

Outer Dowsing Offshore Wind

19.5 Applicant's Responses to Comments on Relevant Representations

Deadline 2

Date: November 2024

Document Reference: 19.5

Rev: 1.0

Company:		Outer Dowsing Offshore Wind		Asset:		Whole Asset	
Project:		Whole Wind Farm		Sub Project/Package:		Whole Asset	
Document Title or Description:		Applicant's Response to Comments on Relevant Representations					
Internal Document Number:		PP1-ODOW-DEV-CS-REP-0244		3 rd Party Doc No (If applicable):		N/A	
Rev No.	Date	Status / Reason for Issue	Author	Checked by	Reviewed by	Approved by	
1.0	November 2024	Deadline 2	GoBe	Outer Dowsing	Shepherd & Wedderburn	Outer Dowsing	

Executive Summary

1. The Marine Management Organisation (MMO) submitted Responses to Relevant Representations at the Procedural Deadline on the 19th September 2024 (PD1-115) which presented the MMOs comments on the relevant representations received from other interested parties which includes local authorities, statutory and non-statutory consultees and organisations.
2. Table 2-1 of this document sets out the Applicant's Responses to Comments on Relevant Representations.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....	3
Acronyms & Definitions	5
Abbreviations / Acronyms.....	5
Terminology	6
1 Introduction & Document Purpose	7
2 The Marine Management Organisation (MMO) Response to Other Interested Parties Relevant Representations.....	8

Table of Tables

Table 2-1 Applicant's Responses to Comments on Relevant Representations.

Acronyms & Definitions

Abbreviations / Acronyms

Abbreviation / Acronym	Description
AEZ	Archaeological Exclusion Zones
ANS	Artificial Nesting Structures
CoCP	Code of Construction Practice
CRA	Chemical Risk Assessment
DCO	Development Consent Order
dML	deemed marine licence
EA	Environment Agency
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
ES	Environmental Statement
HDD	Horizontal Directional Drilling
HRA	Habitats Risk Assessment
IDRBNR	Inner Dowsing Race Bank and North Ridge
IFCA	Inshore Fisheries and Conservation Authority
INNS	Invasive Non-Native Species
LWT	Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust
MHWS	Mean High Water Springs
MMO	Marine Management Organisation
MPA	Marine Protected Area
MPCP	Marine Pollution Contingency Plan
NAS	Noise Abatement Systems
NCERM	National Coastal Erosion Risk Mapping
NE	Natural England
NSN	National Site Network
O&M	Operations and Maintenance
PEMP	Project Environmental Environment Plan
PLONOR	Pose Little or No Risk to the Environment
UWN	Underwater Noise
RSPB	Royal Society for the Protection of Birds
SAC	Special Area of Conservation
SPA	Special Protected Area
SSSI	Site of Special Scientific Interest
WCS	Worst Case Scenario
WSI	Written Scheme of Investigation

Terminology

Term	Definition
The Applicant	GTR4 Limited (a joint venture between Corio Generation (and its affiliates), TotalEnergies and Gulf Energy Development), trading as Outer Dowsing Offshore Wind
Baseline	The status of the environment at the time of assessment without the development in place.
Deemed Marine Licence (dML)	A marine licence set out in a Schedule to the Development Consent Order and deemed to have been granted under Part 4 (marine licensing) of the Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009.
Development Consent Order (DCO)	An order made under the Planning Act 2008 granting development consent for a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP).
Effect	Term used to express the consequence of an impact. The significance of an effect is determined by correlating the magnitude of the impact with the sensitivity of the receptor, in accordance with defined significance criteria.
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.
Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA)	A process which helps determine likely significant effects and (where appropriate) assesses adverse impacts on the integrity of European conservation sites and Ramsar sites. The process consists of up to four stages of assessment: screening, appropriate assessment, assessment of alternative solutions and assessment of imperative reasons of over-riding public interest (IROPI) and compensatory measures.
Impact	An impact to the receiving environment is defined as any change to its baseline condition, either adverse or beneficial.
Maximum Design Scenario	The project design parameters, or a combination of project design parameters that are likely to result in the greatest potential for change in relation to each impact assessed
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.
The 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.
Receptor	A distinct part of the environment on which effects could occur and can be the subject of specific assessments. Examples of receptors include species (or groups) of animals or plants, people (often categorised further such as 'residential' or those using areas for amenity or recreation), watercourses etc.

1 Introduction & Document Purpose

The Applicant has responded to the Procedural Deadline submissions Responses to Relevant Representations (PD1-115) submitted by the MMO in Table 2-1 below.

2 The Marine Management Organisation (MMO) Response to Other Interested Parties Relevant Representations

Table 2-1 Applicant's Responses to Comments on Relevant Representations

ID	Comment	Applicant Response
1.1 Environmental Agency (EA)		
1.1 Environment Agency - Chapter 7 Marine Physical Processes (APP-062)		
Section 7.4.3.3 Morphology	The MMO notes that the EA raised concerns about National Coastal Erosion Risk Mapping (NCERM) data and if it will cover this location. The EA also raised concerns regarding the unlikelihood that this section of the coast will not be affected by erosion unless current recharge actions are maintained as well as the monitoring data set not covering a sufficient long-term period. The MMO will keep a watching brief on the outcomes of this throughout examination.	The Applicant has responded to the concerns regarding the use of the NCERM data and the conclusions of the assessments in response 24 and 25 of Table 1.18 of the Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations (PD1-071).
Section 7.12 Impact Assessment	The MMO notes that the EA has raised concerns about Wolla Bank Beach being subject to erosion and destabilisation due to certain stressors. EA also raised concerns about the conclusion of no "pathways of effect" on Chapel Point Wolla Bank Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and feel it is currently uncertain. The MMO welcomes EA's suggestion that a geophysical and geological investigation be conducted to determine the full extent of the features of that SSSI to aid in the micro-siting of the exit pit and cable protection as well as helping to avoid HDD issues. The MMO defers to NE on all matters related to SSSI but will maintain a watching brief for any potential mitigation or dML conditions for those areas below Mean High Water Springs (MHWS).	The Applicant has responded to these concerns within response 26 of Table 1.18 of The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations (PD1-071).
1.1.1 Environment Agency - Chapter 8 Marine Water and Sediment Quality (APP-063)		
1.1.1	The MMO notes the EA is satisfied with Environmental Statement (ES) Chapter 8: Water Sediment and Quality. The MMO has made some recommendations for rectifying some points in this Chapter and also raised concerns in our Relevant Representation regarding all chemicals with a pathway to the marine environment, including those on the Pose Little or No Risk to the Environment (PLONOR) list, to still require approval from MMO. Please refer to points: 4.3.5, 4.3.11, 4.3.12, 4.3.17 and 4.3.18 within our Relevant Representation.	The Applicant has responded to the points raised by the MMO within the Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations (PD1-071) document. Responses can be found in Table 1.42 RR-042 Marine Management Organisation as paragraphs RR-042.043, RR-042.049, RR-042.050, RR-042.055 and RR-042.056.
1.1.2 Environment Agency - Chapter 8 Appendix 1 Water Framework Directive (APP-153)		
1.1.2	The MMO defers all matters concerning Water Framework Directive to the EA.	This is noted by the Applicant.
1.1.3 Environment Agency - Chapter 9 Benthic and Intertidal Ecology (APP-064)		
1.1.3	The MMO notes the EA is satisfied with ES Chapter 9: Benthic and Intertidal Ecology. The MMO raised concerns regarding the reefiness assessments and the spread of Invasive Non-Native Species (INNS) in our Relevant Representation (RR-042). Please refer to section 4.4 Benthic Ecology.	The Applicant has responded to the points raised by the MMO within the Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations (PD1-071) document. Responses can be found in Table 1.42 RR-042 Marine Management Organisation as paragraphs RR-042.057 to RR-042.065
1.1.4 Environment Agency - Chapter 10 Fish and Shellfish Ecology9 APP-065)		
1.1.4	The MMO notes the EA is satisfied with ES Chapter 10: Fish and Shellfish Ecology. The MMO raised concerns in our Relevant Representation, whereby we requested the inclusion of some further underwater noise (UWN) modelling and the impacts to herring from UWN from piling have been assessed as 'minor' adverse which is not significant in EIA terms, so any specific mitigation measures for the species have not been proposed. The MMO does not support the conclusion and believes that there is potential for significant impacts to occur to Banks herring at a population level, if suitable mitigation is not employed. Please go to section 4.5 Fish Ecology and 4.6 Shellfish Ecology of the MMO's Relevant Representation (RR-042).	The Applicant has responded to the points raised by the MMO within the Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations (PD1-071) document. Responses can be found in Table 1.42 RR-042 Marine Management Organisation as paragraphs RR-042.067 to RR-042.106.
1.1.5 Environment Agency - Outline Pollution Prevention and Emergency Incident Response Plan (APP-272)		

ID	Comment	Applicant Response
1.1.5	The MMO notes the EA is satisfied with the scope of topics included by the Applicant. The MMO notes that the EA also welcomes their inclusion as a consultee to Requirement 18 (in Schedule 1, Part 3 of the DCO), in order to review and comment on the final plan.	This is noted by the Applicant.
1.1.6 Environment Agency - Outline Project Environmental Management Plan (APP-278)		
1.1.6	8.1.6 Outline Project Environmental Management Plan [APP-278] The MMO notes the EA is satisfied with the scope of topics the Applicant has included. MMO has previously welcomed that the Project Environmental Environment Plan (PEMP) will include a Marine Pollution Contingency Plan (MPCP) that will provide protocols to cover accidental spills and potential contaminant release, and provide key emergency contact details. The PEMP will also include a chemical risk assessment (CRA).	This is noted by the Applicant.
1.1.7 Environment Agency - Schedule of Mitigation (APP-287)		
1.1.7	The MMO notes the EA request this document to be updated to include the mitigation measures requested for the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) which outlines further detail and additional mitigation with regards to flood risk and monitoring pre and post-construction of any trenchless main river crossings. The MMO is in agreement that this schedule should be updated to include any updates/changes throughout the examination process.	The Applicant has updated the Schedule of Mitigation at Deadline 1 (PD1-058) and will continue to update the Schedule of Mitigation as necessary throughout examination.
1.2 Natural England		
1.2.1	The MMO notes Natural England's (NE's) decision to use the 'Red Amber Green' ('RAG') system to denote the level of risk associated with a topic related to this development. The MMO welcomes NE's use of this system and considers it a clear and concise way to present the severity of an outstanding concern.	This is noted by the Applicant.
1.2.2	The MMO defers to NE on all matters related to HRA. The MMO will maintain a watching brief on these matters and will ensure we are included/are provided updates on any discussions in relation to the HRA and the DMLs. The MMO highlights that any mitigation secured through the HRA will need to be included within the conditions on the deemed marine licence.	This is noted by the Applicant.
1.2.3	The MMO notes that, as the competent authority (Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017), NE is not satisfied that it can be excluded beyond reasonable scientific doubt that the project would have an adverse effect alone or in combination on the integrity of the: - Inner Dowsing Race Bank and North Ridge (IDRBNR) Special Area of Conservation (SAC) - Flamborough and Filey Coast Special protected Area (SPA) - The Wash SPA - Southern North Sea SAC - North Norfolk Coast SPA	The Applicant wishes to highlight that Natural England is not the Competent Authority. The relevant Secretary of State is the Competent Authority for the purposes of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 and the Conservation of Offshore Marine Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 as set out in the Planning Inspectorate's Guidance Note Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects: Advice on Habitats Regulations Assessments (Planning Inspectorate, 2024). ¹ Natural England is the statutory nature conservation body.
1.2.4	The MMO welcomes comments raised by NE relating to marine physical processes and welcomes the request to clarify the Maximum Design Scenario for cable protection within shallow nearshore water and the potential effects to coastal SAC and SPAs. The MMO especially welcomes the comment to make all efforts to avoid, reduce and mitigate impacts to the features of the IDRBNR SAC, including the avoidance of using external cable protection within a designated site.	The Applicant has responded the points raised within this comment in response B2 and B6, Table 1.45.3.1 of The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations (PD1-071).
1.2.5	The MMO agrees with Natural England that Operations and Maintenance (O&M) activities need to be presented within Chapter 3: Project Description [APP-060] and in the Marine Physical Process Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) [APP-062].	The Applicant has responded the points raised in this comment in response B7 of Table 1.45.3.2 within The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations (PD1-071).

¹ Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects: Advice on Habitats Regulations Assessments available at <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/nationally-significant-infrastructure-projects-advice-on-habitats-regulations-assessments>
 Applicant's Responses to Comments on Relevant Representations
 Document Reference: 19.5

ID	Comment	Applicant Response
1.2.6	The MMO agrees with concerns raised by NE regarding the <i>Sabellaria spinulosa</i> reef baseline assessment and we have already provided comments on this matter under Section 4.4 of the MMO's Relevant Representation (RR-042).	The Applicant has responded to the points raised within this comment within the Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations (PD1-071) document. Responses can be found in Table 1.42 RR-042 Marine Management Organisation as paragraphs RR-042.057 to RR-042.065.
1.2.7	The MMO defers to NE for the appropriateness of the proposed benthic compensation of new site designation or extension for Annex I Sandbanks and Reef. We note that NE is not in agreement with the Applicant on the presented Worse Case Scenario (WCS) of lasting habitat loss/change of Annex I Sandbanks and Reef features from the placement of cable protection within the IDRBNR SAC and habitat disturbance of Annex I Sabellaria spinulosa reef from cable installation within IDRBNR SAC. NE are also not in agreement with the Applicant on scale and extent of the compensation measures required. However, NE are in broad agreement with this compensation measure since there is a restore conservation objective for Annex I <i>Sabellaria spinulosa</i> reef feature of IDRBNR SAC and therefore there is a preference for management measures to be put in place to support its recovery.	The Applicant has responded to the points raised in this comment in response C5, C6 and C7 of Table 1.45.4.1 within The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations (PD1-071).
1.2.8	Regarding the alternative measures for Annex I Sandbanks and Reef compensation proposed, the MMO notes NE's concern over the requirement of legislation changes for the delivery of this measure.	The Applicant has responded to the points raised in this comment in response D12 of Table 1.45.5.2 within The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations (PD1-071).
1.2.9	Regarding the compensation measure for the removal of redundant infrastructure, namely disused telecommunications cables, for anthropogenic pressure removal on Annex I Sandbanks, MMO notes that NE does not currently support this measure. NE have highlighted that currently there is no evidence that these redundant cables are causing a significant impact on the Annex I Sandbank feature of the IDRBNR SAC or other benthic designated sites. The MMO acknowledges that NE support the compensation measure for anthropogenic pressure removal of aggregates industry pressures for Annex I Sandbanks. We note that NE is supportive of the option for a percentage buyout of aggregate licence(s) as reduction of existing pressure on Annex I sandbanks would help restore Annex I sandbanks, prior to any licence renewal.	The Applicant has responded to the points raised in this comment in response D21 of Table 1.45.5.3 within The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations (PD1-071).
1.2.10	The MMO notes that NE considers that the proposed compensation measure of removal marine debris and awareness campaign for Annex I Sandbanks and Reef, does not provide sufficient compensation for the long-lasting loss of designated sandbank habitat. We note that NE have signposted to evidence of this compensation measure being ineffective on other projects.	The Applicant has responded to the points raised in this comment in response D42 of Table 1.45.5.5 within The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations (PD1-071).
1.2.11	The MMO agrees with NE in that the Applicant needs to consider Noise Abatement Systems (NAS) at application stage, as mitigation during construction. The MMO has provided a recommendation of NAS in comment 4.5.31 in our Relevant Representation (RR-042). To ensure adequate preparations are made and potential delays avoided, it is in the Applicant's interest to plan for noise abatement measures at the earliest opportunity and to incorporate such measures into relevant mitigation plans.	<p>The Applicant has responded to the points raised by the MMO within the Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations (PD1-071) document. Response can be found in Table 1.42 RR-042 Marine Management Organisation at paragraph RR-042.096.</p> <p>The Applicant has also responded to this point in the ExA written questions addressing Q1MM 1.6 Marine Mammals within the document 19.2 The Applicant's Responses to The ExA's First Written Questions (ExQ1).</p>
1.2.12	The MMO supports NE's advice to use the average summer density for harbour porpoise (2.63 individuals / kilometre) in the impact assessment to reflect the importance of the project area during the summer, as opposed to the average annual density.	The Applicant has responded to the points raised in this comment in response E1 of Table 1.45.6.1 within Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations (PD1-071).
1.2.13	The MMO notes that NE does not agree with the Applicant's position with regards to offshore ornithology; specifically relating to the assessment and apportioning of displacement impacts on common guillemot (<i>Uria aalge</i>) and razorbill (<i>Alca torda</i>) that may arise from the construction,	The Applicant has responded to the Natural England's position on assessment methodology in responses F16 - F26 of Table 1.45.7.2 within The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations (PD1-071).

ID	Comment	Applicant Response
	operation, and maintenance phases, and apportioning of impacts on these species to the Flamborough and Filey Coast SPA. The MMO defers to NE for matters relating to ornithology.	
1.2.14	The MMO notes that Natural England have requested that further work is needed to increase the evidence base and feasibility of the Flamborough and Filey Coast Special Protection Area Guillemot and Razorbill Predator Control compensation measure. The MMO notes that NE consider the compensation measure to have the potential to increase the size of the razorbill colony in the Channel Islands, and that this in turn has the potential to increase the number into the National Site Network (NSN), but there is uncertainty of success of the measure for guillemot.	The Applicant has responded to the points raised in this comment in Table 1.45.8.1 within The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations (PD1-071) and is submitting an updated Plemont Evidence Plan and Roadmap at Deadline 2.
1.2.15	Regarding the compensation measure of Artificial Nesting Structures (ANS) for Kittiwake and Guillemot and Razorbill, the MMO notes that NE consider the measure to be more effective for Kittiwake, rather than Guillemot and Razorbill. The MMO is in discussions with the Applicant regarding their request for a Marine Licence Application for the ANS to be submitted in parallel with the DCO application to avoid any delay to the award of the DCO. The MMO is still discussing this internally and will provide an update in due course.	The Applicant has engaged in ongoing discussions with the MMO on this matter. The MMO confirmed their position not supporting the parallel applications, and the Applicant will respond in due course.
1.2.16	The MMO acknowledges NE's concerns regarding the data collected to assess noise disturbance to sensitive receptors of designated sites (Sea Bank Clay Pits SSSI and The Wash SSSI). The MMO defers to NE on all matters related to SSSI but will maintain a watching brief for any potential mitigation or dML conditions for those areas below MHWS.	The Applicant has responded to the points raised in this comment in response H2 of Table 1.45.9.1 within Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations (PD1-071).
1.3 Trinity House		
1.3.1	The MMO defers to Trinity House for their comments on the safety of shipping and seafarers, the superintendence and management of all lighthouses, buoys and beacons within its area of jurisdiction. The MMO will keep a watching brief on any matters that need to be secured within the DML.	This is noted by the Applicant.
1.4 Maritime and Coastguard Agency		
1.4.1	The MMO defers to the Maritime and Coastguard Agency for any comments on matters concerning the safety of maritime navigation and maritime emergency response. The MMO will keep a watching brief on any matters that need to be secured within the DML.	This is noted by the Applicant.
1.5 Historic England		
1.5.1	The MMO notes that Historic England has accounted for the development area including 56 wrecks and obstructions. Historic England also noted that the Applicant discovered an additional wreck not previously recorded. Historic England noted that the geophysical survey data analysis has led to the identification of 23 high potential anomalies and 166 medium potential anomalies which have been assigned Archaeological Exclusion Zones (AEZ). The MMO notes the points mentioned and will maintain a watching brief for any potential mitigation or DML conditions for AEZ.	This is noted by the Applicant.
1.5.2	Historic England confirms marine survey programmes including all geotechnical works are to be designed and planned inclusive of the collection of archaeologically specific cores to meet archaeological objectives set out in an agreed Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI), building on the Outline Marine WSI submitted by the Applicant.	This is noted by the Applicant.
1.5.3	The MMO notes Historic England's concerns on the Applicant's acknowledgement of the risk that this project will encounter both the known and presently unknown elements of the historic environment. The MMO agrees that Applicants should always consider that previously unknown archaeological features may be present.	The Applicant has responded to the points raised in this comment in response RR-027.004 of Table 1.27 within Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations (PD1-071).
1.5.4	The MMO acknowledges Historic England highlighting the importance of effective assessment and risk management, especially in areas formerly isolated dryer ground within coastal sediment/salt	The Applicant has responded to the points raised in this comment in response RR- 027.005 of Table 1.27 within Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations (PD1-071).

ID	Comment	Applicant Response
	marsh as such areas pose the highest risk of importance remind being identified late in the process.	
1.5.5	The MMO supports Historic England’s advice on the coordinated delivery of marine – terrestrial documentation to avoid failure to address impacts in the intertidal zone or confusion over responsibilities.	The Applicant has responded to the points raised in this comment in response RR- 027.007 of Table 1.27 within Applicant’s Responses to Relevant Representations (PD1-071).
1.5.6	The MMO notes the Historic England’s confirmation of the production of a scheme specific Marine WSI as conditioned within the DMLs (Schedule 10 Generation Assets and Schedule 11 Transmission Assets) of the draft DCO. However, Schedule 12 (northern artificial nesting structure 1), Schedule 13 (northern artificial nesting structure 2), Schedule 14 (southern artificial nesting structure 1), Schedule 15 (southern artificial nesting structure 2) and Schedule 16 (biogenic reef creation), do not include the equivalent of Condition for a Marine WSI (Condition 13(1)(g) as used in Schedules 11 and 12). The MMO acknowledges that Historic England notes that the present Outline Marine WSI is sufficient in relation to pre-construction, construction and operation and maintenance phases inclusive of proposed locations for installation of Artificial Nesting Structures (ANS) and creation of benthic reef. The MMO supports HE in the inclusion of this.	The Applicant updated the draft Development Consent Order (dDCO) to include the provisions requested by Historic England (3.1) at the procedural deadline on 19 September 2024.
1.5.7	The MMO notes that the present Outline Marine WSI is sufficient according to Historic England.	This is noted by the Applicant.
1.5.8	The MMO defers to Historic England regarding any further comments in relation to the historic environment.	This is noted by the Applicant.
1.6 Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust (LWT)		
1.6.1	The MMO acknowledges the involvement of Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust (LWT) since the pre-application stage, providing written responses to published documentation and participating in virtual meetings.	This is noted by the Applicant.
1.6.2	The MMO notes that LWT are not satisfied with the Applicants reasoning and the application of the mitigation hierarchy concerning the Cable Route through IDRBNR SAC.	The Applicant has responded to the points raised in this comment in response RR--036.002 of Table 1.36 within Applicant’s Responses to Relevant Representations (PD1-071).
1.6.3	The MMO acknowledges that LWT have raised concerns over the accuracy of the statement of ‘temporary impact’ on the sandbank feature during construction phase and due to cable protection.	The Applicant has responded to the points raised in this comment in response RR--036.003 of Table 1.36 within Applicant’s Responses to Relevant Representations (PD1-071).
1.6.4	The MMO acknowledges that LWT disagrees with the assessment of no significant impact on the SAC particularly regarding cable protection. LWT raised that it does not align with previous casework (Hornsea Project Three decision) and fails to mention the site’s unfavourable condition. LWT raise that Natural England’s update to the Marine Protected Area (MPA) advice package for the site has not been considered and that there are site features that are in an unfavourable condition due to existing activities such as cabling. The MMO is in agreement that the most up to date advice packages should be taken into consideration by the Applicant.	The Applicant has responded to the points raised in this comment in response RR--036.004 of Table 1.36 within The Applicant’s Responses to Relevant Representations (PD1-071).
1.6.5	The MMO notes that LWT has various concerns that have been provided with detailed descriptions to the Applicant in their formal written response which can be shared upon request.	This is noted by the Applicant.
1.7 Inshore Fisheries and Conservation Authority		
1.7.1	The MMO notes that no Relevant Representation was received from the Inshore Fisheries and Conservation Authority (IFCA). The MMO recommends that the Applicant/Examining Authority seeks IFCA’s comments on the application.	The Applicant consulted with the Eastern Inshore Fisheries and Conservation Authority (IFCA) during the preapplication process. Details of these meetings are provided in Table 14.2 of Chapter 14 Commercial Fisheries (APP-069) and Table 9.14 of the Consultation Report (AS1-034), which provide details of all commercial fisheries consultation. The Eastern IFCA were consulted in March 2022, August 2023 and October 2023 on the export cable corridor optioneering, ‘without prejudice’ compensation measures and fisheries byelaws, and provided relevant project and assessment updates.
1.8 Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB)		

ID	Comment	Applicant Response
1.8.1	The MMO notes that the comments provided by the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB) represents an initial assessment of the Applicant's submitted information and will be added to in the main response of the written representation which the MMO will review when submitted.	This is noted by the Applicant.
1.8.2	The MMO notes that the RSPB has concerns regarding offshore ornithology and the export cable corridor potential impact on wildlife. This is due to passing close to a number of national and international protected areas as well as RSPB's Frampton Marsh and Freiston Shore reserves and land within the within the Defra-funded Lincolnshire Wash Landscape Recovery Project (formerly known as the Greater Frampton Vision Landscape Recovery Project). The MMO defers to RSPB and Natural England regarding issues related to offshore ornithology.	The Applicant has responded to the points raised in this comment in response RR-056.1 to RR-065.18 of Table 1.56 within The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations (PD1-071).
1.8.3	The MMO acknowledges that the RSPB have now reviewed the survey data concerning the potential implications of disturbance of breeding, wintering and passage birds of the protected areas of The Wash Special Protection Area/Ramsar and the Greater Wash SPA. The RSPB has concluded that any disturbance to wintering and passage birds on the cable route will be localised and short-term in nature and have no further concerns in relation to this aspect of the project. The RSPB request that the Applicant provides the additional data for March and April 2024 to review this conclusion in the light of two years of complete data.	The Applicant has responded to the points raised in this comment in response RR-056.3 of Table 1.56 within The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations (PD1-071).
1.8.4	The MMO notes that RSPB raised concerns to the Applicant regarding the potential for the construction of the cable route to affect the mains water supply to the RSPB Frampton Marsh reserve as the cable route and works access route crosses the pipe carrying water supply. The MMO acknowledges that RSPB and the Applicant will continue discussions to ensure that, should the DCO receive consent, the construction of the cable corridor has minimal impact on the operations of the mains water supply to the reserve.	The Applicant has responded to the points raised in this comment in response RR-056.19 and RR-056.21 of Table 2.1 within The Applicant's Responses to Additional Submissions and Relevant Representations (REP1-020).
1.8.5	The MMO acknowledges that the RSPB has significant concerns regarding issues relating to offshore ornithology, the main issues concerning displacement, collision and mortality of a number of bird species.	The Applicant has responded to the points raised in this comment in response RR-056.3 – RR-056.6 of Table 1.56 within The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations (PD1-071).
1.8.6	The MMO defers to RSPB and NE regarding issues of adequacy of the modelling supplied by the Applicant.	The Applicant has responded to the points raised in this comment in response RR-056.3 of Table 1.56 within The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations (PD1-071).
1.8.7	The MMO acknowledges that RSPB has raised concerns regarding compensation measures, particularly in relation to gannet; kittiwake; guillemot, razorbill and red throated. The MMO defers to Natural England regarding ornithological issues related to compensation measures.	The Applicant has responded to the points raised in this comment in response– RR-056.10 to RR-056.18 of Table 1.56 within The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations (PD1-071).
1.8.8	The MMO notes that RSPB have raised a number of questions in relation to Artificial Nesting Structures for kittiwake compensation. The MMO will keep a watching brief on the answers to these queries they have raised. The MMO will review the responses in relation to this and may provide further comments at Deadline 1.	The Applicant has responded to the points raised in this comment in response– RR-056.13 of Table 1.56 within The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations (PD1-071).
1.9 Lincolnshire County Council (Lincolnshire County Council)		
1.9.1	The MMO notes that Lincolnshire County Council expects Natural England and the MMO to lead on offshore elements concerning ecological and biodiversity matters. The MMO highlights that both the Council's and MMO's jurisdictions overlap in the intertidal area, and the MMO welcomes the opportunity to discuss any intertidal matters with Lincolnshire County Council.	This is noted by the Applicant.

