phase.</p>	6.1.28 Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
			- We would expect a scheme of trail trenching to be included as part of the main planning submission.	Other than the onshore substation, there will be no other large-scale above-ground features with potential to give rise to significant effects. The effects of residual effects relating to the removal of trees or hedgerows during the construction phase has been considered in the assessment of the operational phase outlined in Chapter 28.	
237	South Holland District Council	P2_34	<p>Geology and Ground Conditions</p> <p>South Holland District Council do not have an in-house geologist and the Coal Authority may have chosen to comment directly on the content of the consultation at phase 2, however having reviewed the information put forward within the PEIR, the approach taken appears reasonable in the methodology and we have the below specific comments to offer:</p> <p>Soil management practices may need further evidence and investigation with relation to marine silts.</p> <p>Methodologies to prevent silt slurries should be presented as these pose a dangerous environmental risk.</p>	<p>The potential impact and subsequent reinstatement and aftercare of soils has been considered in Chapter 23 Geology and Ground Conditions and Chapter 25 Land Use. The results of the assessment will determine the appropriate mitigation measures, and these will be outlined and secured through the Soil Management Plan.</p> <p>It is noted that the soils in the region are high quality and complex soils. The Outline Soil Management Plan includes further management practices and mitigation to address the potential risk and will manage handling and protection of soils, including management practices and mitigation measures for working in marine silts, and ceasing work during wet weather.</p>	<p>6.1.23 Geology and Ground Conditions,</p> <p>6.1.25 Land Use</p> <p>8.1.3 Outline Soil Management Plan</p>
238	South Holland District Council	P2_34	<p>Hydrology, Hydrogeology and Flood Risk</p> <p>Lincolnshire County Council act as Lead Local Flood Authority and may comment directly to the proposed development. having reviewed the information put forward within the PEIR, the approach taken appears reasonable in the methodology and we have no specific comments to offer.</p>	The Applicant has noted this comment.	
239	South Holland District Council	P2_34	<p>Environmental Health</p> <p>The Environmental Protection Team have reviewed the following sections and comment as follows:</p> <p>- 8.1.1 Outline Noise and Vibration Management Plan</p> <p>Please provide SHDC Environmental Protection with appropriate contact details in event of complaints.</p> <p>Ensure SHDC EP Team &amp; all relevant Noise sensitive receptors (NSR) in the immediate area are informed of any proposed works outside of normal working hours.</p> <p>Maintain sound barriers in good order.</p> <p>Vibration, ensure SHDC EP Team &amp; all Vibration Sensitive Receptors in immediate area are informed of operations such as piling where vibration is likely to exceed 0.3mms and ensure appropriate monitoring equipment is used in vicinity of works.</p> <p>- 8.1.2 Air quality management plan</p> <p>Burning of waste should be avoided. Any burning of waste deemed strictly necessary should be undertaken in accordance with the relevant waste management exemption issued the Environment Agency, and consideration should be given to the timing of such burning, and the prevailing weather conditions to impact emissions to air and nuisance to offsite receptor's</p> <p>- 8.1.3 Outline Soil management plan</p>	<p>Contact details of an appointed representative will be made available to the relevant authorities and local community for the duration of the construction period.</p> <p>Direct mitigation relating to vibration from construction operations (drilling, piling) is not proposed. However the following is proposed within the Noise and Vibration Management Plan which will be drafted in accordance with the Outline Noise and Vibration Management Plan.</p> <p>Prior to any vibration generating works being undertaken the residents of the nearest Vibration Sensitive Receptors would be notified of the nature and proposed duration of the works (BS5228:2014 states that vibration levels up to 1.0mm/s PPV be tolerated if prior warning and explanation has been given to residents). If required vibration monitoring would be undertaken at the nearest VSRs during the works to monitor the levels being generated, which would be compared to agreed limits. If the limits are exceeded then the cause of the exceedance would be determined as far as reasonably practicable and suitable mitigation measures implemented. Mitigation measures for Air Quality are outlined in the Outline Air Quality Management Plan which has been revised following the ES</p> <p>The Outline SMP which has been produced and submitted as part of the DCO application includes guidance for construction and maintenance of stockpiles.</p> <p>The Applicant has appointed a Community Liaison Officer (CLO) in order to act as a representative for the community to be kept informed of Project progress.</p>	<p>8.1.1 Outline Noise and Vibration Management Plan,</p> <p>8.1.2 Outline Air Quality Management Plan,</p> <p>8.1.3 Outline Soil Management Plan</p>



Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
			<p>Soil stockpiles should be sealed to reduced fugitive dust emissions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 8.1.5 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan</li> </ul> <p>No comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 8.1.10 Outline Artificial Light Emissions Management Plan</li> </ul> <p>No comments.</p>		
240	South Holland District Council	P2_34	<p>Please provide SHDC Environmental Protection with appropriate contact details in event of complaints.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Ensure SHDC EP Team &amp; all relevant Noise sensitive receptors (NSR) in the immediate area are informed of any proposed works outside of normal working hours.</li> <li>- Maintain sound barriers in good order.</li> <li>- Vibration, ensure SHDC EP Team &amp; all Vibration Sensitive Receptors in immediate area are informed of operations such as piling where vibration is likely to exceed 0.3mms and ensure appropriate monitoring equipment is used in vicinity of works.</li> </ul>	The Project has incorporated these proposals within the Outline Noise and Vibration Management Plan	8.1.1. Outline Noise and Vibration Management Plan
241	South Holland District Council	P2_34	<p>Traffic and Transport</p> <p>Lincolnshire County Council act as Highway Authority and may comment directly to the proposed development. Having reviewed the information put forward within the PEIR, the approach taken appears reasonable in the methodology and but have the following comments to offer:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- One community liaison person in place for contact with any issues should they arise whilst works are being carried out;</li> <li>- Consideration of the effect of mud on roads as well as the impact of large load vehicles on roads which are already in a poor state;</li> <li>- Consideration of works traffic hours in relation to effects on local transport; and</li> <li>- Construction compounds and field accesses in the countryside can have a significant affect and we would therefore welcome a full scheme of remediation and reinstatement after the cable/works have been undertaken.</li> </ul>	The Project has noted all of these comments and suggestions which will be set out in the Construction Traffic Management Plan which will be drafted post consent in accordance with the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan submitted as part of the application. The Project have appointed a Community Liaison Officer who acts as an independent link between the Project and the local community. Additionally refined construction compounds and accesses were consulted on as part of the Autumn Consultation, the materials for which are included within the Consultation Report. The Project has committed to a full scheme of remediation and reinstatement as outlined in the Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Strategy submitted as part of the DCO application.	5.1 Consultation Report, 8.1.5 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan, 8.10 Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Strategy
242	South Holland District Council	P2_34	I have nothing majorly to add, but would expect the applicant to be open to a S106 agreement with Parish Councils where the areas are going to be disrupted.	The Applicant has noted this response.	
243	South Kesteven	P2_35	South Kesteven District Council has no specific comments to make on the proposed scheme at this time. However, we wish to confirm that appropriate consultation is undertaken with Lincolnshire County Council (as Local Highways Authority) to ensure that any temporary traffic impacts associated with the construction of the proposed development, namely the onshore substation (subject to final location), which may affect South Kesteven are fully understood. Similarly, we would encourage direct consultation with the Parish Council's of the Deepings and Bourne to consider how the potential wider	The Applicant has continued to consult with LCC throughout the pre-application phase. An Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan has been submitted as part of the application which sets out the approach that will be taken to manage the potential impacts of construction traffic for onshore works.	8.5 Outline CTMP

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
			routing of construction traffic from the development site to the strategic highway network may affect these areas		
244	UK Health Security Agency	P2_41	We have considered the submitted documentation and can confirm that we are satisfied with the approach taken in preparing the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and the conclusions drawn. We wish to make no further comment at this time.	The Applicant has noted this response	
245	UK Health Security Agency	P2_41	The report (para 30.1.12) notes there is no fixed method for assessing human health in this context.	The Applicant has noted this response	
246	UK Health Security Agency	P2_41	<p>Para 30.6.5 further notes the report methodology uses emerging best practice published by the Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (IEMA) in line with the 'Health in Environmental Impact Assessment: A Primer for a Proportionate Approach' (Cave et al., 2017a). Professional judgements on significance is based on Table 30.10: Human health guide questions for determining significance. The report fails to note the latest guidance in relation to assessing significance for population and human health (Pyper, R et al., 20221), published by the Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (IEMA). Subsequently the PEIR does not follow this methodological approach to the assessment of significance for population and human health.</p> <p>The IEMA guidance has been developed to be the national guidance for assessing significance in population and human health and so should be adopted and utilised for the purposes of the Environmental Statement (ES).</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Determining significance for population and human health should follow guidance within Pyper, R et al., 2022, published by the Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (IEMA).</p> <p>The final ES should provide suitable justification for any assessment of significance.</p>	The Applicant has noted this response. Justification for any assessment of significance is set out in Chapter 30 Human Health.	6.1.30 Human Health
247	Wainfleet St.Mary Parish Council	P2_42	<p>Wainfleet All Saints Town Council duly note the application, but are unable to comment further until such time as the definite location of the onshore route has been decided</p> <p>The suitability of the rural roads, many of which are in poor condition (e.g. subsidence), to cope with the loading by heavy construction vehicles. What mechanism is in place for any urgent reinstatement, by the Applicant? Is a survey of the roads (and any strengthening needed) to be carried out at the commencement of works?</p> <p>2. What restrictions will be placed on working hours/days?</p> <p>3. What is the procedure in place to deal with complaints from residents regarding access, noise, dust etc.</p>	The Project has noted this comment and continued to engage throughout the development of the proposals.	
248	Well Parish Council	P2_43	Finally, NG has no real need to connect with the ODOW project onshore. There are many ways of configuring a network. Lincolnshire already produces more green power than it requires: we are a net exporter of green energy and carbon	The Applicant has noted this response	

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
			neutral. The real problem is power demand in London and the South East. Power generation should ideally be at the point of use. NG should provide offshore grid points and the power should be cabled up the Thames and distributed appropriately. This, however, would mean that grid storage support would have to be removed from the your project. In terms of splitting water to produce vast quantities of hydrogen to replace methane in the gas transmission system (which would require significant quantities of energy to achieve), separate offshore power lines should be laid to St. Fergus, Theddlethorpe, Bacton, Morecombe Bay and the LNG re-gasification plant in East London. These are the existing entry points for gas and would be the natural point of entry for a replacement gas stream. Any required hydrogen electrolyzers and associated compression units should be placed at those sites. It's just common sense.		
249	Well Parish Council	P2_43	<p>Summary: None of this sits well with the Project's Mission Statement: "Environmental stewardship and community engagement are central to Outer Dowsing Offshore Wind's vision. We are committed to a long term positive environmental impact through responsible design optimisation of the project, honest and transparent engagement with local communities and stakeholders, and proactive mitigation solutions".</p> <p>We believe that this Phase 2 Consultation (particularly the PIER), is neither honest nor transparent with respect to local communities.</p>	The Applicant has noted this response.	
250	Well Parish Council	P2_43	We have previously had serious issues with the accuracy of visualisations provided in planning applications with respect to the Heritage Assets of Well. For any EIA assessment, we request that NG and the Project pay for, but the NPCU supervises and appoints, independent 3rd party consultants to produce accurate wirelines, photomontages (photos taken both in winter and summer, since much of the possible screening: trees, woods, hedgerows etc., and proposed mitigation planting, is deciduous), and ZTVs from viewpoints nominated by statutory consultees along the entire route of the pylons (for the planned 4 projects i.e. including all NG extension of the grid and reinforcement), and all infrastructure included in the LN and ODOW projects, and that hard copies at the proper scale are distributed free of charge to statutory consultees and, on request, to the public. We will be writing to the Secretary of State to request this.	The Applicant has contracted OP-EN to for their LVIA and visualisations for the OnSS (including a cumulative visualisation with respect to the NGSS) as included in Chapter 28 LVIA (document reference 6.1.28). The Applicant is able to confirm there will be no significant effects after 15 years (and in some cases this is expected to be between 5-10 years). Following feedback from the Autumn consultation in relation the Applicant has also undertaken winter photography which is forming part of the Design Review Process which the Applicant has committed to undertake, details of this and the commitment to an External Design Review are included in 8.17 Design Approach Document and 8.18 Design Principles Statement.	
251	Well Parish Council	P2_43	<p>in terms of the PIER:</p> <p>d. it does not include the Lincolnshire Wolds AONB in which St. Margaret's Church, Well, is sited and which is also a designated landscape in the Preliminary Environmental Information (PIER 6.1.28: 28.4.24);</p>	The proposed location for the OnSS was not progressed following the confirmation of the Grid Connection location at Weston marsh and potential effects on the Lincolnshire Wolds AONB have been scoped out of the assessment as described in Chapter 28 LVIA	
252	Well Parish Council	P2_43	<p>in terms of the PIER:</p> <p>The height of the substation buildings is stated as a 'Maximum Design Scenario' at 19m in the visualisations and the exhibition panels, however in the Scoping Report, Tables 3.5.3 and 3.5.4, the maximum building height for the substations is stated as 25m. 19m is therefore not the 'Maximum Design Scenario' and the height of these buildings is understated in the PIER visualisations. These visualisations do not include additional infrastructure i.e. the 30m noise 'enclosers' included in the Scoping, or any infrastructure associated with battery storage and hydrogen generation and so are unrepresentative of the nature and scale of the proposed onshore development (see Appendix 20);</p>	Updated project parameters and the Maximum Design Scenario are set out in Chapter 3 Project Description.	6.1.3 Project Description

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
253	Well Parish Council	P2_43	<p>g. the height of the camera (viewpoint) for the ZTVs is 2m (PIER 28.6.76) but for the photomontages 'approximately 1.5m above ground' (PEIR 28.6.81). These heights should be standardised (at 1.6m ideally i.e. average human line of sight), so that the visual impact can be compared between the two types of visualisation, and the exact elevation of the viewpoint (including camera distance above ground) should be clearly stated. Otherwise no reliance can be placed on either type of visualisation.</p> <p>Again, the poor quality of the information provided in the PEIR, contravenes the Project's own guidelines in that it is impossible to make an informed assessment of the environmental impact of the proposed development(s) with such incomplete and inaccurate data.</p>	<p>The Project has noted this comment. The camera height for taking of photography and the production of associated wirelines is set at 1.5m in line with Landscape Institute's Technical Guidance Note 06/19 to ensure consistency across all LVIAs. Guidance previously set 2m as the recommended height for running ZTVs. Review of this guidance has led to this being changed to 1.5m to be in line with the guidance for the photography and visualisations. 1.5m has been used within Chapter 28 of the Environmental Statement.</p>	
254	Well Parish Council	P2_43	<p>Appendix 2: Plant and Infrastructure at the proposed Lincolnshire Node missing from the PIER:</p> <p>(c) ... Finally, the source of the water feedstock and any associated infrastructure outwith your site (for example, seawater input pipe(s) and ultra-saline return discharge system to the coast).</p>	<p>The Applicant has noted this comment.</p>	
255	Well Parish Council	P2_43	<p>As the Chairman informed one of your engineers and the project Manager, any development visible from the Heritage Assets of Well will potentially be an issue. The Chairman offered the Project Manager the opportunity of a visit to the Heritage Assets of Well so that they could appreciate the sensitivity of the location. He pointed out that the Grade I church is located above 40m contour and the proposed site for the onshore substation would appear directly above Well Vale Hall when viewed from the Church. As yet, this offer has not been taken up but is still open.</p>	<p>The Project notes this comment, however due to the iterative site selection process and the grid connection confirmation the Lincolnshire Node OnSS is no longer part of the development proposals and the issues no longer need to be addressed</p>	6.1.4 Site Selection
256	Well Parish Council	P2_43	<p>With respect to the proposed Lincolnshire Node, once the meeting understood that the ODOW would be the first of at least four such connections at the site; that your project would result in a substantial industrial complex, including a grid support battery plant and hydrogen electrolyser (the latter to produce liquid oxygen, and hydrogen to the gas transmission system at Alford), and in addition, that the Lincolnshire Node (LN) would likely require at least 2 sets of 50m pylons running roughly NW-SE for your Project, and multiple sets for each additional project, the Meeting voted to object since all of this would be visible from the Heritage Assets in Well.</p>	<p>The Applicant notes this comment, however due to the iterative site selection process and the grid connection confirmation the Lincolnshire Node OnSS is no longer part of the development proposals and the issues no longer need to be addressed.</p>	6.1.3 Site Selection
257	Well Parish Council	P2_43	<p>In your consultation material, you have only declared two buildings (substations). We believe that the information provided in the PIER (Preliminary Environmental Impact Report) materially understates both their size and visual impact (see Appendix 1). As your ZTV (Figure 28.6), and Sections 5.30-6.31 state, these buildings will be visible from the Heritage Assets at Well. At present the largest buildings in the landscape in the line of sight from St Margaret's, Well, to the LN site are chicken sheds, typically no more than 8m high. Your substations will be almost 3 times this (as stated in the scoping). Your two declared buildings at 25m would be the most substantial in the landscape. Therefore we do not agree that the impact will be of 'negligible adverse significance' as claimed in Sections 6.32-6.40 of your PIER.</p>	<p>The Applicant notes this comment, however due to the iterative site selection process and the grid connection confirmation the Lincolnshire Node OnSS is no longer part of the development proposals and the issues no longer need to be addressed.</p>	
258	Well Parish Council	P2_43	<p>The PIER does not include the Heritage Assets of Well, namely the Grade 1 Listed St. Margaret's Church; Grade II* Well Vale Hall (or Well Hall), and the Grade II Coach House, which, according to Historic England, are Heritage Assets of National Importance, whose significance is in the relationship of the assets</p>	<p>The Applicant notes this comment, however due to the iterative site selection process and the grid connection confirmation the Lincolnshire Node OnSS is no longer part of the development proposals and the issues no longer need to be addressed.</p>	



Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
			with the landscape, both the designated landscape and background. This landscape as viewed from St. Margaret's Church has been described by Historic England as a 'rare survival of a 17th century landscape'. The setting and significance of these heritage assets is likely to be substantially harmed if the Lincolnshire Node is chosen as the grid connection point for the ODOW Project since the substations and associated electrical infrastructure i.e. pylons will be visible and, in the case of the Grade I Listed St. Margaret's Church, which is at an elevation of over 40m, clearly visible. While Well Hall Registered Park and Garden, in which all these buildings are set, is a Designated Landscape in the Preliminary Environmental Information (OTOW PIER 6.1.28: 28.4.24), none of these Heritage Assets appear on the Draft Historical Environment Plan (Phase 2 Consultation Document 2.06). On Figure 20.1.7.2 Well Vale Hall (Well Hall) is incorrectly marked as Grade II and St. Margaret's Church is missing. Furthermore, the ZTV (fig.28.at6), understates the visibility of the substations from the latter viewpoint (even at 19m);		
259	Well Parish Council	P2_43	We therefore request the following:  2. That the separate Heritage Assets of Well (Grade II Park and Garden, Grade II Coach House, Grade II * Well Vale Hall and Grade I St. Margaret's Church), and the Lincolnshire Wolds AONB, are included in the PIER, EIA (Environmental Impact Assessment) and ES (Environmental Statement).	The Applicant notes this comment, however due to the iterative site selection process and the grid connection confirmation the Lincolnshire Node OnSS is no longer part of the development proposals and the issues no longer need to be addressed.	
260	Well Parish Council	P2_43	Having reviewed the documents provided in the ODOW (Outer Dowsing Offshore Wind) Phase 2 Consultation and the HG (National Grid) HND (Holistic Network Design), we held an EMG of the Parish Meeting (we have no Parish Council). No-one had any issues with your project and onshore cabling if you connect to the Weston Marsh grid point. It is in keeping with other projects that have landfall in the area, including Viking Link and Triton Knoll.	The Applicant has confirmed that its grid connection will be at Weston Marsh.	
261	Well Parish Council	P2_43	Furthermore, the LN site is a green-field site and, according to your Scoping, your intentions far exceed 2 onshore substations. You are really proposing a substantial complex to include grid support battery array(s) and a hydrogen electrolyser plant. These are not mentioned in the PIER (Document 6), although they are in the Scoping Report (Document 4). There are no details of these Associated Developments in the PIER at all, let alone the extent of the buildings, facilities and the infrastructure required. We believe that you will require many of the facilities detailed in Appendix 2.	The Applicant notes this comment, however due to the iterative site selection process and the grid connection confirmation the Lincolnshire Node OnSS is no longer part of the development proposals and the issues no longer need to be addressed.	
262	Well Parish Council	P2_43	We are disappointed that you have provided inaccurate (understated) information in your Phase 2 Consultation documents. The material provided is totally inadequate for any meaningful assessment of the impact of the proposed ODOW development(s) on communities and the environment. Project sponsors are quoted global corporate citizens and we expect better than this from them.	The Applicant has noted this comment.	
263	Well Parish Council	P2_43	We therefore request the following: 1. That you unilaterally agree to re-scope your PIER to include everything you are actually proposing in the ODOW Application (DCO), and that the Phase 2 Consultation is widened and repeated, including a Public Information Day and Information access point in Alford as well as those places already listed in the Section 48 notice;	The Applicant notes this comment, however due to the iterative site selection process and the grid connection confirmation the Lincolnshire Node OnSS is no longer part of the development proposals and the issues no longer need to be addressed.	
264	Well Parish Council	P2_43	Connecting at the proposed LN requires substantial new NG grid development and reinforcement, for ODOW and the 3 other projects that NG already plan to accommodate at this site.	The Applicant notes this comment, however due to the iterative site selection process and the grid connection confirmation the Lincolnshire Node OnSS is no longer part of the development proposals and the issues no longer need to be addressed.	

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
			We believe that your project (ODOW), and any plans by NG, must be fully disclosed to all interested parties (public and statutory consultees), i.e. this should be a joint Application as one project cannot exist without the other. We believe that anything else lacks equity with respect to the Project, all statutory consultees, and communities from the existing grid point at Scunthorpe to the proposed LN to the grid connection at Spalding. It is not possible to access the impact of the ODOW project with a connection at LN without assessing the impact of the NG HND as part of the same process because the two projects cannot exist alone.		
265	Well Parish Council	P2_43	<p>Therefore, if the LN is nominated by the NG as the project's connection site, we request the following:</p> <p>That the ODOW project and NG grid extension from Scunthorpe to Spalding via the LN are treated as one application (DCO). To progress with separate projects is fundamentally unfair on the Project (since NG may not be able to deliver the LN), and all the communities along the route(s), unless a holistic approach is taken. There should be an integrated DCO, EIA and ES because the projects cannot exist separately. (The pylons necessary for the ODOW project alone will be visible from the Heritage Assets of Well, for example). We will write to the Secretary of State under separate cover to request this.</p> <p>Or that the project (ODOW) is put on hold until the DCO (including full EIA), for the NG LN and its entire associated infrastructure (pylons etc.), has been approved.</p>	The Project notes this comment, however due to the iterative site selection process and the grid connection confirmation the Lincolnshire Node OnSS is no longer part of the development proposals and the issues no longer need to be addressed.	
266	Well Parish Council	P2_43	1. The section 48 Notice for the ODOW Project does not itemise all the developments referred to in the Project Scoping (ODOW document 4.1 Scoping Report June, 2023). It states that 'The proposed DCO would, among other things, license and authorise'. The Section 48 Notice is therefore not representative of the Project.	The section 48 Notice has been drafted in accordance with precedent set by similar scale developments.	
267	Well Parish Council	P2_43	<p>Not all the structures/developments mentioned in the Scoping Report (Document 4), are included in the PIER or the publicity material for the Phase 2 Consultation (such as battery storage; green hydrogen production facilities; additional underground cables, more substations; noise enclosures; water tanks; compensation transformers (see Appendix 2)). The size and nature of these are not mentioned in the PIER, even as possibilities. Nor is the siting of these additional developments detailed. It is impossible to assess the potential impact of the Project without knowing exactly what the DCO includes. The EIA should include all proposed developments, scoped to maximum design scenario, and the EIA area should be increased to cover the whole area(s) potentially affected by the Project, as stated in the Guide to Phase 2 Consultation (ODOW Doc 1.1):</p> <p>'1.2.2 The documents submitted as part of the Phase 2 Consultation are intended to provide sufficient information and detail to those taking part in the statutory consultation process to understand the nature, scale, location and likely significant environmental effects of the Project, based on the information available at this stage, so they can make an informed contribution through the statutory pre-application consultation requirements of the 2008 Act and the EIA Regulations. Phase 2 documents include the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PIER) for consultation to inform the DCO Application as part</p>	The Applicant has noted this comment. The Project has undertaken a total of five consultation phases to allow interested parties to engage with the development of the proposals. The Project's approach to consultation and refinements are set out in Chapter 4 Site Selection and the Consultation Report.	6.1.4 Site Selection and 5.1 Consultation Report

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
			of the Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP) Process'. It appears that the Project has not followed its own guidelines.		
268	Well Parish Council	P2_43	3. The disclaimer at the start of every volume: 'Outer Dowsing Offshore Wind accepts no liability for the accuracy or completeness of the information in this document nor for any loss or damage arising from the use of such information' means that non of the information provided can be relied upon.	This is a standard disclaimer that is standard practice for developments of a similar scale and size.	
269	Well Parish Council	P2_43	4. In the Exhibition Panel: 'The Application Process', no time is allocated for a full EIA of the Project.	A full EIA has been undertaken for the Project.	
270	Well Parish Council	P2_43	5. The PIER is unacceptable for the following reasons: a. the information provided is insufficient to allow consultees 'to understand the nature, scale, location, and likely significant environmental effects of the Project... so that they can make an informed contribution through the statutory pre-application consultation requirements of the 2008 Act and the EIA Regulations' (Guide to the Phase 2 Consultation (ODOW Doc. 1.1));	The Applicant has noted this comment. The Applicant has undertaken a total of five consultation phases to allow interested parties to engage with the development of the proposals. The Project's approach to consultation and refinements are set out in Chapter 4 Site Selection and the Consultation Report.	6.1.4 Site Selection and 5.1 Consultation Report
271	Well Parish Council	P2_43	b. The PIER area is far too narrow and appears to have been scoped mainly to account for the environmental impact of the buried cables and two substation buildings which is a gross understatement of the true size of the project;	The Applicant has noted this comment. The Applicant has undertaken a total of five consultation phases to allow interested parties to engage with the development of the proposals. The Applicant's approach to consultation and refinements are set out in Chapter 4 Site Selection and the Consultation Report.	6.1.4 Site Selection and 5.1 Consultation Report
272	Well Parish Council	P2_43	f. There appears to be a discrepancy between the footprint of the substations as depicted on the exhibition panel 'Our Onshore Substation' which illustrates the total footprint at 169,800m2, and the 240,000m2 site area per onshore substation stated in Table 3.5.3 of the Scoping Report.	The Applicant has noted this comment. Discrepancies have been amended in the updated documentation submitted as part of the ES.	
273	Well Parish Council	P2_43	Appendix 2: Plant and Infrastructure at the proposed Lincolnshire Node missing from the PIER: (a) Specifications for buildings required to service each additional offshore project over and above the Outer Dowsing Project. It appears there will at least three other offshore projects. Buildings to house transformers to step up an additional circa 6GW of power from sub 275 kV or 275KV to 400kv. Two of which will be HVDC feed requiring inversion to AC. Buildings/ equipment to facilitate any required modulation as the site will have multiple feeds.	The Applicant has noted this comment., however due to the iterative site selection process and the grid connection confirmation the Lincolnshire Node OnSS is no longer part of the development proposals and the issues no longer need to be addressed.	
274	Well Parish Council	P2_43	Appendix 2: Plant and Infrastructure at the proposed Lincolnshire Node missing from the PIER: (b) Specifications for the infrastructure to add the grid support battery storage facility (including footprints, building dimensions). Grid support storage will be substantial, it usually comes in multiples of 100MW.	The Applicant has noted this comment., however due to the iterative site selection process and the grid connection confirmation the Lincolnshire Node OnSS is no longer part of the development proposals and the issues no longer need to be addressed.	
275	Well Parish Council	P2_43	Appendix 2: Plant and Infrastructure at the proposed Lincolnshire Node missing from the PIER: (c) Specifications of the infrastructure for the Hydrogen Electrolyser Plant and associated site requirements (including configuration, footprints and building dimensions). Including any demineralisation plant, electrolyser(s), compression, sieves for conversion of rough oxygen to product and storage (oxygen and hydrogen). if the rough oxygen is to be vented, specifications of venting facilities, including height, size and dimensions. If the rough oxygen is to be	The Applicant has noted this comment., however due to the iterative site selection process and the grid connection confirmation the Lincolnshire Node OnSS is no longer part of the development proposals and the issues no longer need to be addressed.	

Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
			sieved and turned into saleable product, details of cryogenic storage, liquid oxygen loading and distribution facilities.		
276	Well Parish Council	P2_43	Appendix 2: Plant and Infrastructure at the proposed Lincolnshire Node missing from the PIER:  (d) The site office to run the whole complex, parking and ancillary facilities to provide fire services (Alford fire services are volunteers) and the dimensions of any screens for safety and noise mitigation. Provision of onsite lighting required for a 24/7 operation including its nature, location and any light pollution mitigation planned.	The Applicant has noted this comment., however due to the iterative site selection process and the grid connection confirmation the Lincolnshire Node OnSS is no longer part of the development proposals and the issues no longer need to be addressed.	
277	Well Parish Council	P2_43	Appendix 2: Plant and Infrastructure at the proposed Lincolnshire Node missing from the PIER:  (e) Size and extent of any security measures (including height and likely composition of fencing). The security and integrity of liquid oxygen and high pressure hydrogen (100Bar plus) plant will be paramount. Details of any nitrogen purging (if required) in the case of major incident (such as fire outbreak) including liquid nitrogen storage and venting. The need for a flare (size, height and location). Provision of any blast bunding in the event of catastrophic failure.	The Applicant has noted this comment., however due to the iterative site selection process and the grid connection confirmation the Lincolnshire Node OnSS is no longer part of the development proposals and the issues no longer need to be addressed.	
278	Well Parish Council	P2_43	Appendix 2: Plant and Infrastructure at the proposed Lincolnshire Node missing from the PIER:  (f) The overall site configuration plan and layout to accommodate all of the above  note: see a-e bullets	The Applicant has noted this comment., however due to the iterative site selection process and the grid connection confirmation the Lincolnshire Node OnSS is no longer part of the development proposals and the issues no longer need to be addressed.	
279	Well Parish Council	P2_43	Appendix 2: Plant and Infrastructure at the proposed Lincolnshire Node missing from the PIER:  (g) The Outer Dowsing Project will require at least two 400kV 50m grid connections. NG will most likely extend the Grid from the existing Grid Point east of Scunthorpe to the Lincolnshire Node. In addition NG will likely wish to add a new set of 400kV 50metre pylons south east to the Spalding area grid point. NG have yet to share their detailed pylon routes. The three additional projects in (a) above will require further grid reinforcement, adding a possible three sets of duplicate 50m 400kV pylons into the site from the NW (Scunthorpe) and from the Node to the Spalding area. There is also the possibility of a separate Grid extension towards Cleethorpes and the Humber from the LN.	The Applicant has noted this comment., however due to the iterative site selection process and the grid connection confirmation the Lincolnshire Node OnSS is no longer part of the development proposals and the issues no longer need to be addressed.	
280	Well Parish Council	P2_43	6. The 'Lincolnshire Node' (LN) NG connection point does not yet exist and there is no grid infrastructure at this site. The NG HND report (737773_NGESO_HND_Report_2022) was produced without public consultation or detailed consideration of the environmental and community impact. A Detailed Network Design (DND) has not yet been published by NG. This means that no-one, presumably including the Project, has any idea of the size of the proposed NG Lincolnshire Node development or the route(s) of the associated pylons. If the Lincolnshire Node is chosen by NG as the connection point for the ODOW Project, it will therefore be impossible to assess the impact of the Project without also assessing the impact of the full proposed Lincolnshire Node	The Applicant has noted this comment., however due to the iterative site selection process and the grid connection confirmation the Lincolnshire Node OnSS is no longer part of the development proposals and the issues no longer need to be addressed.	



Ref	Stakeholder	Response ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
			development(s) and all infrastructure included in the DCOs for both the ODOW Project and NG HND.		
281	Well Parish Council	P2_43	Appendix 2: Plant and Infrastructure at the proposed Lincolnshire Node missing from the PIER: (c)... Details of likely daily liquid oxygen lorry movements and any plans for road upgrades to cater for this increased traffic (Asserby is surrounded by single track and B class roads). Your plans for traffic mitigation around Alford in particular, including the size and location of any bypass. (Unless you plan to re-lay and reopen the railway line).	The Applicant has noted this comment., however due to the iterative site selection process and the grid connection confirmation the Lincolnshire Node OnSS is no longer part of the development proposals and the issues no longer need to be addressed.	
282	Weston Parish Council	P2_44	- The project would be taking up excellent Grade 1 agricultural land for the sub-station site, access road to the site and the areas that would be used for the route of the cabling. Disturbance of the land for the cabling would have a long term impact on the agricultural use of the land	Potential long term direct impacts on the agricultural usage of the land as a result of cable route construction has been assessed in Chapter 25 Land Use. Appropriate mitigation measures will be outlined and secured through the final Soil Management Plan which will be drafted in accordance with the Outline Soil Management Plan submitted as part of the DCO application.	8.1.4 Outline Soil Management Plan 6.1.25 Land Use
283	Weston Parish Council	P2_44	Residents in the area affected particularly by the proposed sub-station are concerned primarily by the size and visual aspects of the sub-station and would want to press for screening in the form of trees etc to be carried out at the initial stage	The mitigation planting plan is shown in Figure 28.15 and included in the visualisations in the appendices of LVIA. Mitigation planting is outlined in the OLEMS.	6.2.28.15 Figure 28.15 6.3.28.1 LVIA Appendices 8.10 OLEMS

### 3 Applicant Regard to Autumn Section 42 Consultation Responses

#### 3.1 Offshore

Table 3.1 Applicant Regard to Section 42 Autumn Consultation Responses (Offshore)

Ref	Response Ref	Stakeholder	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
1	AC_11	Marine Management Organisation	<p><u>1. Refinements to Project Parameter</u></p> <p>1.1 The document entitled ‘Outer Dowsing Offshore Wind – Autumn Consultation – Environmental Update Report. October 2023. Anonymous author (2023)’ details refinements to project parameters that have been proposed since the PEIR was submitted. The report does not attempt to respond to any concerns raised at the PEIR stage, rather, it describes the potential environmental impacts of these refinements, and it sets out how they will be addressed in the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA).</p> <p>1.2. The offshore changes are summarised below:• 100 Wind Turbine Generators (WTGs) to be installed. The original PEIR included 93.  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• After a review of geophysical and geotechnical data, the Project has made the commitment of a maximum 50% inclusion of Gravity Base System (GBS) Foundations for turbines &amp; platforms (not Artificial Nesting Structures). The original PEIR had 100% GBS foundations.</li> <li>• Minimum Wind Turbine Generator tip height increased to 40 metres (m) above Mean Sea Level (MSL) to minimise the impacts of the Project on bird species. The original PEIR had detailed a 30m tip height.</li> <li>• The Offshore Reactive Compensation Platforms (ORCPs) will be located at least 12 kilometres (km) from the shore. The original PEIR detailed the distance as being 6km.</li> </ul> </p> <p>1.3. MMO notes that there are additional changes that relate to onshore elements of the project.MMO defers to other associated consultees for their assessment of impacts from these onshore changes.</p> <p>1.4. The wind farm is referred to hereafter as Outer Dowsing Offshore Wind Farm (ODOW).</p> <p>1.5. MMO has reviewed the consultation documents received 20 October 2023 in consultation with our scientific advisors at the Centre for Environment, Fisheries and Aquaculture Science (Cefas) and sets out our initial comments below.</p> <p>1.6. MMO reserves the right to make further comments on the Project throughout the preapplication process and may modify its present advice or opinion in view of any additional information that may come to our attention.</p>	<p>The Applicant has noted this response. Comments raised during the Phase 2 Consultation have been reviewed and the Applicant's Regard for these is set out in Appendix 5.1.4b to the Consultation Report and where relevant in topic specific ES chapters.</p>	5.1.4 Consultation Responses
2	AC_11	Marine Management Organisation	<p><u>2. Marine Processes</u></p> <p>2.1. MMO notes that impacts on the Marine Processes assessments are summarised in Table 3.3 of the Environmental Update Report.</p> <p>2.2. Table 3.3 indicates that updated hydrodynamic modelling will be presented, despite the suggestion that no new or materially different impacts will arise as a result of the changes.MMO concurs with the applicant’s approach, albeit recognising that the Environmental Update Report does not specify in detail what updates will in fact be made</p>	<p>The Applicant welcomes the comments from the MMO. The updates to the modelling were discussed at the ETG in November 2023 with no comments from stakeholders.</p>	

Ref	Response Ref	Stakeholder	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
3	AC_11	Marine Management Organisation	<p>to the modelling, and therefore that these changes will need to be reviewed as and when completed. MMO would welcome this as part of the evidence plan process.</p> <p><u>3. Marine Sediment and Water Quality</u></p> <p>3.1. With regard to marine sediment and water quality, the Environmental Update Report states that the increased number of turbines alone would be expected to increase total sediment displacement and the associated effects to water and sediment quality, but when considering the reduction in number of GBS (as the worst-case foundation type for seabed impacts and sediment displacement volumes) the changes to the project design are not expected to result in new or materially different impacts than assessed at PEIR and that hydrodynamic modelling will be undertaken to inform the Environmental Statement (ES). MMO agrees with this statement.</p> <p>3.2. As the number of gravity bases has been reduced to 50% the likely estimated volume for relocation/dredging is likely to be lower. Therefore table 1 (summarised in Annex 1) in the PEIR, must be amended to take the changes in design into account. This is to be able to inform consideration of the need for designation of a disposal site(s).</p> <p>3.3. A summary of the expected area and volume of dredge material from the works (e.g., bed levelling, trenching or arisings) should be provided. This is to be able to inform considerations for disposal of the material.</p> <p>3.4. MMO requests the inclusion of a discussion on the requirement for a disposal site to be designated across the array and/or Export Cable Corridor (EEC) area together with potential beneficial use or existing disposal sites for the disposal of sediment/arisings as a result of proposed seabed preparation activities, and where appropriate provide adequate characterisation. MMO requests that this information is provided at the earliest opportunity so any disposal sites can be designated and included within the DML.</p> <p>3.5. Although reference is made to the reduction in the requirement for the number of gravity bases, it is not known from reading the Environmental Update Report whether there will be a need for an increase in the need for scour protection (rock dumping) due to the change in foundation, this must be amended as appropriate if required.</p>	<p>The Applicant welcomes the agreement from the MMO with regard to the combined effect of the change to the number of turbines and the reduction of the number of GBS. The Applicant has considered the need for disposal sites as part of the updated assessment presented in the ES and has provided a disposal site characterisation report alongside the DCO application. Changes to the scour protection required following design refinement has been considered within the ES, specifically in Chapter 7 Marine Physical Processes.</p>	6.1.7 Marine Physical Processes
4	AC_11	Marine Management Organisation	<p><u>4. Benthic and Intertidal Ecology</u></p> <p>4.1. MMO notes that there are no proposed changes to the benthic ecology receptors that are scoped in or out. This is appropriate, as the proposed refinements to project parameters are unlikely to alter the benthic ecology receptors that require consideration.</p> <p>4.2. The Environmental Update Report concludes that the increase in the number of WTGs combined with the reduction in the proportion of WTGs and offshore platforms that have gravity base system foundations is not expected to result in new or materially different impacts than assessed in the PEIR (Table 3.2 of the Environmental Update Report). MMO is in agreement, however, the impacts of all 100 WTGs and foundations should be fully assessed in the EIA.</p> <p>4.3. In addition to this if there is an increase in scour protection to the remaining WTG the assessment and impact from invasive species should be updated.</p> <p>4.4. MMO agrees with the conclusion that increasing the maximum turbine tip height</p>	<p>The Applicant has noted this response. The impacts of the refinements proposed in the Environmental Update Report have been incorporated and assessed in the ES including impact from invasive species due to increase in scour protection.</p>	

Ref	Response Ref	Stakeholder	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
			<p>does not have a pathway for impact on benthic ecology receptors PEIR (Table 3.2 of the Environmental Update Report).</p> <p>4.5. The Environmental Update Report concludes that increasing the distance of ORCPs from the shore to a minimum of 12km will not have any effect because ORCP locations were modelled at 12km in the PEIR (Table 3.2 of the Environmental Update Report). MMO is in agreement with this.</p>		
5	AC_11	Marine Management Organisation	<p><u>5. Fish and Shellfish Ecology – Shellfish</u></p> <p>5.1. Comments on the PEIR have been provided previously in the MMO letter dated 21 July 2023 and are unaffected by the design changes listed in the Environmental Update Report.</p>	The Applicant has noted this response. Comments raised during the Phase 2 Consultation have been reviewed and the Applicant's Regard for these is set out in Appendix 5.1.4 to the Consultation Report	5.1.4 Consultation Responses
6	AC_11	Marine Management Organisation	<p><u>6. Fish and Shellfish Ecology – Fish</u></p> <p>6.1. Regarding the increase in the number of turbines, the Environmental Update Report acknowledges that this change would be expected to increase impacts to fish ecology. However, when considering the reduction in number of gravity base foundations in terms of a worst-case for temporary/permanent habitat loss and changes to suspended sediment concentrations and sediment deposition, the changes to the project design are not expected to result in new or materially different impacts than assessed at PEIR. MMO agrees with this conclusion.</p> <p>6.2. In light of the increased number of turbines now proposed, the Environmental Update Report recognises that this may lead to an increase in the duration of underwater noise impacts overall from piling and states that:  “the Project’s commitment to reduce the array area before DCO submission will reduce the spatial impact from piling noise. Therefore, when considering the balance between the spatial and temporal impacts from underwater noise associated with piling, the changes to the project design are not expected to result in new or materially different impacts than assessed at PEIR. However, updated noise modelling will be undertaken to inform the ES”.</p> <p>MMO agrees and supports the proposal to update the underwater noise modelling based on the increase in the number of wind turbines that will need to be installed using percussive piling. MMO would welcome review of this information prior to application submission as part of the evidence plan process.</p>	The Applicant welcomes the comments from the MMO. The updated noise modelling has been presented within the ES and forms the basis of the assessment of impacts to fish and shellfish receptors.	
7	AC_11	Marine Management Organisation	<p><u>7. Marine Mammals</u></p> <p>7.1. Table 3.5 considers the proposed refinements against each of the various offshore technical topics assessed at PEIR. As noted above, for fish and shellfish, and marine mammals, the table concludes that:  “for underwater noise effects, whilst the increased number of turbines could lead to a slight increase in the duration of underwater noise impacts overall from piling, the Project’s commitment to reduce the array area before DCO submission will reduce the spatial impact from piling noise. Therefore, when considering the balance between the spatial and temporal impacts from underwater noise associated with piling, the changes to the project design are not expected to result in new or materially different impacts than assessed at PEIR. However, updated noise modelling will be undertaken to inform the ES”.</p> <p>It is appropriate that updated noise modelling will be undertaken, and this should be</p>	The Applicant welcomes the comments from the MMO. The updated noise modelling has been presented within the ES and forms the basis of the assessment of impacts to marine mammal receptors.	



Ref	Response Ref	Stakeholder	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
			representative of the worst-case scenarios. MMO would welcome review of this information prior to application submission as part of the evidence plan process.		
8	AC_11	Marine Management Organisation	<p><u>8. Offshore and Intertidal Ornithology</u></p> <p>8.1. The MMO defers to Natural England regarding the potential impacts to offshore ornithology and will maintain a watching brief on anything that may fall within the MMO's remit – such as DML conditions.</p>	The Applicant has noted this comment.	
9	AC_11	Marine Management Organisation	<p><u>9. Marine and Intertidal Archaeology</u></p> <p>9.1. The MMO defers to Historic England regarding the potential impacts to offshore archaeology that may occur because of the refinements.</p> <p>9.2. The MMO will maintain a watching brief on anything that may fall within the MMO's remit – such as DML conditions.</p>	The Applicant has noted this comment.	
10	AC_11	Marine Management Organisation	<p><u>10. Commercial Fisheries</u></p> <p>10.1. Regarding stakeholder awareness of this proposal, MMO is not aware of any engagement with fishers and other legitimate users of the sea in the area. As commercial fishers on the North Sea coast have been expressing increased concerns, via various channels, regarding projects of this nature causing spatial squeeze, MMO would like to encourage continued consultation and engagement with commercial fishers within the International Council for the Exploration of the Seas (ICES) area IVc.</p> <p>10.2. Additionally, and as noted in our response to the PEIR dated 21 July 2023, MMO recommends early engagement with National Federation of Fishermen's Organisations (NFFO), Inshore Fisheries and Conservation Authorities (IFCA) and local harbour authorities, including the early appointment of a Fisheries Liaison Officer.</p>	The Applicant can confirm that engagement with fishers has been ongoing since the early stages of the Project, with details of the consultation undertaken presented within Chapter 14 Commercial Fisheries chapter, including that undertaken with the NFFO, IFCA and other stakeholders and Chapter 6 Technical Consultation.	6.1.14 Commercial Fisheries, 6.1.6 Technical Consultation
11	AC_11	Marine Management Organisation	<p><u>11. Shipping and Navigation</u></p> <p>11.1. The MMO defers to the Maritime and Coastguard Agency and Trinity House and relevant Harbour Authorities regarding the potential impacts on shipping and navigation that may occur because of the refinements.</p> <p>11.2. The MMO will maintain a watching brief on anything that may fall within the MMO's remit – such as DML conditions.</p>	The Applicant has noted this comment.	
12	AC_11	Marine Management Organisation	<p><u>12. Aviation, Radar, Military and Communication</u></p> <p>12.1. The MMO defers to the Civil Aviation Authority and Ministry of Defence regarding the potential impacts on shipping and navigation that may occur because of the refinements</p>	The Applicant has noted this comment.	
13	AC_11	Marine Management Organisation	<p><u>13. Seascape, Landscape and Visual</u></p> <p>13.1. The MMO defers to the statutory advice provided by the Natural England or Local Planning Authority regarding the potential impacts to the seascape that may occur because of the refinements.</p> <p>13.2. The MMO will maintain a watching brief on anything that may fall within the MMO's remit – such as DML conditions.</p>	The Applicant has noted this comment.	

Ref	Response Ref	Stakeholder	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
14	AC_11	Marine Management Organisation	<p><u>14. Marine Infrastructure and Other Users</u></p> <p>14.1. The MMO has no comments on this chapter.</p>	The Applicant has noted this comment.	
15	AC_11	Marine Management Organisation	<p><u>15. Conclusion</u></p> <p>The MMO welcomes the progress GTR4 Limited has made to date to assess the environmental impacts of the ODOW project, particularly in light of the refinements to the Project. However, the MMO requires the points raised in this response, and those raised within the PEIR response dated 21 July 2023, to be addressed within the ES. In addition to this the MMO would welcome early engagement and review of any updated reports or modelling as part of the evidence plan process to ensure that only major topics of disagreement are discussed past the application stage.</p> <p>Please note this letter comprises the MMO's initial comments in respect of the Outer Dowsing Offshore Wind Farm Environmental Update Report and is without prejudice to any future representation the MMO may make about the proposed Project and associated documents.</p>	The Applicant has noted this response. Comments raised during the Phase 2 Consultation have been reviewed and the Applicant's Regard for these is set out in Appendix 5.1.4 to the Consultation Report. This has been discussed with the MMO through the EPP and ETGs.	5.1.4 Consultation Responses
16	AC_16	NATS	<p><u>4.2. En-route Navigational Aid Assessment</u></p> <p>4.2.1. Predicted Impact on Navigation Aids</p> <p>No impact is anticipated on NATS' navigation aids</p>	The Applicant has noted this comment.	
17	AC_16	NATS	<p><u>4.3. En-route Radio Communication Assessment</u></p> <p>4.3.1. Predicted Impact on the Radio Communications Infrastructure</p> <p>No impact is anticipated on NATS' radio communications infrastructure</p>	The Applicant has noted this comment.	
18	AC_16	NATS	<p><u>5. Conclusions</u></p> <p>5.1. En-route Consultation</p> <p>The proposed development has been examined by technical and operational safeguarding teams. A technical impact is anticipated, this has been deemed to be unacceptable.</p> <p>Refer to Appendix A - Background RADAR Theory within the consultation response</p>	The Applicant has noted this comment.	
19	AC_27	RSPB	<p><u>Offshore ornithology</u></p> <p>Mainly due to resource constraints, the RSPB has been unable to fully review and provide detailed comments on the offshore ornithology aspects of the Outer Dowsing proposal in the PEIR documents and the changes proposed in the Autumn Consultation, including the without prejudice compensation strategy. We will continue to contribute to the consideration of these matters through the relevant Expert Topic Group.</p>	The Applicant has noted this comment. The Applicant has continued to engage with RSPB through bilateral engagement and the EPP and ETGs. Updated ornithology documents have been submitted as part of the Applicant's DCO application.	
20	AC_12	Ministry of Environment of Denmark	<p>Denmark thanks for the notification regarding OWF project "Outer Dowsing Offshore Wind" and wants to participate in the further environmental assessment process.</p> <p>The notification has been sent for consultation to several Danish authorities and interest organizations and has been published on the Danish Environmental Protection Agency's website.</p> <p>Consultation responses have been received from the following, which are attached to this email:</p> <p><u>Authorities</u></p> <p>- The Environmental Protection Agency; the unit: Marine and Water Environment: Have no comments but wish to participate in the further process.</p> <p><u>Associations/Organisations</u></p> <p>- Danish Shipping Companies say: For our member shipping company DFDS, which i.a.</p>	The Applicant has noted this comment, as outlined in Chapter 15 Shipping and Navigation, based on feedback received the northern array area boundary was reduced leaving to increased searoom and lower deviations and understand that DFDS are broadly content with the changes incorporated.	6.1.15 Shipping and Navigation

Ref	Response Ref	Stakeholder	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
			sailing from Esbjerg, Hornsea 3 will have a big impact. In order to counter some of these impacts, we would like this to be taken into account in the Outer Dowsing Wind Project, by reducing the northern extent of the Outer Dowsing Wind so that it is ensured that DFDS can sail in a more direct line south of Hornsea 3 in towards the entrance to the Humber.		
21	AC_8	Joint Nature Conservation Committee	<p>Thank you for consulting JNCC on the Outer Dowsing Offshore Wind Further Statutory Pre-Application Consultation under Section 42 and Section 44, which we received on 20/10/2023.</p> <p>Natural England is now authorised to exercise the JNCC’s functions as a statutory consultee in respect of certain applications for offshore waters (0-200nm) adjacent to England. Therefore, Natural England should provide a full response. Where required Natural England will contact JNCC directly if any additional input is required.</p> <p>As such JNCC have not reviewed this application and will not be providing further comment as an individual consultee.</p>	The Applicant has noted this comment.	
22	AC_25	Norwegian Environment Agency	<p>The Norwegian Environment Agency, as point of contact for the Espoo convention, acknowledge receipt of the consultation on the proposed application for Outer Dowsing Offshore Wind.</p> <p>The Norwegian Environment Agency have consulted relevant authorities, and there are no comments from Norway at this stage.</p>	The Applicant has noted this comment.	
23	ac_34	Health and Safety Executive	<p><u>Would Hazardous Substance Consent be needed?</u> Based on the phase 2 consultation documents and the Autumn Consultation Report at <a href="https://www.outerdowsing.com/phase-2-consultation/">https://www.outerdowsing.com/phase-2-consultation/</a>, and Environmental Update Report (outerdowsing.com) it is not clear whether the applicant has considered the hazard classification of any chemical substances that may be proposed to be present at the development. This may be because there are none due to the nature of the scheme.</p> <p>The HSE would like to highlight that hazardous substances consent [‘HSC’] is required to store or use any of the Categories of Substances or Named Hazardous Substances set out in Schedule 1 of The Planning (Hazardous Substances) Regulations 2015 as amended, if those hazardous substances will be present on, over or under the land at or above the controlled quantities. Also, there is an “addition rule” in Paragraph 5 Part 4 of Schedule 1 for below-threshold substances. Further information on HSC should be sought from the relevant Hazardous Substances Authority.</p>	The Applicant does not anticipate a requirement for hazardous substances.	
24	AC_6	Health and Safety Executive	<p><u>Consideration of Risk Assessments</u> Regulation 5(4) of the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 requires the assessment of significant effects to include, where relevant, the expected significant effects arising from the proposed development’s vulnerability to major accidents. HSE’s role in NSIPs is summarised in Advice Note 11 ‘working with public bodies in the infrastructure planning process’ Annex G on the Planning Inspectorate’s website [Advice Note Eleven, Annex G – The Health and Safety Executive   National Infrastructure Planning (planninginspectorate.gov.uk)]. This document includes consideration of risk assessments under the heading “Risk assessments”.</p> <p>In the phase 2 consultation documents and the Autumn Consultation Report, it was not clear if there was consideration of risk assessments arising from the development’s vulnerability to major accidents. We would advise this is considered further in line with Advice Note 11 Annex on the Planning Inspectorate’s website - Annex G – The Health and</p>	The Applicant has noted this response. Risk assessments have been carried out throughout the chapters of the Environmental Statement and mitigation measures, best practices and protocols are secured in the Outline CoCP. Contractors will be required to prepare a Health, Safety and Environment Plan	

Ref	Response Ref	Stakeholder	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
			Safety Executive taking account of the following: "it may be beneficial for applicants to undertake a risk assessment as early as possible to satisfy themselves that their design and operation will meet the requirements of relevant health and safety legislation as design of the Proposed Development progresses."		
25	AC_6	Health and Safety Executive	<u>Explosives sites</u> CEMHD 7's response remains the same as previous response - no comment to make as there are no HSE licenced explosives sites in the vicinity of the proposed development	The Applicant has noted this comment.	
26	AC_6	Health and Safety Executive	<u>Electrical Safety</u> No comment from a planning perspective.	The Applicant has noted this comment.	
27	AC_26	Peterborough City Council	Further to your enquiry received on 20 October 2023, in respect of the above, the Local Planning Authority makes the following comments:  The off-shore elements of the proposal are remote from the Peterborough area, and the associated on-shore infrastructure is considered unlikely to impact on the Peterborough area. As such, Peterborough City Council has no comments at this time. I trust that the above advice is of use however should you have any further queries, please do not hesitate to contact me on the details shown at the top of this letter.	The Applicant has noted this comment.	
28	#VALUE!	NATS	<u>4.1. En-route RADAR Technical Assessment</u> 4.1.1. Predicted Impact on Claxby RADAR Using the theory as described in Appendix A and development specific propagation profile it has been determined that the terrain screening available will not adequately attenuate the signal, and therefore this development is likely to cause false primary plots to be generated. A reduction in the RADAR's probability of detection, for real aircraft, is also anticipated.  4.1.2. Predicted Impact on Cromer RADAR Using the theory as described in Appendix A and development specific propagation profile it has been determined that the terrain screening available will not adequately attenuate the signal, and therefore this development is likely to cause false primary plots to be generated. A reduction in the RADAR's probability of detection, for real aircraft, is also anticipated.  4.1.3. En-route operational assessment of RADAR impact Where an assessment reveals a technical impact on a specific NATS' RADAR, the users of that RADAR are consulted to ascertain whether the anticipated impact is acceptable to their operations or not. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Aberdeen ATC Unacceptable</li> <li>• Prestwick Centre ATC Unacceptable</li> <li>• Swanwick ATC Unacceptable</li> <li>• Military ATC Unacceptable</li> </ul> Note: The technical impact, as detailed above, has also been passed to non-NATS users of the affected RADAR, this may have included other planning consultees such as the MOD or other airports. Should these users consider the impact to be unacceptable it is expected that they will contact the planning authority directly to raise their concerns	The Applicant thanks NATS for their comments and confirms that the relevant Radar sites have been considered within the ES. The Applicant is engaging with NATS to agree appropriate mitigation for the residual impacts, noting that the Applicant has proposed an extension of the existing Transponder Mandatory Zones which were instigated to mitigate for existing offshore wind projects in the locale.	



### 3.2 Onshore

Table 3.2 Applicant Regard to Section 42 Autumn Consultation Responses (Onshore)

Ref	Stakeholder	Response Ref	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
1	Boston Borough Council	AC_1	<p><b>Cable Route</b> The cable route through BBC is located in the countryside where there are (obviously) fewer dwellings. However, the route is near to isolated dwellings and passes by a number of villages. Many fall into 'Other Service Centres and Settlements' in Policy 1: Spatial Strategy of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan and do not have allocated housing sites. A few fall into 'Minor Service Centres' in that policy and do allocate housing sites, but these are not near the route. It is important that noise impacts are properly assessed and the management plans that will be a requirement by the DCO provide suitable protection from noise and dust impacts from installing the cable and storing soil during the process that satisfies the Environmental Health teams in BBC and SHDC.</p> <p>The cable route redline now excludes the Doves Lane Local Wildlife site near Butterwick and so it should not be impacted by the installation of the cables. The Hobhole Drain and Havenside LWS are crossed and this will be by direct drilling so should protect the habitat.</p> <p>The cable route crosses the Haven near to the RSPB reserve at Frampton. They are preparing a Landscape Recovery Bid (LRB) that includes land where the cable will run. RSPB have advised me the developers are aware of this project. Clearly if both projects proceed Outer Dowsing may be able to assist in the LRB as they reinstate the cable route, although that maybe outside the LDO requirements.</p> <p>The route also passes near to the 'South Bank Fosdyke' LWS that lies against the River Welland. The cable route is on the opposite bank and so will not affect the LWS. However, what is assumed to be a haul road route, runs directly against the LWS and so protection measures need to be clearly stated. This haul route runs towards the National Grid substation site that will be considered in a separate application.</p> <p>Boston Borough's impact from the cable route will be temporary and once installed the farmed landscape recovers as we have experienced with other cable routes for other infrastructure proposals.</p>	<p>Chapter 26 Onshore Noise and Vibration describes all the noise assessment undertaken including any identified impacts and mitigation measures. A detailed Noise and Vibration Management Plan (NVMP) has been submitted as part of the DCO application.</p> <p>The Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) details control measures which are required to prevent/avoid or reduce and mitigate potential impacts from construction dust. The plan forms part of the Construction Code of Practice (CoCP), which is secured as a requirement of the DCO and will be approved by relevant consultees. Furthermore, soils will be handled and managed in line with the Outline Soil Management Plan (Document 8.1.3).</p> <p>The plans form part of the CoCP, which is secured as a requirement of the DCO and will be approved by the relevant consultees.</p> <p>A meeting was held between the Applicant and RSPB on 20 October 2023, to understand more about the Greater Frampton Vision project and opportunities for the Project to support and contribute to it.</p> <p>The design shows a temporary enabling access running parallel to, and south of, South Bank Fosdyke LWS. Prior to commencement of the construction phase, it is necessary for workforce employees and construction machinery to gain entry to the working area before the main construction access points and haul road have been completed. To facilitate this entry, the project has identified a number of existing farm tracks and other access avenues, which are currently used by landowners with farm machinery, that the project intends to utilise as 'enabling accesses'. Once the construction of the haul road and construction access points have been established, the enabling accesses would no longer be required by the Project. As these tracks are currently used to transport farm machinery, the work required to facilitate their use will be minimal, limited to vegetation clearance, laying of track matting and associated packing (or similar) to level the track and/ or protect the ground surface during periods of wet weather, erection of associated signage and HSE goal posts, as required. The use of these enabling accesses will be limited to a maximum of two months, after which vehicles needed to enter and exit the work area will do so via the temporary construction accesses.</p>	<p>8.1.1 Outline NVMP 8.1.3 Outline SMP 8.1.2 Outline AQMP 8.1 Outline CoCP</p>
2	Boston Borough Council	AC_1	<p><b>Substation</b> The Outer Dowsing Substation site landscaping is bounded to the north by the Risegate Eau that is also a LWS. However, the red line also crosses this LWS, possibly indicating a bridge for an access to the A16. This needs clarifying.</p> <p>The main impact of this scheme is the substation in SHDC as it is positioned close to the A16. The proposal contains significant landscaping and this will take time to fully screen the substation. However, there are quite significant existing planting belts</p>	<p>Post consent, mitigation planting, secured in the OLEMS, will be designed in detail and in respect of planting along the A16 this will involve new planting being integrated with existing planting to bolster and enhance the existing screen. To ensure the worst-case-scenario has been covered in LVIA terms, the maximum design scenario for the assessment is based on the larger footprint of the AIS substation and the taller buildings of the GIS substation. The mitigation planting comprises a 'framework' of shelterbelts designed to link with surrounding hedgerows and tree belts</p>	<p>8.10 OLEMS 6.1.28 LVIA</p>

Ref	Stakeholder	Response Ref	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
			<p>along the A16, which were planted as a result of the road being built. Some of this existing planting is where proposed further planting is indicated on the map. Where there are gaps, for example, to the east of the A16 between Surfleet Bank and Peter Seadike Lane there is a hedge on Surfleet Bank that will close or soften views of the substation whilst the new planting establishes. Although there will be places where the substation will be very clearly visible until new planting becomes established, traffic along the A16 will not have constantly open views of it whilst the landscaping grows.</p> <p>The infrastructure at the substation has not been determined yet. There are two options for switch gear, Air Insulated and Gas Insulated (AIS &amp; GIS). Until that decision has been taken the actual impact in terms of land take and height will be subject to change. The current consultation confirms the AIS footprint has risen by 5h. The equipment height of both types has been reduced by 1m, although the height the land may be raised to, to cater for flood risk is not clear, and so the total height will be more than this from current ground level. The GIS building height has been reduced by 2.5m. Clearly the smaller the land take and the lower the equipment the better but the differences are ameliorated by the scale of the landscape.</p> <p>The indicative viewpoints suggest the infrastructure will be suitably screened. The success of the substation site depends on the quality, establishment and retention of the proposed landscaping on and off the site. The benefit is that it introduces planting into the landscape, which is otherwise relatively sparse. New planting along the A16 provides an almost complete linkage upto the Golf course so habitats begin to connect together.</p> <p>SHDC will be involved with the Local Nature Recovery Strategy that is being led by the County Council, in partnership with all the district Councils and the two unitary councils on the Humber estuary and the Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership. Therefore, despite the initial harm to the landscape the proposal brings, it could benefit habitat, sequester carbon, provide better linkages for wildlife both at the substation site and at the LRB proposal by the RSPB in Frampton.</p>	<p>and extend the network of ecological corridors.</p> <p>The Applicant recognises the potential for ecological benefits associated with the substation planting scheme. The Applicant will look to maximise ecological benefits within this scheme by planting locally appropriate species which comprise a mix of faster growing 'nurse' species and slower growing 'core' species. Whips will be a minimum of 0.8m in height, enabling a more rapid establishment of screening, compared with planting smaller whips.</p>	
3	Boston Borough Council	AC_1	<p><u>Economy and Social Impact</u>            From an economic and social perspective, the Council would like to see the development doing as much as it possibly can to maximise the benefits for local people and businesses for hosting this infrastructure. The local electricity network lacks capacity and so the substation could potentially improve that issue if it includes local 'low voltage' grid upgrades and additional capacity being created within the substation to enable further projects to have capacity to connect. Lack of capacity often holds back local development.</p> <p>Other benefits include enhanced skills offerings, particularly in relation to Net-Zero and energy generation for local people via colleges and Lincoln University student placements; promotional events and supporting communities to engage with the development during construction and during operation – eg skills fairs, procurement advice; use of social value engines to maximise benefits, and development of other schemes, such as related employment development by companies that may benefit from co locating near to the substation, which together can create a positive legacy for hosting this sort of infrastructure.</p>	<p>The economic opportunities from the development of the offshore wind sector are considered to be critical for the economic future of the area.</p> <p>Based on the assumptions and methodology outlined in Chapter 29 Socioeconomics it is estimated that under a worst case scenario the Project could result in the creation of 1,690 years of employment in the Local Economic Area (LEA) and 2,010 years of employment in the Regional Area.</p> <p>In addition to the direct and supply chain impacts the Project will support economic activity through the spending of those employed in its construction. The majority of this economic activity is expected to occur during the construction period and peak in Q3 of 2029 when the construction of the Project is expected to support 680 jobs in the LEA and 810 jobs in the Regional Area.</p>	

Ref	Stakeholder	Response Ref	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
				<p>The Applicant has committed to developing a Procurement Strategy that will consider the role of local suppliers and contribution to skills development.</p> <p>The Applicant is committed to engaging with the local community and the development of a community benefit fund to be launched post consent.</p>	
4	Boston Borough Council	AC_1	<p><u>JRC Windfarm Coordinations Old</u> This proposal is cleared with respect to radio link infrastructure operated by the local energy networks.</p> <p>JRC analyses proposals for wind farms on behalf of the UK Fuel &amp; Power Industry. This is to assess their potential to interfere with radio systems operated by utility companies in support of their regulatory operational requirements.</p> <p>In the case of this proposed wind energy development, JRC does not foresee any potential problems based on known interference scenarios and the data you have provided. However, if any details of the wind farm change, particularly the disposition or scale of any turbine(s), it will be necessary to re-evaluate the proposal.</p> <p>In making this judgement, JRC has used its best endeavours with the available data, although we recognise that there may be effects which are as yet unknown or inadequately predicted. JRC cannot therefore be held liable if subsequently problems arise that we have not predicted.</p> <p>It should be noted that this clearance pertains only to the date of its issue. As the use of the spectrum is dynamic, the use of the band is changing on an ongoing basis and consequently, developers are advised to seek re-coordination prior to considering any design changes.</p>	The Applicant has noted this response.	
5	Boston Borough Council	AC_1	<p><b>Review of the Environmental Update Report</b> At this stage the following comments are offered in connection with the topic areas as listed. As stated in the aforementioned section, where no opinion has been received from in-house advisors at the Council nor has there been an external consultant employed to provide comment then general observations have been put forward at this stage. Due to the content of the updated Environmental Report it is not considered that comments are required from the Local Planning Authority and the degree of changes are generally considered acceptable.</p> <p><u>Landscape and Visual Assessment</u> The changes to the scheme have been reviewed by external consultants Terra Loci. Firstly, we would like to reiterate some comments previously made following various ETG meetings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Scoping out the offshore array area - Following review of the SLVIA Figures Wirelines and Visualisations, it is considered appropriate to scope out the offshore array from LVIA to be assessed separately through the SLVIA.</li> <li>- New substation size and proposed mitigation planting - Figure 28.15 - Surfleet Marsh OnSS Indicative Layout and Mitigation Planting shows general areas and locations for mitigation planning but does not indicate intended height or types of mitigation planting proposed, this should be clarified during assessment. Where off site mitigation planting / hedgerow is shown as under consideration, assessment of</li> </ul>	<p>Information on the mitigation planting is presented in the Outline Landscape and Ecology Mitigation Strategy (OLEMS). This specifies whips would be planted at approximately 0.8m in height and that the anticipated growth of trees would be between 0.4m and 0.5m per annum to give an approximate height range of 6.8 to 8.3m after 15 years of growth. While the OLEMS presents some suggested species, the final planting palette will be developed in the Landscape and Ecology Mitigation Strategy (LEMS) post consent. On-site and off-site mitigation planting is photomontaged in the visualisations for the representative viewpoints and the assessment in the LVIA covers scenarios in which the mitigation planting is and is not taken into account. Noted regarding the appropriateness of the updated viewpoint list for the LVIA. Noted regarding the appropriateness of the maximum design scenario based on the AIS footprint and GIS height - visualisations will be clearly labelled to ensure the distinction is readily apparent</p> <p>The assessment of effects on landscape character is presented in Chapter 28 LVIA with reference to the relevant LCAs for the LVIA study area.</p>	8.10 OLEMS 6.1.28 LVIA

Ref	Stakeholder	Response Ref	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
			<p>effects should be undertaken for scenarios with and without this planting to indicate the effectiveness and potential requirement for this mitigation planting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Updated viewpoint locations - The additional viewpoint locations circulated on the 06/11/23 are more comprehensive and take on board previous comments, these are appropriate to assess the potential for visual impacts. Approach to assessment considering a Project Design Envelope (PDE) based on the AIS footprint and GIS height with visuals showing indicative models of both technologies with the PDE. This proposed PDE appears to consider the 'worst case' scenario from each technology and is an appropriate basis for assessment of potential landscape and visual impacts. The technology modelled in each visual should be clearly indicated.</li> </ul> <p>Secondly, we would like to comment on the September viewpoint consultation as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Without accompanying ZTV analysis, it's difficult to comment on the exact location of potential additional viewpoints.</li> <li>- It's good to see Viewpoints 4 and 5 located along the Macmillan Way and I have no problems with the locations of viewpoints 1, 2 and 3.</li> <li>- However, 5 Viewpoints is on the light side for a development of this scale. Some longer distance views would be useful, particularly from the edges of Surfleet Seas End and Gosberton. I'd like to see around 10 Viewpoints total from close to long distance views to ensure that there is scope to thoroughly assess visual impacts.</li> </ul> <p>Lastly, with regards the latest updated environmental report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The landscape and visual receptors and representative viewpoints need to be submitted and approved prior to the assessment being undertaken. Supporting Zone of Theoretical Visibility mapping should also be provided to ensure that the proposed study area is sufficient.</li> <li>- The full LVIA methodology, including factors and / or matrices used for determining sensitivity of landscape and visual receptors and magnitude and significance of effects should be submitted and approved prior to the assessment being undertaken. The combination of desk and field based study can be sufficient to understand the baseline landscape and visual resource, however complete methodologies are required to agree if the method of assessment is sufficient and appropriate.</li> <li>- All visual representation with any submitted Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) should be in line with The Visual Representation of Development Proposals Technical Guidance Note (TGN) 06/19 (Landscape Institute, September 2019) to ensure the assessment of visual impact is accurate and in turn an appropriate judgement of the assessed impacts can be made. Locations for proposed 'photomontage' visualisations, including visualisation types, following TGN 06/19 should be submitted and approved prior to being undertaken.</li> <li>- The EIA should include a full assessment of the potential impacts of the development on local landscape character using landscape assessment methodologies. The use of Landscape Character Assessment (LCA), based on the good practice guidelines produced jointly by the Landscape Institute and Institute of Environmental Assessment in 2013 is encouraged. LCA provides a sound basis for guiding, informing and understanding the ability of any location to accommodate change and to make positive proposals for conserving, enhancing or regenerating character, as detailed proposals are developed.</li> <li>- It is recommended that any development proposal explores and applies the</li> </ul>		



Ref	Stakeholder	Response Ref	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
			<p>Building with Nature standards and achieves an accreditation to highlight what 'good' looks like at each stage of the GI lifecycle and strengthen the development and demonstrate the development goes beyond the statutory minima, to create places that really deliver for people and wildlife.</p> <p>The assessment should refer to the relevant National Character Areas as published by Natural England. Local landscape character areas should be mapped at a scale appropriate to the development site as well as any relevant management plans or strategies pertaining to the area. The EIA should include assessments of visual effects on the surrounding area and landscape together with any physical effects of the development, such as changes in topography and loss or disturbance of vegetation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- In order to foster high quality development that respects, maintains, or enhances, local landscape character and distinctiveness, the LVIA should consider the character and distinctiveness of the area, with the siting and design of the proposed development reflecting local design characteristics. The EIA process should detail the measures to be taken to ensure the building design will be of a high standard, as well as detail of layout alternatives together with justification of the selected option in terms of landscape impact and benefit.</li> <li>- The assessment should also include the cumulative effect of the development with other relevant existing or proposed developments in the area. A list of proposed cumulative schemes should be submitted and approved prior to the assessment being undertaken. Cumulative impact assessment should include other proposals currently at Scoping stage and onwards. Due to the overlapping timescale of their progress through the planning system, cumulative impact of the proposed development with those proposals currently at Scoping stage would be likely to be a material consideration at the time of determination of the planning application.</li> </ul> <p>Operational effects arising from the Onshore ECC and export cable landfall should be scoped into the assessment as there is potential for a loss of vegetation and alteration of the baseline landscape and visual resource which will be longer lasting than the construction phase and the long-term effectiveness of remediation and mitigation proposals should be considered. Other potential effects identified are sufficient, pending the submission and approval of full landscape and visual receptor groups and representative viewpoints.</p> <p><u>Concluding Remarks</u> This advice is based upon the information available at this time. Please note that the advice is given without prejudice to any future comments made by the Local Planning Authority upon the receipt of further information, whether during or before the submission of a full EIA planning application.</p>		
6	East Lindsey District Council	AC_2	<p><b>Review of the Environmental Update Report</b> At this stage the following comments are offered in connection with the topic areas as listed. As stated in the aforementioned section, where no opinion has been received from in-house advisors at the Council nor has there been an external consultant employed to provide comment then general observations have been put forward at this stage. Due to the content of the updated Environmental Report it is not considered that comments are required from the Local Planning Authority and the degree of changes are considered generally acceptable. We would however like to make several comments on landscape matters which are summarised as follows. We acknowledge that the substation is within the South Holland District and visible</p>	Information on the mitigation planting is presented in the Outline Landscape and Ecology Mitigation Strategy (OLEMS). This specifies whips would be planted at approximately 0.8m in height and that the anticipated growth of trees would be between 0.4m and 0.5m per annum to give an approximate height range of 6.8 to 8.3m after 15 years of growth. While the OLEMS presents some suggested species, the final planting palette will be developed in the Landscape and Ecology Mitigation Strategy (LEMS) post consent. On-site and off-site mitigation planting is photomontaged in the visualisations for the representative viewpoints and the assessment in the LVIA covers scenarios in which the	

Ref	Stakeholder	Response Ref	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
			<p>from Boston BC so we have avoided comment on that aspect.</p> <p><u>Landscape and Visual Assessment</u>            The changes to the scheme have been reviewed by external consultants Terra Loci. Firstly, we would like to reiterate some comments previously made following various ETG meetings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Scoping out the offshore array area - Following review of the SLVIA Figures Wirelines and Visualisations, it is considered appropriate to scope out the offshore array from LVIA to be assessed separately through the SLVIA.</li> <li>- Updated viewpoint locations - The additional viewpoint locations circulated on the 06/11/23 are more comprehensive and take on board previous comments, these are appropriate to assess the potential for visual impacts. Approach to assessment considering a Project Design Envelope (PDE) based on the AIS footprint and GIS height with visuals showing indicative models of both technologies with the PDE. This proposed PDE appears to consider the 'worst case' scenario from each technology and is an appropriate basis for assessment of potential landscape and visual impacts. The technology modelled in each visual should be clearly indicated.</li> </ul> <p>Secondly, with regards the latest updated environmental report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The landscape and visual receptors and representative viewpoints need to be submitted and approved prior to the assessment being undertaken. Supporting Zone of Theoretical Visibility mapping should also be provided to ensure that the proposed study area is sufficient.</li> <li>- The full LVIA methodology, including factors and / or matrices used for determining sensitivity of landscape and visual receptors and magnitude and significance of effects should be submitted and approved prior to the assessment being undertaken. The combination of desk and field based study can be sufficient to understand the baseline landscape and visual resource, however complete methodologies are required to agree if the method of assessment is sufficient and appropriate.</li> <li>- All visual representation with any submitted Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) should be in line with The Visual Representation of Development Proposals Technical Guidance Note (TGN) 06/19 (Landscape Institute, September 2019) to ensure the assessment of visual impact is accurate and in turn an appropriate judgement of the assessed impacts can be made. Locations for proposed 'photomontage' visualisations, including visualisation types, following TGN 06/19 should be submitted and approved prior to being undertaken.</li> <li>- The EIA should include a full assessment of the potential impacts of the development on local landscape character using landscape assessment methodologies. The use of Landscape Character Assessment (LCA), based on the good practice guidelines produced jointly by the Landscape Institute and Institute of Environmental Assessment in 2013 is encouraged. LCA provides a sound basis for guiding, informing and understanding the ability of any location to accommodate change and to make positive proposals for conserving, enhancing or regenerating character, as detailed proposals are developed.</li> <li>- It is recommended that any development proposal explores and applies the Building with Nature standards and achieves an accreditation to highlight what 'good' looks like at each stage of the GI lifecycle and strengthen the development and demonstrate the development goes beyond the statutory minima, to create places that really deliver for people and wildlife.</li> </ul>	<p>mitigation planting is and is not taken into account. Noted regarding the appropriateness of the updated viewpoint list for the LVIA. Noted regarding the appropriateness of the maximum design scenario based on the AIS footprint and GIS height - visualisations will be clearly labelled to ensure the distinction is readily apparent</p>	

Ref	Stakeholder	Response Ref	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
			<p>- The assessment should refer to the relevant National Character Areas as published by Natural England. Local landscape character areas should be mapped at a scale appropriate to the development site as well as any relevant management plans or strategies pertaining to the area. The EIA should include assessments of visual effects on the surrounding area and landscape together with any physical effects of the development, such as changes in topography and loss or disturbance of vegetation.</p> <p>- In order to foster high quality development that respects, maintains, or enhances, local landscape character and distinctiveness, the LVIA should consider the character and distinctiveness of the area, with the siting and design of the proposed development reflecting local design characteristics. The Environmental Impact Assessment process should detail the measures to be taken to ensure the building design will be of a high standard, as well as detail of layout alternatives together with justification of the selected option in terms of landscape impact and benefit.</p> <p>- The assessment should also include the cumulative effect of the development with other relevant existing or proposed developments in the area. A list of proposed cumulative schemes should be submitted and approved prior to the assessment being undertaken. Cumulative impact assessment should include other proposals currently at Scoping stage and onwards. Due to the overlapping timescale of their progress through the planning system, cumulative impact of the proposed development with those proposals currently at Scoping stage would be likely to be a material consideration at the time of determination of the planning application.</p> <p>- Operational effects arising from the Onshore ECC and export cable landfall should be scoped into the assessment as there is potential for a loss of vegetation and alteration of the baseline landscape and visual resource which will be longer lasting than the construction phase and the long-term effectiveness of remediation and mitigation proposals should be considered.</p> <p>Other potential effects identified are sufficient, pending the submission and approval of full landscape and visual receptor groups and representative viewpoints.</p> <p><b>Concluding Remarks</b> This advice is based upon the information available at this time. Please note that the advice is given without prejudice to any future comments made by the Local Planning Authority upon the receipt of further information, whether during or before the submission of a full EIA planning application.</p>		
7	South Holland District Council	AC_28	<p><u>Cable Route</u> The cable route through BBC is located in the countryside where there are (obviously) fewer dwellings. However, the route is near to isolated dwellings and passes by a number of villages. Many fall into 'Other Service Centres and Settlements' in Policy 1: Spatial Strategy of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan and do not have allocated housing sites. A few fall into 'Minor Service Centres' in that policy and do allocate housing sites, but these are not near the route. It is important that noise impacts are properly assessed and the management plans that will be a requirement by the DCO provide suitable protection from noise and dust impacts from installing the cable and storing soil during the process that satisfies the Environmental Health teams in BBC and SHDC.</p> <p>The cable route redline now excludes the Doves Lane Local Wildlife site near Butterwick and so it should not be impacted by the installation of the cables. The</p>	<p>The Noise and Vibration Management Plan (NVMP) will be forwarded to the local Environmental Health departments for their review. The NVMP will include reasonably practicable noise management measures, and where relevant mitigation measures, to ensure that noise and vibration impacts are kept to a minimum.</p> <p>The Project is in agreement that Hobhole Drain and Havenside LWS will not be directly impacted by installation of the cables. Surfleet LWS will also not be directly impacted by the cable installation due to utilisation of directional drilling. The Code of Construction Practice will include mitigation measures to ensure there are no significant indirect impacts on these designations. The Project is in communication with the RSPB regarding their reserve at Frampton. Opportunities to support the Greater Frampton Vision through considered mitigation and biodiversity</p>	

Ref	Stakeholder	Response Ref	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
			<p>Hobhole Drain and Havenside LWS are crossed and this will be by direct drilling so should protect the habitat.</p> <p>The cable route crosses the Haven near to the RSPB reserve at Frampton. They are preparing a Landscape Recovery Bid (LRB) that includes land where the cable will run. RSPB have advised me the developers are aware of this project. Clearly if both projects proceed Outer Dowsing may be able to assist in the LRB as they reinstate the cable route, although that maybe outside the LDO requirements.</p> <p>The route also passes near to the 'South Bank Fosdyke' LWS that lies against the River Welland. The cable route is on the opposite bank and so will not affect the LWS. However, what is assumed to be a haul road route, runs directly against the LWS and so protection measures need to be clearly stated. This haul route runs towards the National Grid substation site that will be considered in a separate application.</p> <p>Boston Borough's impact from the cable route will be temporary and once installed the farmed landscape recovers as we have experienced with other cable routes for other infrastructure proposals.</p>	<p>net gain are also being explored. Specific protection measures for South Bank Fosdyke LWS will be secured within the Outline Landscape and Ecology Strategy.</p> <p>The Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) details control measures which are required to prevent/avoid or reduce and mitigate potential impacts from construction dust. The plan forms part of the Construction Code of Practice (CoCP), which is secured as a requirement of the DCO and will be approved by relevant consultees.</p> <p>SLR Ornithology: A meeting was held between the Applicant and RSPB on 20 October 2023, to understand more about the Greater Frampton Vision project and opportunities for the Project to support and contribute to it.</p> <p>SLR - Ecology: The design shows a temporary enabling access running parallel to, and south of, South Bank Fosdyke LWS. Prior to commencement of the construction phase, it is necessary for workforce employees and construction machinery to gain entry to the working area before the main construction access points and haul road have been completed. To facilitate this entry, the project has identified a number of existing farm tracks and other access avenues, which are currently used by landowners with farm machinery, that the project intends to utilise as 'enabling accesses'. Once the construction of the haul road and construction access points have been established, the enabling accesses would no longer be required by the Project. As these tracks are currently used to transport farm machinery, the work required to facilitate their use will be minimal, limited to vegetation clearance, laying of track matting and associated packing (or similar) to level the track and/ or protect the ground surface during periods of wet weather, erection of associated signage and HSE goal posts, as required. The use of these enabling accesses will be limited to a maximum of two months, after which vehicles needed to enter and exit the work area will do so via the temporary construction accesses.</p>	
8	South Holland District Council	AC_28	<p><u>Substation</u> The Outer Dowsing Substation site landscaping is bounded to the north by the Risegate Eau that is also a LWS. However, the red line also crosses this LWS, possibly indicating a bridge for an access to the A16. This needs clarifying.</p> <p>The main impact of this scheme is the substation in SHDC as it is positioned close to the A16. The proposal contains significant landscaping and this will take time to fully screen the substation. However, there are quite significant existing planting belts along the A16, which were planted as a result of the road being built. Some of this existing planting is where proposed further planting is indicated on the map. Where there are gaps, for example, to the east of the A16 between Surfleet Bank and Peter Seadike Lane there is a hedge on Surfleet Bank that will close or soften views of the substation whilst the new planting establishes. Although there will be places where the substation will be very clearly visible until new planting becomes established, traffic along the A16 will not have constantly open views of it whilst the landscaping grows.</p> <p>The infrastructure at the substation has not been determined yet. There are two</p>	<p>Post consent, mitigation planting will be designed in detail and in respect of planting along the A16 this will involve new planting being integrated with existing planting to bolster and enhance the existing screen. To ensure the worst-case-scenario has been covered in LVIA terms, the maximum design scenario for the assessment is based on the larger footprint of the AIS substation and the taller buildings of the GIS substation. The mitigation planting comprises a 'framework' of shelterbelts designed to link with surrounding hedgerows and tree belts and extend the network of ecological corridors.</p>	



Ref	Stakeholder	Response Ref	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
			<p>options for switch gear, Air Insulated and Gas Insulated (AIS &amp; GIS). Until that decision has been taken the actual impact in terms of land take and height will be subject to change. The current consultation confirms the AIS footprint has risen by 5h. The equipment height of both types has been reduced by 1m, although the height the land may be raised to, to cater for flood risk is not clear, and so the total height will be more than this from current ground level. The GIS building height has been reduced by 2.5m. Clearly the smaller the land take and the lower the equipment the better but the differences are ameliorated by the scale of the landscape.</p> <p>The indicative viewpoints suggest the infrastructure will be suitably screened. The success of the substation site depends on the quality, establishment and retention of the proposed landscaping on and off the site. The benefit is that it introduces planting into the landscape, which is otherwise relatively sparse. New planting along the A16 provides an almost complete linkage upto the Golf course so habitats begin to connect together.</p> <p>SHDC will be involved with the Local Nature Recovery Strategy that is being led by the County Council, in partnership with all the district Councils and the two unitary councils on the Humber estuary and the Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership. Therefore, despite the initial harm to the landscape the proposal brings, it could benefit habitat, sequester carbon, provide better linkages for wildlife both at the substation site and at the LRB proposal by the RSPB in Frampton.</p>		
9	South Holland District Council	AC_28	<p><u>Economy and Social Impact</u> From an economic and social perspective, the Council would like to see the development doing as much as it possibly can to maximise the benefits for local people and businesses for hosting this infrastructure. The local electricity network lacks capacity and so the substation could potentially improve that issue if it includes local 'low voltage' grid upgrades and additional capacity being created within the substation to enable further projects to have capacity to connect. Lack of capacity often holds back local development.</p> <p>Other benefits include enhanced skills offerings, particularly in relation to Net-Zero and energy generation for local people via colleges and Lincoln University student placements; promotional events and supporting communities to engage with the development during construction and during operation – eg skills fairs, procurement advice; use of social value engines to maximise benefits, and development of other schemes, such as related employment development by companies that may benefit from co locating near to the substation, which together can create a positive legacy for hosting this sort of infrastructure.</p>	<p>The economic opportunities from the development of the offshore wind sector are considered to be critical for the economic future of the area.</p> <p>Based on the assumptions and methodology outlined in Chapter 29 Socioeconomics it is estimated that under a worst case scenario the Project could result in the creation of 1,690 years of employment in the Local Economic Area (LEA) and 2,010 years of employment in the Regional Area.</p> <p>In addition to the direct and supply chain impacts the Project will support economic activity through the spending of those employed in its construction. The majority of this economic activity is expected to occur during the construction period and peak in Q3 of 2029 when the construction of the Project is expected to support 680 jobs in the LEA and 810 jobs in the Regional Area.</p> <p>The Applicant has committed to developing a Procurement Strategy that will consider the role of local suppliers and contribution to skills development.</p> <p>The Applicant is committed to engaging with the local community and the development of a community benefit fund to be launched post consent.</p>	
10	South Holland District Council	AC_28	<p><u>Review of the Environmental Update Report</u></p> <p><u>Landscape and Visual Assessment</u></p>	<p>Information on the mitigation planting is presented in the Outline Landscape and Ecology Mitigation Strategy (OLEMS). This specifies whips would be planted at approximately 0.8m in height and that the anticipated growth of trees would be between 0.4m and 0.5m per annum</p>	

Ref	Stakeholder	Response Ref	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
			<p>The changes to the scheme have been reviewed by external consultants Terra Loci. Firstly, we would like to reiterate some comments previously made following various ETG meetings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Scoping out the offshore array area - Following review of the SLVIA Figures Wirelines and Visualisations, it is considered appropriate to scope out the offshore array from LVIA to be assessed separately through the SLVIA.</li> <li>- New substation size and proposed mitigation planting - Figure 28.15 - Surfleet Marsh OnSS Indicative Layout and Mitigation Planting shows general areas and locations for mitigation planning but does not indicate intended height or types of mitigation planting proposed, this should be clarified during assessment. Where off site mitigation planting / hedgerow is shown as under consideration, assessment of effects should be undertaken for scenarios with and without this planting to indicate the effectiveness and potential requirement for this mitigation planting.</li> <li>- Updated viewpoint locations - The additional viewpoint locations circulated on the 06/11/23 are more comprehensive and take on board previous comments, these are appropriate to assess the potential for visual impacts. Approach to assessment considering a Project Design Envelope (PDE) based on the AIS footprint and GIS height with visuals showing indicative models of both technologies with the PDE. This proposed PDE appears to consider the 'worst case' scenario from each technology and is an appropriate basis for assessment of potential landscape and visual impacts. The technology modelled in each visual should be clearly indicated.</li> </ul> <p>Secondly, we would like to comment on the September viewpoint consultation as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Without accompanying ZTV analysis, it's difficult to comment on the exact location of potential additional viewpoints.</li> <li>- It's good to see Viewpoints 4 and 5 located along the Macmillan Way and I have no problems with the locations of viewpoints 1, 2 and 3.</li> <li>- However, 5 Viewpoints is on the light side for a development of this scale. Some longer distance views would be useful, particularly from the edges of Surfleet Seas End and Gosberton. I'd like to see around 10 Viewpoints total from close to long distance views to ensure that there is scope to thoroughly assess visual impacts.</li> </ul> <p>Lastly, with regards the latest updated environmental report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The landscape and visual receptors and representative viewpoints need to be submitted and approved prior to the assessment being undertaken. Supporting Zone of Theoretical Visibility mapping should also be provided to ensure that the proposed study area is sufficient.</li> <li>- The full LVIA methodology, including factors and / or matrices used for determining sensitivity of landscape and visual receptors and magnitude and significance of effects should be submitted and approved prior to the assessment being undertaken. The combination of desk and field based study can be sufficient to understand the baseline landscape and visual resource, however complete methodologies are required to agree if the method of assessment is sufficient and appropriate.</li> </ul>	<p>to give an approximate height range of 6.8 to 8.3m after 15 years of growth. While the OLEMS presents some suggested species, the final planting palette will be developed in the Landscape and Ecology Mitigation Strategy (LEMS) post consent. On-site and off-site mitigation planting is photomontaged in the visualisations for the representative viewpoints and the assessment in the LVIA covers scenarios in which the mitigation planting is and is not taken into account. Noted regarding the appropriateness of the updated viewpoint list for the LVIA. Noted regarding the appropriateness of the maximum design scenario based on the AIS footprint and GIS height - visualisations will be clearly labelled to ensure the distinction is readily apparent</p>	

Ref	Stakeholder	Response Ref	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
			<p>All visual representation with any submitted Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) should be in line with The Visual Representation of Development Proposals Technical Guidance Note (TGN) 06/19 (Landscape Institute, September 2019) to ensure the assessment of visual impact is accurate and in turn an appropriate judgement of the assessed impacts can be made. Locations for proposed 'photomontage' visualisations, including visualisation types, following TGN 06/19 should be submitted and approved prior to being undertaken.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The EIA should include a full assessment of the potential impacts of the development on local landscape character using landscape assessment methodologies. The use of Landscape Character Assessment (LCA), based on the good practice guidelines produced jointly by the Landscape Institute and Institute of Environmental Assessment in 2013 is encouraged. LCA provides a sound basis for guiding, informing and understanding the ability of any location to accommodate change and to make positive proposals for conserving, enhancing or regenerating character, as detailed proposals are developed.</li> <li>- It is recommended that any development proposal explores and applies the Building with Nature standards and achieves an accreditation to highlight what 'good' looks like at each stage of the GI lifecycle and strengthen the development and demonstrate the development goes beyond the statutory minima, to create places that really deliver for people and wildlife.</li> <li>- The assessment should refer to the relevant National Character Areas as published by Natural England. Local landscape character areas should be mapped at a scale appropriate to the development site as well as any relevant management plans or strategies pertaining to the area. The EIA should include assessments of visual effects on the surrounding area and landscape together with any physical effects of the development, such as changes in topography and loss or disturbance of vegetation.</li> <li>- In order to foster high quality development that respects, maintains, or enhances, local landscape character and distinctiveness, the LVIA should consider the character and distinctiveness of the area, with the siting and design of the proposed development reflecting local design characteristics. The Environmental Impact Assessment process should detail the measures to be taken to ensure the building design will be of a high standard, as well as detail of layout alternatives together with justification of the selected option in terms of landscape impact and benefit.</li> <li>- The assessment should also include the cumulative effect of the development with other relevant existing or proposed developments in the area. A list of proposed cumulative schemes should be submitted and approved prior to the assessment being undertaken. Cumulative impact assessment should include other proposals currently at Scoping stage and onwards. Due to the overlapping timescale of their progress through the planning system, cumulative impact of the proposed development with those proposals currently at Scoping stage would be likely to be a material consideration at the time of determination of the planning application.</li> </ul> <p>Operational effects arising from the Onshore ECC and export cable landfall should be scoped into the assessment as there is potential for a loss of vegetation and</p>		

Ref	Stakeholder	Response Ref	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
			<p>alteration of the baseline landscape and visual resource which will be longer lasting than the construction phase and the long-term effectiveness of remediation and mitigation proposals should be considered. Other potential effects identified are sufficient, pending the submission and approval of full landscape and visual receptor groups and representative viewpoints.</p> <p><b>Concluding Remarks</b> This advice is based upon the information available at this time. Please note that the advice is given without prejudice to any future comments made by the Local Planning Authority upon the receipt of further information, whether during or before the submission of a full EIA planning application.</p>		
11	South Holland District Council	AC_17	<p><u>Opportunities for optimising landscaping proposals.</u> We note that, for some of the proposals made by the project, Natural England has some relevant standing advice which it deems would be useful for the project to be aware of. This standing advice is aimed at maximising the benefits to nature and landscape when considering the design principals for some elements of developments. Landscaping proposals should show that, wherever possible, they have accounted for the relevant National Character Area profiles. For example, there is a need to ensure that any mitigation planting is not only delivering the intended mitigation but that it is also sympathetic with existing character set out within the NCA profile. Details of NCA profiles can be found here - Natural England Access to Evidence - National Character Areas. When designing landscaping proposals, we recommend that the project considers their potential as a key Sustainable Drainage System (SuDS) feature. In our experience, landscaping projects where function as a SuDS feature is considered from the outset are invariably more effective in achieving desired outcomes. We recommend the project references the CIRA SuDS manual within the design process (Update to the SuDS Manual - GOV.UK (<a href="http://www.gov.uk">www.gov.uk</a>)).</p>	<p>The onshore substation is situated within National Character Area (NCA) 46: Fens as classified by Natural England. The classification for this NCA highlights the openness of the landscape, the importance of agricultural production and the scarcity of woodland cover but does also reference the presence of shelterbelts and roadside planting as a baseline feature. In respect of the over-riding objective of the LVIA to screen the onshore substation as far as is practical, the use of a framework of shelterbelt and road-side planting fulfils this role whilst also respecting the baseline character of the landscape. An overview of the landscape character is presented in Chapter 28 LVIA.</p> <p>SuDS are being considered as part of the design at OnSS.</p>	



Ref	Stakeholder	Response Ref	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
12	Lincolnshire County Council	AC_34	<p>The presentation from the November Technical Working Group meeting confirms the analysis made onsite with the Applicants Landscape Architect. The Council is happy with the approach, the viewpoints and the proposals for onsite and offsite mitigation. There are no other issues and it's just a case of waiting for the DCO application with the LVIA.</p> <p>In respect of the formal consultation, the presentation boards online have been considered.</p> <p>There's quite a number of construction compounds and this will be an important issue in regards restoration and protection during construction that needs to be assessed appropriately .</p> <p>The core mitigation planting around the substation is combined with offsite mitigation including along the A16 and this is shown in the maps from the consultation, it correlates with the ideas discussed on site, so in the current level of detail is an acceptable strategy.</p> <p>The Environmental Update report in section 3.3 assesses the onshore design refinements including building heights, the footprint area. The height dropping is beneficial given the open flat aspect of the substation site.</p> <p>Table 3.5 details the impact of the changed on the LVIA, including the decision to include offsite planting to aid the mitigation of the substation. This table presents the progression and expectation of the ES to flesh out the details of these current proposals.</p> <p>The Council concludes that overall the approach and openness of the strategy is acceptable and hope this is presented well in the submission documents.</p>	The Applicant has noted this response.	
13	Lincolnshire County Council	AC_34	<p>Highways</p> <p>No comment on the public consultation documents which are fairly generic.</p> <p>However have been involved in a dialogue with the applicants Transport Consultant and the Council's latest response is set out below for your information.</p> <p>In principle, the trip generation, routes and proposed mitigation in form of passing places seems appropriate.</p> <p>Will the Transport Assessment have existing 2 way flows on all the links ? Some of the daily flows seem to be quite large in total, especially on the A roads and it would be informative to know how much these compare with existing flows.</p> <p>The Council is concerned about the volume of traffic proposed through Boston on the A16 and A52, whilst these are strategic A roads, they operate at capacity in most peak periods and additional traffic of the scale proposed in these tables could be a concern. The TA would need to consider % change due to the development impact, and possibly junction capacity assessments.</p>	The Applicant has noted this response. Local concerns are noted in respect of traffic and travel impacts and the Applicant has proposed measures to minimise disruption as much as possible including the implementation of a CTMP, travel plan and the use of a haul road to avoid traffic being on the road.	8.15 Outline CTMP 8.16 Outline Travel Plan

Ref	Stakeholder	Response Ref	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
			<p>With regard to the passing place drawings. In general, the proposals appear to show passing places in suitable places, sometimes using proposed existing accesses or junctions – it should be noted that some of the accesses would need upgrading as they appear not suitable currently.</p> <p>Again, if the existing base flows are provided as well as the development traffic it would be possible to better estimate if all the spaces are needed. It is considered that some rural lanes might have low traffic flows and low development traffic such that spaces are not needed every 200m but less frequently.</p>		
14	Natural England	AC_17	<p><u>General advice in response to the Further Statutory Consultation</u>            Natural England advise that, whilst amendments have been presented to the overall project design envelope during this further statutory consultation, the impact pathways and assessment methods as stated by the project during their original statutory consultation were high level and remain largely unchanged by this changes made in this latest revision. Natural England therefore advise that our advice as presented to the project during the Statutory Consultation remains relevant to the amendments made during the latest. Further Statutory Consultation. We expect that the project will include the latest amendments to the project design when presenting their conclusions within the final Environmental Statement and that it will take onboard the advice Natural England has previously provided as part of Statutory consultations. Natural England will provide further advice upon receipt of the Environmental Statement accordingly.</p>	The Applicant has noted this response.	
15	Natural England	AC_17	<p><u>Functionally Linked Land for Designated features of SPAs</u>            The project has concluded that impacts from increasing the footprint of the substation are unlikely to result in new significant effects on ornithological receptors because of the low ornithological potential for this type of land. Whilst we agree that this conclusion is likely accurate, Natural England look forward to reviewing the conclusion in further detail within the Environmental Statement.</p> <p>Natural England would further note that that agricultural land can be functionally linked to certain designated features of SPAs occurring in the wider region. Natural England expects and understands that consideration of encroachment onto land functionally linked to designated features of nearby SPAs will be included in the Environmental Statement.</p>	Screening for SPAs was based on an initial 15km search area around the Scoping Project onshore boundary, which covered a much greater area than the Order Limits. The study area has been refined through PEIR and ES stages based on the refined onshore project boundaries. The study area has been extended where there is evidence of possible connectivity beyond this distance, for example to include the North Norfolk SPA in relation to non-breeding pink-footed goose.	
16	Natural England	AC_17	<p><u>Land Use Conclusion</u>            Natural England notes that the project has used the justification that any impacts on taking of agricultural land are minor in terms of the percentage of land being taken up compared to the total available across the whole country. It is likely that we agree with the conclusions the project is drawing in terms of its impact within this latest consultation and the advice Natural England provided in response to the Statutory consultation remains valid. However, we would like to note that the justification used by the project is inappropriate. Natural England’s statutory remit is to advise on projects where the total amount of agricultural land lost exceeds 20 hectares. We advise that the project notes this and includes a summary of agricultural land lost when justifying the impact in the Environmental Statement.</p>	The permanent loss of agricultural land has been assessed in Chapter 25 Land Use along with the total area of agricultural land expected to be lost from the OnSS, link boxes, landscaping, drainage, access and associated infrastructure. It is expected that the majority of impacted land will only be impacted temporarily.	6.1.25 Land Use
17	Natural England	AC_17	<p><u>Opportunities for optimising landscaping proposals.</u>            We note that, for some of the proposals made by the project, Natural England has some relevant standing advice which it deems would be useful for the project to be aware of. This standing advice is aimed at maximising the benefits to nature and landscape when considering the design principals for some elements of</p>	The onshore substation is situated within National Character Area (NCA) 46: Fens as classified by Natural England. The classification for this NCA highlights the openness of the landscape, the importance of agricultural production and the scarcity of woodland cover but does also reference the presence of shelterbelts and roadside planting as a baseline feature.	6.1.28 LVIA

Ref	Stakeholder	Response Ref	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
			<p>developments. Landscaping proposals should show that, wherever possible, they have accounted for the relevant National Character Area profiles. For example, there is a need to ensure that any mitigation planting is not only delivering the intended mitigation but that it is also sympathetic with existing character set out within the NCA profile. Details of NCA profiles can be found here - Natural England Access to Evidence - National Character Areas.</p> <p>When designing landscaping proposals, we recommend that the project considers their potential as a key Sustainable Drainage System (SuDS) feature. In our experience, landscaping projects where function as a SuDS feature is considered from the outset are invariably more effective in achieving desired outcomes. We recommend the project references the CIRA SuDS manual within the design process (Update to the SuDS Manual - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)).</p>	<p>In respect of the over-riding objective of the LVIA to screen the onshore substation as far as is practical, the use of a framework of shelterbelt and road-side planting fulfils this role whilst also respecting the baseline character of the landscape. An overview of the landscape character is presented in Chapter 28 LVIA.</p> <p>SuDS are being considered as part of the design at OnSS.</p>	
18	NFU	AC_34	<p>We would like to engage further with Outer Dowsing on behalf of members that may be affected by the proposed scheme and arrange a meeting with the project team as soon as possible to discuss and obtain further information on the points raised in this consultation response, specifically the impact of link boxes and the details included within the Outline Code of Construction.</p>	<p>The Applicant has noted this comment and engaged with local landowners and farm agents throughout the pre-application phase including in respect of the Outline Code of Construction Practice and the Outline Soil Management Plan submitted as part of the application.</p>	<p>8.1 Outline CocP 8.1.3 Outline SMP</p>
19	Eastern Power Networks	AC_3	<p>Eastern objects to the making and confirmation of the Order unless at the cost of the acquiring authority there are first provided to it on no less favourable tenure suitable alternative sites and suitable alternative rights in, on, over or under land in substitution to those to be acquired and/or temporarily used under the above Order and in, on over or under which there are first installed and commissioned Electric Lines and Electrical Plant in substitution for those in the land to be acquired and/or temporarily used under the above Order, before that land is acquired and/or temporarily used so that my client can carry out its statutory functions and contractual obligations no less efficiently than previously.</p> <p>Please treat this letter as an objection by [DNO] to the relocation/extinguishment of rights and apparatus mentioned above because their relocation will be detrimental to the carrying on of its undertaking. No alternative land, rights and apparatus for those proposed to be acquired under the above Order are in place.</p> <p>Eastern Power Networks reserves the right to amend or supplement its objections in the light of any information that later becomes available.</p> <p>The above objection(s) will be deemed to be withdrawn upon signature of an appropriate deed of Undertaking by an authorised signatory of the Acquiring Authority.</p> <p>All future correspondence relating to this matter should be sent to myself or by hard copy to UK Power Networks Legal Department, Energy House, Carrier Business Park, Hazelwick Avenue, Three Bridges, West Sussex, RH10 1EX.</p>	<p>The Applicant has noted this comment. UK Power Networks are not expected to be affected by the project, as the relevant Distribution Network Operator for the area is National Grid Electricity Distribution.</p>	<p>6.3.3.2 Onshore Crossing Schedule</p>
20	Environment Agency	AC_4	<p><b>Onshore assessment</b> <u>Groundwater protection:</u> We have no concerns with the proposed project refinements in so far as they relate to the risk posed to controlled waters.</p> <p><u>Flood risk:</u> we note that for the coastal and River Witham catchment areas, the refined route is almost identical to the original PEIR route, particularly with regard to the Main River and defence crossings. The location of construction infrastructure at the landfall location and along the onshore Export Cable Corridor has been refined</p>	<p>There is no planned access to the beach required for the installation of the land fall cables by HDD. The plans to be submitted to the EA for approval prior to construction will include contingency arrangements for access in the event of an emergency.</p> <p>The additional area referred to within the Order Limits is only a temporary access route for enabling works and will not restrict access to the Willoughby High Drain.</p>	

Ref	Stakeholder	Response Ref	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
			<p>but is primarily confined within PEIR route limits.</p> <p>Access to the beach is no longer shown. The PEIR route limits included the Anderby pullover (for access to the beach). We welcome the removal of this route as the use of the Anderby pullover was unacceptable as it would involve the trafficking of plant and machinery over the Anderby Creek Tunnel. However, the Refined Cable Corridor red line boundary shows no access route to the beach at the landfall location. We would be grateful if you could confirm whether access to the beach is required.</p> <p>The Refined Cable Corridor red line boundary shows an additional area adjacent to and within 8m of the Willoughby High Drain at grid reference TF 53196 71686. This is on land outside of the previous PEIR boundary. We request further information is provided on what is proposed for this location, to ensure that our ability to access our assets and maintenance is not restricted.</p>		
21	Environment Agency	AC_4	<p><u>LVA</u>: The Environmental Update Report concludes that there is potential that the landfall Transition Joint Bays (TJBs) will require raising above ground level following installation. While the Environmental Update Report confirms the extent to which this is required is unknown, the flood risk assessment must assess the impact and detail any mitigation measures required to manage the potential effects of these in respect of flood risk.</p> <p>The compound locations on the left and right banks of the Wainfleet Relief channel are adjacent to and within 8m of the raised defences. The PEIR Draft Works Plans (Onshore) showed a temporary working compound on the left bank, which was set back significantly and away from the defences. Any compounds should be set back a least 8m from the toe of the raised defences to ensure that they are not impacted and that Environment Agency access to the defences is not restricted.</p> <p>Within our Welland and Nene Catchment, drawing no. 20231017_22000087_PLN_PEIR_10936.22 upstream of Fosseydyke Bridge shows a refined cable route. The original route showed that the cable would be in the vicinity of the River Welland flood defence. However, the updated route shows an option for the cable to be located within the flood defence, which would affect approximately 1km of the defence. Before we can confirm that we accept this route, further details are required to determine if this option is suitable. We need to know the method of cable installation and depths, as well as the proposed mitigation measures. We assume that this would have to make use of open-cut methods as it is not simply crossing the defence whereby directional drilling could be used. We are currently waiting for your model to be submitted for review. We are unable to comment on the setting of the finished floor levels until the model has been approved.</p>	<p>The Applicant has confirmed that the land at the TJB will not be permanently raised, and any flood risk associated with its installation will be mitigated through the use of a temporary bund which will be removed once the construction is complete.</p> <p>The Applicant noted the comments in relation to compound locations, all compounds shown on plans are indicative at this stage. All final designs will be developed to make sure this offset is adhered to.</p> <p>It is not intended to locate the cables within the flood defence. At its closest point, the cables would be a minimum of 40m from the flood defence upstream of Fosseydyke Bridge. It is possible that this is a misunderstanding of the plans, which show a temporary access track running along the flood defence.</p>	
22	Historic England	AC_7	<p>We note the further information provided in particular in respect of the terrestrial cable routing.</p> <p>We note that work is underway in respect of terrestrial archaeological assessment, in which regard we refer you to the advice of the Local Authority curators but would underscore the importance of effective assessment and hence risk management especially in areas of formerly isolated dryer ground within coastal sediment / salt marsh. Such areas and in particular their fringes arguably pose the highest risk of important remains being identified late in process.</p>	<p>Geophysical survey commenced in July 2023 comprising magnetometer and electromagnetic techniques. The geophysical survey is targeting the parts of the Order Limits within areas west of historic high-water marks. These areas in the northern and central parts of the Order Limits are considered to hold archaeological potential due to their historic location within areas not characterized by permanent inundation or tidal conditions for part of or all of the periods between the Late Mesolithic period and the medieval period. Areas of drier land in these parts of the Order Limits, which may have persisted as habitable or semi-habitable</p>	



Ref	Stakeholder	Response Ref	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
			<p>We will look to see an effective approach in place informed by curatorial advice and iterative investigations. Whilst not all archaeological risk can be quantified prior to submission the earlier and better that the project can be across these matters through survey and trenching informed by deposit modelling – the less frequent and substantive construction impacts and any associated construction delays are likely to be.</p> <p>Appropriate design solutions to the deserted medieval village earthworks at Slackholme have been discussed and we would reaffirm that directional drill at depth beneath the monument is a necessary and proportionate responses to an undesignated site of equivalent importance to a Scheduled Monument (where diversion around the whole site is not possible).</p> <p>We anticipate that further work is forthcoming refining the supporting documentation in respect of offshore archaeological / heritage impacts.</p> <p>We will continue to engage positively with the ETG.</p>	<p>places within areas being affected by the historic fluctuations in high water marks and coastal flooding, will be identified by the electromagnetic survey with highly magnetic features attesting to possible anomalies of archaeological origin recorded through the complimentary magnetometry survey. These will include anomalies indicative of salt making within any former salt marshes in these areas. The southern parts of the Order Limits not subject to geophysical survey are in areas located east of historic high-water marks from the Late Mesolithic onwards and/or areas in the vicinity of these high water marks identified from deposit modelling to be limited in potential with any saltern remains severely eroded by coastal processes (Area of Potential A1). It being noted that some targeted survey has been undertaken in the southern parts of the Order Limits as a precaution, referencing LiDAR anomalies. The results of the geophysical survey will inform on a programme of trial trenching to be undertaken in two phases. The first phase of trial trenching will be undertaken within the Examination Period. The second phase of trial trenching will be undertaken post DCO Consent. Both phases will inform mitigation works ahead of the construction timetable, reducing risk to construction delays. The first phase of trial trenching will target geophysical anomalies identified through magnetometry survey in the first instance, alongside HER entries and other parameters set out within the ES chapter and an Outline Written Scheme of Investigation for Archaeological Works. The second phase of trial trenching will include testing of areas identified as being of potential through the electromagnetic survey if these haven't already been tested in phase 1. Both phases of trial trenching undertaken ahead of construction works will inform on mitigation works including excavation to be undertaken ahead of the construction schedule as well as informing on the necessity for watching briefs. As referenced by Historic England, direction drilling is proposed to avoid physical impact to remains associated with the Deserted Medieval Village at Slackholme. This is in acknowledgement that remains could be of equal importance to a Scheduled Monument but that route diversion is not possible in this instance.</p>	
23	Health and Safety Executive	AC_6	<p><b><u>HSE's land use planning advice</u></b></p> <p><u>Will the proposed development fall within any of HSE's consultation distances?</u> According to HSE's records, the proposed DCO application boundary for this Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project falls into the consultation zones of two Major Accident Hazard Pipelines ['MAHP']. This is based on the site boundary contained in the Autumn Consultation Environmental Update Report dated October 2023, Drawing Numbers 20231017_22000087_PLN_PEIR_10936.1 to 20231017_22000087_PLN_PEIR_10936.24, inclusive (Link to report: Environmental Update Report (outerdowsing.com) ) The major accident hazard pipelines are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• National Grid, 7 Feeder Gosberton/North Level Main Drain, HSE reference 6905, Transco ref.1180.</li> <li>• InterGen (UK), NTS to Spalding Energy PS Pipeline, HSE reference 11622.</li> </ul>	<p>The applicant has consulted the statutory undertakers in relation to the MAHPs and will include protective provisions in the draft DCO. The protective provisions will include the requirement for pre-construction plans to be submitted for approval by the pipeline operators. The applicant will engage with the operators to agree methodologies for cable installation under the pipelines and access across the pipelines. The operators have been approached regarding land interests.</p>	6.3.3.2 Onshore Crossing Schedule

Ref	Stakeholder	Response Ref	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
			<p>The Applicant should contact the above operators, to inform an assessment of whether or not the proposed development is vulnerable to a possible major accident. There are three particular reasons for this:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. The pipeline operator may have a legal interest in developments in the vicinity of the pipeline. This may restrict developments within a certain proximity of the pipeline.</li> <li>ii. The standards to which the pipeline is designed and operated may restrict major traffic routes within a certain proximity of the pipeline. Consequently, there may be a need for the operator to modify the pipeline or its operation, if the development proceeds.</li> <li>iii. To establish the necessary measures required to alter/upgrade the pipeline to appropriate standards.</li> </ul> <p>HSE's Land Use Planning advice is dependent on the location of areas where people may be present. Based on the information in the phase 2 consultation documents and the Autumn Consultation Report[<a href="https://www.outerdowsing.com/phase-2-consultation/">https://www.outerdowsing.com/phase-2-consultation/</a> and Environmental Update Report (outerdowsing.com) ], it is unlikely that HSE would advise against the development. Please note that the advice is based on HSE's existing policy for providing land-use planning advice [<a href="https://www.hse.gov.uk/landuseplanning/methodology.htm">https://www.hse.gov.uk/landuseplanning/methodology.htm</a>]. HSE's advice in response to a subsequent planning application may differ should HSE's policy or the scope of the development change by the time the Development Consent Order application is submitted.</p>		
24	National Gas	AC_13	<p>I refer to a letter dated 19th October 2023 regarding the above proposed DCO. This is a response on behalf of National Gas Transmission Plc (NGT).</p> <p>NGT has feeder mains located within or in proximity to the Order limits. Details of this infrastructure is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Feeder Main 7 - GOSBERTON TO TYDD ST. GILES <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Approx. coordinates</li> <li>(1) X:529195 Y:331619</li> <li>(2) X:529322 Y:331500</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ Associated cathodic protection apparatus</li> <li>▪ Ancillary apparatus</li> </ul> <p>Please note that NGT has existing easements for these pipelines which provides rights for ongoing access and prevents the erection of permanent / temporary buildings/structures, change to existing ground levels or storage of materials etc within the easement strip.</p>	<p>The Applicant has continued to engage with the owners of neighbouring infrastructure including in relation to any interaction between the infrastructure and the Project and where required potential for agreeing protective provisions.</p>	
25	Natural Gas Transmission	AC_18	<p><u>Key Considerations:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NGT has a Deed of Grant of Easement for each pipeline, which prevents the erection of permanent / temporary buildings, or structures, change to existing ground levels, storage of materials etc.</li> <li>• Please be aware that written permission is required before any works commence within the NGT easement strip. Furthermore a Deed of Consent will be required prior to commencement of works within NGT's easement strip subject to approval by NGT's plant protection team.</li> <li>• Any large installations which may result in a large population increase in the vicinity of a high pressure gas pipeline must comply with the HSE's Land Use Planning methodology, and the HSE response should be submitted to National Gas</li> </ul>	<p>The Applicant has noted this response</p>	

Ref	Stakeholder	Response Ref	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
			<p>Transmission for review</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The below guidance is not exhaustive and all works in the vicinity of NGT’s asset shall be subject to review and approval from NGT’s plant protection team in advance of commencement of works on site.</li> </ul>		
26	Natural Gas Transmission	AC_18	<p><u>Key Considerations - General Notes on Pipeline Safety:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>You should be aware of the Health and Safety Executives guidance document HS(G) 47 "Avoiding Danger from Underground Services", and NGT’s Dial Before You Dig Specification for Safe Working in the Vicinity of NGT Assets. There will be additional requirements dictated by NGT’s plant protection team.</li> <li>NGT will also need to ensure that its pipelines remain accessible during and after completion of the works.</li> <li>Our pipelines are normally buried to a depth cover of 1.1 metres, however actual depth and position must be confirmed on site by trial hole investigation under the supervision of a NGT representative. Ground cover above our pipelines should not be reduced or increased.</li> <li>If any excavations are planned within 3 metres of NGT High Pressure Pipeline or, within 10 metres of an AGI (Above Ground Installation), or if any embankment or dredging works are proposed then the actual position and depth of the pipeline must be established on site in the presence of a NGT representative. A safe working method agreed prior to any work taking place in order to minimise the risk of damage and ensure the final depth of cover does not affect the integrity of the pipeline.</li> <li>Below are some examples of work types that have specific restrictions when being undertaken in the vicinity of gas assets therefore consultation with NGT’s Plant Protection team is essential: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Demolition</li> <li>Blasting</li> <li>Piling and boring</li> <li>Deep mining</li> <li>Surface mineral extraction</li> <li>Landfilling</li> <li>Trenchless Techniques (e.g. HDD, pipe splitting, tunnelling etc.)</li> <li>Wind turbine installation - minimum separation distance of 1.5x the mast/hub height is required, and any auxiliary installations such as cable or track crossings will require a deed of consent.</li> <li>Solar farm installation</li> <li>Tree planting schemes</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>The Applicant has noted this response and is negotiating protective provisions with National Gas Transmission.</p>	<p>Guidance documents referenced in the Outline Code of Construction Practice (document 8.1)</p>
27	Natural Gas Transmission	AC_18	<p><u>Key Considerations - Traffic Crossings:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Where existing roads cannot be used, construction traffic should ONLY cross the pipeline at agreed locations.</li> <li>Permanent road crossings will require a surface load calculation, and will require a deed of consent.</li> <li>The pipeline shall be protected, at the crossing points, by temporary rafts constructed at ground level. The third party shall review ground conditions, vehicle types and crossing frequencies to determine the type and construction of the raft required.</li> <li>The type of raft shall be agreed with NGT prior to installation.</li> <li>No protective measures including the installation of concrete slab protection shall be installed over or near to the NGT pipeline without the prior permission of NGT</li> </ul>	<p>The Applicant has noted this response.</p>	

Ref	Stakeholder	Response Ref	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NGT will need to agree the material, the dimensions and method of installation of the proposed protective measure.</li> <li>• The method of installation shall be confirmed through the submission of a formal written method statement from the contractor to NGT.</li> <li>• An NGT representative shall monitor any works within close proximity to the pipeline to comply with NGT specification T/SP/SSW22</li> </ul>		
28	Natural Gas Transmission	AC_18	<p><u>Key Considerations - New Asset Crossings:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New assets (cables/pipelines etc) may cross the pipeline at perpendicular angle to the pipeline i.e. 90 degrees.</li> </ul> <p>The separation distance for a cable &gt;33kV is 1000mm and pre and post energisation surveys may be required at National Gas Transmission’s discretion. A risk assessment/method statement will need to be provided to, and accepted by National Gas Transmission prior to the deed of consent being agreed. Where a new asset is to cross over the pipeline a clearance distance of 0.6 metres between the crown of the pipeline and underside of the service should be maintained. If this cannot be achieved the service shall cross below the pipeline with a clearance distance of 0.6 metres.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A new service should not be laid parallel within an easement strip</li> <li>• Clearance must be at least 600mm above or below the pipeline</li> <li>• An NGT representative shall approve and supervise any cable crossing of a pipeline.</li> <li>• A Deed of Consent is required for any cable crossing the easement</li> </ul>	The Applicant has noted this response.	
29	Natural Gas Transmission	AC_18	<p>Where the promoter intends to acquire land, extinguish rights, or interfere with any of NGT apparatus, protective provisions will be required in a form acceptable to it to be included within the DCO. NGT requests to be consulted at the earliest stages to ensure that the most appropriate protective provisions are included within the DCO application to safeguard the integrity of our apparatus and to remove the requirement for objection.</p> <p>Adequate access to NGT pipelines must be maintained at all times during construction and post construction to ensure the safe operation of our network.</p>	The Applicant has continued to engage with the owners of neighbouring infrastructure including in relation to any interaction between the infrastructure and the Project and where required potential for agreeing protective provisions.	
30	National Highways	AC_15	<p>The SRN closest to the proposed site consists of the A1 and A46 trunk roads and the M180 motorway. These are however more than 30 miles from the site.</p> <p>In responding to strategic sustainable development consultations, we have regard to DfT Circular 01/2022: The Strategic Road Network and the Delivery of Sustainable Development (‘the Circular’). This sets out how interactions with the SRN should be considered when making plans and development management decisions. In addition to the Circular, our consideration of development proposals are made in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and other relevant policies</p>	The Applicant has noted this response.	
31	National Highways	AC_15	<p><u>Previous Consultation Response</u></p> <p>National Highways responded to the previous consultation in July 2023. At that time, we advised that given the distance of the site from the SRN, the number of construction vehicles will most likely have dissipated before they reach our network. As such, it was considered that the traffic generated by this proposal both during the construction period and when the site is fully operational, would not adversely impact the SRN.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, we expressed our intent to review the final Construction</p>	The Applicant has noted this response. Local concerns are noted in respect of travel and traffic impacts and the Applicant has proposed measures to minimise disruption as much as possible including the implementation of a CTMP, a travel plan and the use of a haul road to avoid traffic being on the road.	



Ref	Stakeholder	Response Ref	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
			Traffic Management Plan (CTMP), and we set out items that we wished to see included in this document.		
32	National Highways	AC_15	<p><u>Current Consultation</u></p> <p>We understand that since the previous consultation was carried out, a number of design refinements have been made resulting in the need for further consultation. The consultation documents consist of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Environmental Update Report;</li> <li>2. Onshore Substation Visualisations;</li> <li>3. Associated plans.</li> </ol>	The Applicant has noted this response	
33	National Highways	AC_15	<p><u>National Highways review and response</u></p> <p>National Highways has reviewed the above-mentioned documents, and we acknowledge that the proposed project refinements are not anticipated to cause materially new or materially different environmental impacts to those presented in the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR), reviewed as part of the first consultation.</p> <p>Our review has led us to conclude that our position is the same as that advised in our July 2023 response. In summary, given the distance of the site to the SRN, traffic generation as a result of the construction and operational phases of this proposal are unlikely to present a material impact on the National Highways network. Nonetheless, we look forward to reviewing the final Construction Traffic Management Plan which we understand will be prepared and submitted in support of the forthcoming DCO application.</p>	The Applicant has noted this response.	
34	Network Rail	AC_19	<p><u>Impact on Network Rail Infrastructure</u></p> <p>Network Rail has been reviewing the information provided and note that changes have been made to the scheme in order for preparation of a formal DCO application. Proposals include the development of an on-shore cables through railway property. The scheme will intersect with operational railway between Thorpe Culvert and Wainfleet railway stations (GRS4 @ 3m 347-635yds) on the Firsby East Junction to Skegness railway line.</p> <p>At this time we have no further comments to make on the additional information supplied, other than those returned in response to the summer consultation (19 July 2023) as detailed in the attachment which still apply.</p>	The Applicant has continued to engage with the owners of neighbouring infrastructure including in relation to any interaction between the infrastructure and the Project and where required potential for agreeing protective provisions.	6.3.3.2 Onshore Crossing Schedule
35	National Grid	AC_14	<p>Due to the close proximity of some of our assets, NGET wishes to express their interest in further consultation while the impact on our assets is still being assessed.</p> <p>Where the Promoter intends to acquire land, extinguish rights, or interfere with or work within close proximity to any of NGET's apparatus and land, this will require appropriate protection and further discussion on the impact to its apparatus and rights.</p> <p>NGET will require an adequate form of Protective Provisions included within the Order.</p> <p>National Grid Electricity Transmission has high voltage electricity overhead transmission lines in close proximity to the order boundary. The overhead lines form an essential part of the electricity transmission network in England and Wales.</p>	The Applicant has continued to engage with the owners of neighbouring infrastructure including in relation to any interaction between the infrastructure and the Project and where required potential for agreeing protective provisions.	6.3.3.2 Onshore Crossing Schedule
36	National Grid	AC_14	<p><u>Existing Infrastructure</u></p> <p><u>Overhead Lines</u></p> <p>4ZM 400kV OHL SPALDING NORTH – WALPOLE; BICKER FEN - WALPOLE - WEST</p>	The Applicant has continued to engage with the owners of neighbouring infrastructure including in relation to any interaction between the infrastructure and the Project and where required potential for agreeing	6.3.3.2 Onshore Crossing Schedule

Ref	Stakeholder	Response Ref	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
			<p>BURTON 2WS 400KV OHL BICKER FEN - SPALDING NORTH - WEST BURTON; SPALDING NORTH – WALPOLE</p> <p><u>New Infrastructure</u> Please also refer to the Holistic Network Design (HND) and the National Grid ESO website to view the strategic vision for the UK’s ever growing electricity transmission network. <a href="https://www.nationalgrideso.com/future-energy/the-pathway-2030-holistic-network-design/hnd">https://www.nationalgrideso.com/future-energy/the-pathway-2030-holistic-network-design/hnd</a></p> <p>These projects are all essential to increase the overall network capability to connect the numerous new offshore wind farms that are being developed, and transport new clean green energy to the homes and businesses where it is needed.</p> <p>NGET requests that all existing and future assets are given due consideration given their criticality to distribution of energy across the UK. We remain committed to working with the promoter in a proactive manner, enabling both parties to deliver successful projects wherever reasonably possible. As such we encourage that ongoing discussion and consultation between both parties is maintained on interactions with existing or future assets, land interests, connections or consents and any other NGET interests which have the potential to be impacted prior to submission of the Proposed DCO.</p>	<p>protective provisions. Records have been obtained and the apparatus identified in the Crossing Schedule.</p>	
37	National Grid	AC_14	<p><b><u>The following points should be taken into consideration.</u></b></p> <p><u>Electricity Infrastructure:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• National Grid’s Overhead Line/s is protected by a Deed of Easement/Wayleave Agreement which provides full right of access to retain, maintain, repair and inspect our asset</li> <li>• Statutory electrical safety clearances must be maintained at all times. Any proposed buildings must not be closer than 5.3m to the lowest conductor. National Grid recommends that no permanent structures are built directly beneath overhead lines. These distances are set out in EN 43 – 8 Technical Specification for “overhead line clearances Issue 3 (2004).</li> <li>• Please refer to Technical Guidance Note 287 Third-party guidance for working near National Grid Electricity Transmission equipment for specific guidance relating to solar farms. No panels to be positioned directly underneath the conductors and adequate stand off is required from NGET towers allowing for unrestricted 24/7 access to apparatus.</li> <li>• If any changes in ground levels are proposed either beneath or in close proximity to our existing overhead lines, then this would serve to reduce the safety clearances for such overhead lines. Safe clearances for existing overhead lines must be maintained in all circumstances.</li> <li>• Please note that adequate earthing of any conductive material within 30 metres of a tower is required.</li> <li>• The relevant guidance in relation to working safely near to existing overhead lines is contained within the Health and Safety Executive’s (<a href="http://www.hse.gov.uk">www.hse.gov.uk</a>) Guidance Note GS 6 “Avoidance of Danger from Overhead Electric Lines” and all relevant site staff should make sure that they are both aware of and understand this guidance.</li> <li>• Plant, machinery, equipment, buildings or scaffolding should not encroach within 5.3 metres of any of our high voltage conductors when those conductors are under</li> </ul>	<p>The Applicant has noted this response. -</p>	

Ref	Stakeholder	Response Ref	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
			<p>their worse conditions of maximum “sag” and “swing” and overhead line profile (maximum “sag” and “swing”) drawings should be obtained using the contact details above.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If a landscaping scheme is proposed as part of the proposal, we request that only slow and low growing species of trees and shrubs are planted beneath and adjacent to the existing overhead line to reduce the risk of growth to a height which compromises statutory safety clearances.</li> <li>• Drilling or excavation works should not be undertaken if they have the potential to disturb or adversely affect the foundations or “pillars of support” of any existing tower. These foundations always extend beyond the base area of the existing tower and foundation (“pillar of support”) drawings can be obtained using the contact details above.</li> <li>• National Grid Electricity Transmission high voltage underground cables are protected by a Deed of Grant; Easement; Wayleave Agreement or the provisions of the New Roads and Street Works Act. These provisions provide National Grid full right of access to retain, maintain, repair and inspect our assets. Hence, we require that no permanent / temporary structures are to be built over our cables or within the easement strip. Any such proposals should be discussed and agreed with National Grid prior to any works taking place.</li> <li>• Ground levels above our cables must not be altered in any way. Any alterations to the depth of our cables will subsequently alter the rating of the circuit and can compromise the reliability, efficiency and safety of our electricity network and requires consultation with National Grid prior to any such changes in both level and construction being implemented.</li> </ul>		
38	RSPB	AC_27	<p><u>Onshore Ornithology</u></p> <p>As you are aware, the proposed cable route passes close to a number of national and international protected areas including The Wash Special Protection Area (SPA) and Ramsar site and the Greater Wash SPA, as well as the RSPB’s Frampton Marsh and Freiston Shore reserves which include land both inside The Wash SPA/Ramsar site and functionally linked to it.</p> <p>As we said in response to the PEIR Consultation in July 2023, the RSPB is concerned about the implications of the construction and operation of the cable route on a number of wintering, passage and breeding bird species with significant populations in The Wash SPA/Ramsar and the Greater Wash SPA. Additionally, the construction and operation of the Weston Marsh North substation and Weston Marsh South connection area are also likely to have impacts on these wintering, passage and breeding bird species, particularly as the River Welland is a known flyway for birds flying to and from The Wash. When two years of survey data are made available, the RSPB will want to explore in detail with you the potential implications of disturbance on these species through the relevant Expert Topic Group, considering areas of potential sensitivity and any mitigation that may be necessary.</p> <p>The RSPB has already highlighted the significance of its Frampton Marsh and Freiston Shore reserves, both functionally linked to The Wash SPA/Ramsar site, and the obvious importance of the Greater Frampton Vision Landscape Recovery Project (LRP). That project, supported by Defra, aims to use land to the south-east of Boston to expand the habitats that have developed so successfully at Frampton Marsh and Freiston Shore. Based on the information set out in the PEIR and the Autumn Consultation, we consider there is potential for the cable route, the Weston Marsh</p>	<p>The Year 1 winter bird survey data are presented and assessed within the ES. Year 2 surveys are on-going and will be presented shortly after the completion of the surveys in March/April 2024. The RSPB Reserves at Frampton Marsh and Freiston Shore have been taken into consideration during the design process to ensure these sites are avoided. Other potential impacts, including impacts to functionally linked land, have been assessed within Chapter 22 Onshore Ornithology.</p> <p>A meeting was held between the Applicant and RSPB on 20 October 2023, to understand more about the Greater Frampton Vision project and opportunities for the Project to support and contribute to it and we welcome continued engagement.</p> <p>Mitigation for designated sites is detailed in Chapter 22.</p>	6.1.22 Onshore Ornithology

Ref	Stakeholder	Response Ref	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
			<p>North substation and the Weston Marsh South connection area to affect both reserves and the LRP.</p> <p>We are encouraged by Outer Dowsing’s interest so far in the LRP, and in particular by the ongoing discussions between Zoe Gillard, the LRP lead, and Outer Dowsing’s Chris Jenner, and we welcome further detailed discussions and consultation with the Outer Dowsing project team to ensure that the cable routing, substation and connection area impacts avoid the RSPB reserves and any land that is key to the objectives of the LRP.</p>		
39	South Holland Internal Drainage Board	AC_29	<p><b>Autumn Consultation Refined Maps</b>  <b>Connection Area:</b>            Two of the Board’s arterial watercourses, known as R20 Crowtree Connection (DRN208P2001) and R11 New Drain (DRN208P1101), lie within the Connection Area proposed at Weston Marsh. Additionally, a high-priority watercourse, owned and maintained by the Board, known as R07 Lords (DRN208P0701), is located approximately 150 metres to the east of the site. These watercourses are shown in figure 1 below.</p> <p>The Board request that further information is provided regarding the works proposed within the Connection Area.</p> <p>Please be aware that the Board intends to widen most arterial watercourses over the next 50 years. This could impact your proposals when using both overhead and underground cables.</p>	A description of the works to be undertaken in the Connection Area is presented in Chapter 3 Project Description. The Applicant has noted the comments provided.	6.1.3 Project Description
40	South Holland Internal Drainage Board	AC_29	<p><b>Cable Route:</b>            The cable route from the substation and connection area will cross one riparian watercourse, marked by a yellow cross in figure 1. It is unclear after this point if the cable route will cross any other watercourse. As above, more information is requested with regards to the works to be carried out within the Connection Area.</p> <p>South Holland IDB, alongside other Internal Drainage Boards, are working on a consenting agreement schedule for cable crossings below Board maintained and riparian watercourses.</p> <p>In addition, I note that on page 11 of the “Cable corridor and substation search zone map”, that it suggests that there is a cable corridor from the A17 at Fosdyke Bridge, which travels westwards along the riverbank to the connection area (shown in figure 2 below). Please could you confirm if this is a cable corridor or a construction access route?</p> <p>The Board have concerns with this cable/access route, as significant Board assets are located along the corridor, including sluices and pumping stations. Any access over Board-owned land (including crossing watercourses) will require a wayleave or easement from the Board. I encourage you to contact the Board as soon as possible to start discussions regarding this.</p> <p>(See Figures 1-3 in IDB response)</p>	<p>Details of the Applicant’s Crossings are included in the onshore crossing schedule (document reference 6.3.3.2). the Applicant has committed to adopting trenchless techniques on all IDB owned and maintained drains (see Outline CoCP (document reference 8.1)) and has agreed minimum crossing depths and other parameters with the IDBs.</p> <p>The applicant has engaged with all five IDBs affected by the project and will include protective provisions in the draft DCO.</p> <p>The Applicant has been in discussions with SH IDB with respect to determining wayleaves and / or easements.</p> <p>The assets of all IDBs are shown in the Crossing Schedule</p>	<p>8.1 Outline Code of Construction Practice</p> <p>3.1 Draft Development Consent Order</p> <p>6.3.3.2 Onshore Crossing Schedule</p>
41	South Holland Internal Drainage Board	AC_29	<p><b>Cable Route:</b>            Please be aware of the following Board’s Byelaws:</p>	Under the draft DCO the Land Drainage Act and Byelaws would be disapplied and replaced by the requirements of the protective provisions, making the IDB the approver of the pre-construction details. The	3.1 Draft Development Consent Order



Ref	Stakeholder	Response Ref	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
			<p>Section 23, Land Drainage Act 1991 and Byelaw 4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Works proposed to alter a watercourse (whether on a temporary or permanent basis), requires consent under Section 23 of the Land Drainage Act 1991 (and byelaw 4) including any open cut crossings, culverting or infilling of a watercourse required Section 23 consent.</li> </ul> <p>Byelaw 10</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consent is required for all works within 9 metres of the edge of drainage and flood risk management infrastructure. Within the IDD this infrastructure is principally arterial watercourses and water management assets such as pumping stations.</li> <li>The 9 metre distance is measured from the edge/brink of the watercourse (whether open or piped). The 9m zone covers a 360° area around the watercourse, including above and below it, so any crossings of Board maintained watercourses would usually likely require the Boards consent under this Byelaw.</li> <li>Any temporary hall roads within 9 metres of an arterial watercourse will require consent.</li> </ul> <p>Byelaw 3 (surface water and treated foul water)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All new surface water (or treated foul) discharges into a watercourse within the IDD will require consent from the Board under Byelaw 3. The Board recommend that any discharge is in line with the Non-Statutory technical standards for sustainable drainage systems (SuDS), therefore the Board is unlikely to grant consent for discharges in excess of greenfield rate, however we assess each proposal on a case-by-case basis.</li> </ul>	technical content of the byelaws is reflected in the arrangements proposed by the Applicant and will be confirmed in the pre-construction details to be submitted for approval.	8.1 Outline Code of Construction Practice
42	The Coal Authority	AC_30	<p>Thank you for your notification of 20 October 2023 seeking the views of the Coal Authority on the above.</p> <p>I have checked the site location plan against the information held by the Coal Authority and can confirm that the proposed development site is located outside of the defined coalfield. On this basis, the Planning team at the Coal Authority have no comments to make.</p>	The Applicant has noted this response and that there are no comments.	
43	Fenland District Council	AC_5	In response to the consultation received 20 October 2023 the Local Planning Authority have no observations to make.	The Applicant has noted this response and that there are no comments.	
44	Lincolnshire Police	AC_10	Lincolnshire Police do not have any objections to this pre-application notification and enquiry.	The Applicant has noted this response and that there are no comments.	
45	NHS Lincolnshire Integrated Care Board	AC_20	NHS Lincolnshire Integrated Care Board does not have any comments to make at this time.	The Applicant has noted this response and that there are no comments.	
46	Norfolk Coast Partnership	AC_21	<p>Thank you for writing to us with regards the above application and for making us aware of the consultation.</p> <p>On this occasion, we will politely refrain from making comment; whilst Norfolk Coast Partnership (NCP) oversees the Norfolk Coast Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), we are not a statutory planning consultee and, subsequently, are not funded to provide this service. Furthermore, given the proposed project lies outside the AONB, it is perhaps not appropriate for us to provide comment.</p>	The Applicant has noted this response and that there are no comments.	
47	North Kesteven District Council	AC_22	Thank you for consulting North Kesteven District Council on the above proposals, however at this stage we have no specific comments.	The Applicant has noted this response and that there are no comments.	
48	North Northamptonshire Council	AC_23	North Northamptonshire Council (Kettering Office) raises No objection subject to the following conditions/for the following reasons:- NONE	The Applicant has noted this response and that there are no comments.	

Ref	Stakeholder	Response Ref	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
49	Northern Power Grid	AC_24	<p>We have reviewed the plans and note that the proposed project is just outside of our operational area.</p> <p>If you believe that this impacts any of Northern Powergrid's assets, we'd be grateful if you could confirm further details.</p>	The Applicant has noted this response and that there are no comments.	
50	The Scottish Environment Protection Agency	AC_31	Thank you for contacting The Scottish Environment Protection Agency. The location of this project appears to be out with our remit and may lie within the remit of the Environment Agency in England.	The Applicant has noted this response and that there are no comments. The Applicant has engaged extensively with the Environment Agency.	
51	Trinity House	AC_32	With reference to the below and the Hazard Workshop Meeting yesterday, I can confirm that Trinity House has no further comments to add to those previously made (attached for ease of reference) on 14/07/23, which remain valid.	The Applicant has noted this response and that there are no further comments.	
52	UK Health Security Agency	AC_33	<p>Thank you for your letter of 20 October 2023 inviting the UK Health Security Agency (UKHSA) to provide comments relating to the above Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP). Please note that we request views from the Office for Health Improvement and Disparities (OHID) and the response provided is sent on behalf of both UKHSA and OHID.</p> <p>On this occasion, we have no additional comments to provide at this stage of the NSIP application.</p> <p>We note that we have replied to earlier consultations, as listed below, and this response should be read in conjunction with that earlier correspondence: Request for Scoping Opinion: 23/08/22 Public Consultation - Section 42: 14/07/23</p> <p>The additional information supplied does not cause any change to UKHSA's responses above.</p>	The Applicant has noted this response and that there are no comments. The Applicant has responded to previous comments in the sections above.	
53	Lincolnshire County Council	AC_9	The presentation from the November Technical Working Group meeting confirms the analysis made onsite with the Applicants Landscape Architect. The Council is happy with the approach, the viewpoints and the proposals for onsite and offsite mitigation. There are no other issues and it's just a case of waiting for the DCO application with the LVIA.	The Applicant has noted this response	
54	Lincolnshire County Council	AC_9	In respect of the formal consultation, the presentation boards online have been considered.	The Applicant has noted this response	
55	Lincolnshire County Council	AC_9	Theres quite a number of construction compounds and this will be an important issue in regards restoration and protection during construction that needs to be assessed appropriately .	The focus of the LVIA in respect of the onshore export cable corridor is the potential physical and visual effects associated with the temporary construction compounds for both sections where open-cut trenching and trenchless techniques will be deployed.	6.1.28 LVIA
56	Lincolnshire County Council	AC_9	The core mitigation planting around the substation is combined with offsite mitigation including along the A16 and this is shown in the maps from the consultation, it correlates with the ideas discussed on site, so in the current level of detail is an acceptable strategy.	The indicative mitigation planting is illustrated in the visualisations at 15 years of growth, assessed within the LVIA and with detail presented in the Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Strategy (OLEMS).	6.1.28 LVIA 8.10 OLEMS
57	Lincolnshire County Council	AC_9	The Environmental Update report in section 3.3 assesses the onshore design refinements including building heights, the footprint area. The height dropping is beneficial given the open flat aspect of the substation site.	The Applicant has noted this response	
58	Lincolnshire County Council	AC_9	Table 3.5 details the impact of the changed on the LVIA, including the decision to include offsite planting to aid the mitigation of the substation. This table presents the progression and expectation of the ES to flesh out the details of these current proposals.	The detail on the mitigation planting is presented in the OLEMS.	8.10 OLEMS

Ref	Stakeholder	Response Ref	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
59	Lincolnshire County Council	AC_9	The Council concludes that overall the approach and openness of the strategy is acceptable and hope this is presented well in the submission documents.	The Applicant has noted this response	
60	Lincolnshire County Council	AC_9	In principle, the trip generation, routes and proposed mitigation in form of passing places seems appropriate.	The Applicant has noted this response	
61	Lincolnshire County Council	AC_9	Will the Transport Assessment have existing 2 way flows on all the links? Some of the daily flows seem to be quite large in total, especially on the A roads and it would be informative to know how much these compare with existing flows.	<p>Baseline traffic data has been collected (using Automatic Traffic Counters) on all of the proposed construction vehicle access routes. The baseline data are set out in the Traffic &amp; Transport Assessment and Traffic and Transport Chapter (noting in some cases, baseline data has been collected at one location only on a local construction vehicle access routes between the core construction vehicle access routes i.e. the A52/A16/A158 and the onshore cable corridor) representing the whole route.</p> <p>The baseline traffic data (daily 2-way flows) and the percentage change with the addition of the forecast construction vehicle movements associated with ODOW (peak month) are noted below.</p> <p>The range of percentage change of total vehicles on the core construction vehicle access routes is between 0.7% and 12%. The 12% increase is on the A16 between the A158 and the A1028, which is the only increase above 10%. The average percentage increase on these routes is 3.7%, which is negligible.</p> <p>The percentage change on the A52 and A16 in Boston is 1.0% and 1.2%, which is unlikely to be perceptible in the daily fluctuation of daily traffic.</p>	Traffic and Transport (6.1.27) Traffic and Transport Assessment (6.1.27.3)
62	Lincolnshire County Council	AC_9	I am concerned about the volume of traffic proposed through Boston on the A16 and A52, whilst these are strategic A roads, they operate at capacity in most peak periods and additional traffic of the scale proposed in these tables could be a concern. The TA would need to consider % change due to the development impact, and possibly junction capacity assessments.	<p>The maximum forecast number of ODOW construction vehicle movements in the morning or evening peak hours on the highway network through Boston is 44 (two-way) on the A16 (slightly higher than the numbers issued to you due to some slight tweaks to the workforce data).</p> <p>For the workforce vehicle movements on the A16, 19 out of the 24 (20 of the 44 total are HGVs) have been assumed to originate/terminate in Boston based on the gravity model, which could join/leave the A16 at four of five locations within Boston (the analysis does not go into detail regarding specific accommodation and respective routing) and travel out of/into Boston to/from the various segments of the Onshore ECC or Onshore Substation to the north and south of Boston. Therefore, the actual maximum number of two-way vehicle movements at the various junctions on the A16 in Boston is likely to be much closer to, if not below 30, which is typically used as the trigger for the consideration of undertaking a junction capacity assessment. It is also likely that many drivers of HGVs would endeavour to avoid travelling through Boston in the peak hours due to the known congestion.</p>	Traffic and Transport (6.1.27) Traffic and Transport Assessment (6.1.3.27)
63	Lincolnshire County Council	AC_9	With regard to the passing place drawings. In general, the proposals appear to show passing places in suitable places, sometimes using proposed existing accesses or junctions – it should be noted that some of the accesses would need upgrading as they appear not suitable currently.	The Applicant has noted this response. The detailed design of the mitigation will be undertaken post consent and through discussions and agreement with LCC as outlined in Chapter 27 Traffic and Transport. . Local concerns are noted in respect of travel and traffic impacts and the Applicant has proposed measures to minimise disruption as much as	6.1.27 Traffic and Transport

Ref	Stakeholder	Response Ref	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
				possible including the implementation of a CTMP, a travel plan and the use of a haul road to avoid traffic being on the road.	
64	Lincolnshire County Council	AC_9	Again, if the existing base flows are provided as well as the development traffic it would be possible to better estimate if all the spaces are needed. I think some rural lanes might have low traffic flows and low development traffic such that spaces are not needed every 200m but less frequently.	The Applicant has noted this response. The detailed design of the mitigation will be undertaken post consent and through discussions and agreement with LCC as outlined in Chapter 27 Traffic and Transport. Local concerns are noted in respect of travel and traffic impacts and the Applicant has proposed measures to minimise disruption as much as possible including the implementation of a CTMP, a travel plan and the use of a haul road to avoid traffic being on the road.	6.1.27 Traffic and Transport
65	Health and Safety Executive	AC_6	<p><u>Would Hazardous Substance Consent be needed?</u> Based on the phase 2 consultation documents and the Autumn Consultation Report at <a href="https://www.outerdowsing.com/phase-2-consultation/">https://www.outerdowsing.com/phase-2-consultation/</a>, and Environmental Update Report (outerdowsing.com) it is not clear whether the applicant has considered the hazard classification of any chemical substances that may be proposed to be present at the development. This may be because there are none due to the nature of the scheme.</p> <p>The HSE would like to highlight that hazardous substances consent ['HSC'] is required to store or use any of the Categories of Substances or Named Hazardous Substances set out in Schedule 1 of The Planning (Hazardous Substances) Regulations 2015 as amended, if those hazardous substances will be present on, over or under the land at or above the controlled quantities. Also, there is an "addition rule" in Paragraph 5 Part 4 of Schedule 1 for below-threshold substances. Further information on HSC should be sought from the relevant Hazardous Substances Authority.</p>	The Applicant does not anticipate a requirement for hazardous substances and if any are required hazardous substances consent would be sought.	
66	Health and Safety Executive	AC_6	<p><u>Consideration of Risk Assessments</u> Regulation 5(4) of the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 requires the assessment of significant effects to include, where relevant, the expected significant effects arising from the proposed development's vulnerability to major accidents. HSE's role in NSIPs is summarised in Advice Note 11 'working with public bodies in the infrastructure planning process' Annex G on the Planning Inspectorate's website [Advice Note Eleven, Annex G – The Health and Safety Executive   National Infrastructure Planning (planninginspectorate.gov.uk)]. This document includes consideration of risk assessments under the heading "Risk assessments".</p> <p>In the phase 2 consultation documents and the Autumn Consultation Report, it was not clear if there was consideration of risk assessments arising from the development's vulnerability to major accidents. We would advise this is considered further in line with Advice Note 11 Annex on the Planning Inspectorate's website - Annex G – The Health and Safety Executive taking account of the following: "it may be beneficial for applicants to undertake a risk assessment as early as possible to satisfy themselves that their design and operation will meet the requirements of relevant health and safety legislation as design of the Proposed Development progresses."</p>	The Applicant has noted this response. Risk assessments have been carried out throughout the chapters of the Environmental Statement and mitigation measures, best practices and protocols are secured in the Outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP). Contractors will be required to prepare a Health, Safety and Environment plan for onshore works	8.1 Code of Construction Practice
67	Health and Safety Executive	AC_6	<p><u>Explosives sites</u> CEMHD 7's response remains the same as previous response - no comment to make as there are no HSE licenced explosives sites in the vicinity of the proposed development</p>	The Applicant has noted this response	
68	Health and Safety Executive	AC_6	<p><u>Electrical Safety</u> No comment from a planning perspective.</p>	The Applicant has noted this response	



Ref	Stakeholder	Response Ref	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
69	Peterborough City Council	AC_26	<p>Further to your enquiry received on 20 October 2023, in respect of the above, the Local Planning Authority makes the following comments:</p> <p>The off-shore elements of the proposal are remote from the Peterborough area, and the associated on-shore infrastructure is considered unlikely to impact on the Peterborough area. As such, Peterborough City Council has no comments at this time.</p> <p>I trust that the above advice is of use however should you have any further queries, please do not hesitate to contact me on the details shown at the top of this letter.</p>	The Applicant has noted this response	

## 4 Applicant Regard to Targeted Winter Section 42 Consultation Responses

Table 4.1 Applicant Regard to Section 42 Targeted Winter Consultation Responses (Onshore and Offshore)

Ref	Stakeholder	Response Ref	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
1	Environment Agency	TC-6	We have reviewed this information and note that the land take has been reduced at the landfall location, and along the route, several access points and some temporary compound locations have been refined and/or moved. There is no further impact on main rivers and the majority of changes still mean that the route/compounds remain within the floodplain and hazard areas modelled by the Environment Agency. Accordingly, I can advise that we have no further comments to make on these refinements, but our previous comments remain relevant.	The Applicant has noted that there are no further comments. Previous comments from the EA have been addressed in the sections above.	
2	Natural England	TC-8	Natural England advise that, whilst amendments have been made to the overall project design envelope during this targeted statutory consultation, the impact pathways and assessment methods as stated by the project during their original statutory consultation were high level and remain unchanged by amendments made to the design envelope in this latest revision. Natural England therefore advise that our advice, as presented to the project during the Statutory Consultation (NE Ref 936847), remains relevant to the amendments made during the latest Targeted Statutory Consultation. We expect that the project will include the latest amendments to the project design when presenting their conclusions within the final Environmental Statement and that it will take onboard the advice Natural England has previously provided as part of Statutory consultations. Natural England will provide further advice upon receipt of the Environmental Statement accordingly. If you have any queries relating to the content of this letter, please contact me using the details provided below.	The Applicant has noted that there are no further comments. Previous comments from Natural England have been addressed in the sections above.	
3	HSE	TC-18	With reference to the redlined Site Boundary, the changes to the DCO boundary are very minor, there will be no change to our advice, i.e., no further comments. 1. the proposed project does not fall within the consultation distances of any Major Hazard Installation(s) or Major Accident Hazard Pipeline(s). 2. Please note if at any time a new Major Accident Hazard Pipeline is introduced or existing Pipeline modified prior to the determination of a future application, then the HSE reserves the right to revise its advice. 3. Likewise, if prior to the determination of a future application, a Hazardous Substances Consent is granted for a new Major Hazard Installation or a Hazardous Substances Consent is varied for an existing Major Hazard Installation in the vicinity of the proposed development, again the HSE reserves the right to revise its advice. Chemicals, Explosives and Microbiological Hazards Division – Unit 4 Would Hazardous Substances Consent be needed? 4. The presence of hazardous substances on, over or under land at or above set threshold quantities (Controlled Quantities) may require Hazardous Substances Consent (HSC) under the Planning (Hazardous Substances) Act 1990 as amended. The substances, alone or when aggregated with others, for which HSC is required, and the associated Controlled Quantities, are set out in The Planning (Hazardous Substances) (Wales) Regulations 2015. 5. Hazardous Substances Consent would be required if the proposed development site is intending to store or use any of the Named Hazardous Substances or Categories of Substances and Preparations at or above the controlled quantities set out in schedule 1 of these Regulations.	The Applicant has noted that there are no further comments. The Applicant notes the requirement for hazardous substances consent which will be sought if required. It does not anticipate that any of the listed substances will be required.	

Ref	Stakeholder	Response Ref	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
			<p>6. Further information on HSC should be sought from the relevant Hazardous Substances Authority. HSE Explosive Advice response is no comment to make as there are no HSE explosive licenced sites in the vicinity of the proposed development.</p>		
4	Marine Management Organisation	TC-9	<p>MMO has reviewed the consultation documents received 18 December 2023 and notes that the majority of the amendments relate to onshore elements of the project. MMO defers to other associated consultees for their assessment of impacts from these onshore changes.</p> <p>1.5. MMO welcomes the refinement to the location of TJB, which has reduced the landfall footprint. MMO notes that ODOW are not proposing any amendments to the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) or Autumn Consultation Environmental Update Report, as a result of this change. ODOW states that refinements are not anticipated to cause materially new or materially different environmental impacts to those already presented.</p> <p>1.6. MMO reserves the right to make further comments on the Project throughout the pre-application process and may modify its present advice or opinion in view of any additional information that may come to our attention.</p> <p>2. Conclusion The MMO welcomes the progress GTR4 Limited has made to date to assess the environmental impacts of the ODOW project. However, the MMO requires the points raised in our previous response, dated 22 November 2023, and those raised within the PEIR response dated 21 July 2023, to be addressed within the Environmental Statement. Please note this letter comprises the MMO's initial comments in respect of the Outer Dowsing Offshore Wind Farm Targeted Consultation Supporting Information and is without prejudice to any future representation the MMO may make about the proposed Project and associated documents.</p>	<p>The Applicant has noted that there are no further comments. Previous comments from the MMO have been addressed in the sections above</p>	
5	Network Rail	TC-1	<p>Impact on Network Rail Infrastructure Network Rail have been reviewing the information provided and note the changes made to the scheme in order for preparation of a formal DCO application. Proposals include the development of an on-shore cables through railway property. The scheme will intersect with operational railway between Thorpe Culvert and Wainfleet railway stations (GRS4 @ 3m 347-635yds) on the Firsby East Junction to Skegness railway line.</p> <p>At this time we have no further comments to make on the additional information supplied, other than those returned in response to the summer consultation (19 July 2023) as detailed in the attachment which still apply.</p>	<p>The Applicant has noted that there are no further comments. Previous comments from Network Rail have been addressed in the sections above</p>	
6	Historic England	TC-2	<p>We note the latest amendments to the scheme and have nothing to add at this time to our advice as sent 24/11/2023.</p> <p>We will continue to engage positively with the ETG.</p>	<p>The Applicant has noted that there are no further comments. Previous comments from Historic England have been addressed in the sections above</p>	
7	National Grid	TC-3	<p>I refer to your letter dated 14th December 2023 regarding the proposed application for Outer Dowsing Offshore Wind.</p> <p>Further to our previous responses submitted on 22nd November 2023 and 21st July 2023 and having reviewed the consultation information NGET has no additional comments.</p>	<p>The Applicant has noted that there are no further comments. Previous comments from National Grid have been addressed in the sections above</p>	

Ref	Stakeholder	Response Ref	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
8	South Holland Drainage board	TC-4	<p>Targeted Consultation Refinements Plan &amp; Targeted Consultation Order Limits Plan:</p> <p>I note that two small sections of land around the connection area at Weston Marsh have been removed from the Order Limit. I do not believe that these small changes have impacted the Board's previous comments made as part of the Autumn Consultation. Our previous comments are shown below (plans have been amended slightly to reflect the new Order Limit boundary):</p> <p>Connection Area: Two of the Board's arterial watercourses, known as R20 Crowtree Connection (DRN208P2001) and R11 New Drain (DRN208P1101), lie within the Connection Area proposed at Weston Marsh. Additionally, a high-priority watercourse, owned and maintained by the Board, known as R07 Lords (DRN208P0701), is located approximately 150 metres to the east of the site. The Board requests that further information be provided regarding the works proposed within the Connection Area. Please be aware that the Board intends to widen most arterial watercourses over the next 50 years. This could impact your proposals when using both overhead and underground cables.</p> <p>Cable Route: The cable route from the substation and connection area will cross one riparian watercourse, marked by a yellow cross in figure 1. It is unclear after this point if the cable route will cross any other watercourse. As mentioned above, more information is requested with regard to the works to be carried out within the Connection Area. South Holland IDB, alongside other Internal Drainage Boards, are working on a consenting agreement schedule for cable crossings below Board maintained and riparian watercourses. In addition, I note that on page 11 of the "Cable corridor and substation search zone map", that it suggests that there is a cable corridor from the A17 at Fosdyke Bridge, which travels westwards along the riverbank to the connection area (shown in figure 2 below). Please could you confirm if this is a cable corridor or a construction access route? The Board have concerns with this cable/access route, as significant Board assets are located along the corridor, including sluices and pumping stations. Any access over Board-owned land (including crossing watercourses) will require a wayleave or easement from the Board. I encourage you to contact the Board as soon as possible to start discussions regarding this.</p>	<p>The Applicant has noted that there are no further comments. Previous comments from South Holland Drainage Board have been addressed in the sections above</p>	
9	North Lincolnshire Council	TC-5	<p>I can confirm that NLC has no comments or objections to raise in respect of this project. The proposed development is not likely to result in any significant impacts upon North Lincolnshire.</p> <p>Furthermore, given the nature and location of the proposed onshore works, it is</p>	<p>The Applicant has noted that there are no further comments. Previous comments from North Lincolnshire Council have been addressed in the sections above</p>	



Ref	Stakeholder	Response Ref	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
			unlikely that NLC will want to register as an interested party should a formal DCO application be submitted and accepted.		
10	Local Planning Authorities, South Holland District Council, Boston Borough Council and East Lindsey District Council	TC-7	Having reviewed the submitted proposed minor changes following your landowner consultation I can confirm that we have no further comments to make.	The Applicant has noted that there are no further comments. Previous comments have been addressed in the sections above	
11	Kings Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council	TC-10	The land elements of the proposal are at min 20km west of the Borough Council's boundary and the Array Boundary is some 50km from the northern coastline of the borough. It is assumed that the relevant ecological and environmental reports will be completed to ascertain the full impacts of the proposal and how these impacts can be mitigated. The council has NO COMMENT to make on the proposal at this stage.	The Applicant has noted that there are no comments.	
12	National Highways	TC-11	<p>Previous Consultation Response</p> <p>National Highways responded to the previous consultation in November 2023. At that time, we advised that given the distance of the site from the SRN, the number of construction vehicles will most likely have dissipated before they reach our network. As such, it was considered that the traffic generated by this proposal both during the construction period and when the site is fully operational, would not adversely impact the SRN. Notwithstanding this, we expressed our intent to review the final Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP), and we set out items that we wished to see included in this document.</p> <p>Current Consultation</p> <p>We understand that since the previous consultation was carried out, a number of design refinements have been made resulting in the need for further consultation. Revisions to the application consist of: Refinement of landscaping to better align with landownership boundaries to prevent severed land and enable access for maintenance;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Addition of drainage works adjacent to the landscaping to mitigate landowner concerns of potential impacts of planting on land drainage;</li> <li>3. Amendments to accesses following landowner consultation;</li> <li>4. Re-location and removal of passing places following design optimisation studies;</li> <li>5. Removal and re-location of construction compounds based on engineering refinements and landowner feedback; and</li> <li>6. Refinement of landfall works to accommodate optimised engineering design and environmental mitigation</li> </ol> <p>Based on the information available to us, it is considered that these changes will not adversely impact the Strategic Road Network (SRN).</p> <p>National Highways review and response</p> <p>National Highways has reviewed the revised documents, and we acknowledge that the proposed project refinements are not anticipated to cause materially new or materially different environmental impacts to those presented in the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR), reviewed as part of the</p>	The Applicant has noted that there are no further comments. Previous comments from National Highways have been addressed in the sections above	

Ref	Stakeholder	Response Ref	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Regard	Application Reference
			initial consultation. Our review has led us to conclude that our position remains the same as that advised in our original July 2023 response. In summary, given the distance of the site to the SRN, traffic generation as a result of the construction and operational phases of this proposal are unlikely to present a material impact on the National Highways network. Nonetheless, we look forward to reviewing the final Construction Traffic Management Plan which we understand will be prepared and submitted in support of the forthcoming DCO application.		
13	Forestry Commission	TC-12	Having looked at the changes, we can confirm that woodlands and ancient woodlands are unaffected by these changes, therefore we have no further comments to make.	The Applicant has noted that there are no further comments. Previous comments from the Forestry Commission been addressed in the sections above	
14	The Coal Authority	TC-13	I have checked the site location plan against the information held by the Coal Authority and can confirm that the proposed development site is located outside of the defined coalfield.  On this basis, the Planning team at the Coal Authority have no comments to make.	The Applicant has noted that there are no further comments.	
15	Fenland District Council	TC-14	The consultation invites comments on a proposed application for the Outer Dowsing Offshore Wind Project which includes both offshore and onshore infrastructure including up to 100 wind turbines and connection to the National Grid.  I can advise that Fenland District Council have no comments or objections in relation to this application.	The Applicant has noted this response.	
16	NATS Safeguarding	TC-15	NATS objection remains as noted in the attached email.	The Applicant has noted that there are no further comments. Previous comments from NATS been addressed in the sections above.	
17	UK POWER NETWORKS	TC-17	Unfortunately, we cannot process your request as your site (Wolla Bank, Chapel St Leonards) does not fall within UKPN's area of coverage. The Distribution Network Operator for this area is National Grid Electricity Distribution and you will need to submit your request to them directly.	The Applicant has noted this response.	
18	NHS Lincolnshire Integrated Care Board	TC-19	Please be advised that the Lincolnshire ICB has no comments to share at this stage.	The Applicant has noted that there are no comments.	

