



Triton Knoll Offshore Wind Farm Limited Triton Knoll Electrical System

Appendix 12: IEC Landscape and Visual Assessment Clarification Note

Date: October 2015

Appendix 12 of the Applicant's
Response to Deadline 1

Triton Knoll Offshore Wind Farm Limited

Triton Knoll Electrical System

Appendix 12: IEC Landscape and Visual Assessment Clarification Note

Appendix 12 of the Applicants Response to Deadline 1

Date: October 2015

Triton Knoll
Offshore Wind Farm Limited
4th Floor One Kingdom Street
Paddington Central
London
W2 6BD

T : 0845 026 0562
Email: info@tritonknoll.co.uk

www.rweinnogy.com/tritonknoll

Drafted By:	John Meehan
Approved By:	Kim Gauld Clark
Date of Approval:	5 October 2015
Revision:	1.0

Triton Knoll
Offshore Wind Farm Limited
Copyright © 2015 RWE
Innogy UK Ltd
All pre-existing rights reserved

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION	5
Reason for this Clarification Note	5
2. CLARIFICATION	7
Introduction	7
Review of Operational Assessment	8
Review of Cumulative Assessment	20
Review of Proposed Mitigation	20
Clarification Summary	21

FIGURES

Plate 1-1-1b Rev01

Plate 1-1-1c Rev01

Plate 1-1-2b Rev01

Plate 1-1-2c Rev01

Plate 1-1-4b Rev01

Plate 1-1-4c Rev01

Plate 1-1-7b Rev01

Plate 1-1-7c Rev01

Plate 1-1-11d Rev01

Plate 1-1-11e Rev01

Plate 1-1-11f Rev01

Plate 1-1-11g Rev01

Plate 1-1-11h Rev01

Plate 1-1-11i Rev01

1. INTRODUCTION

Reason for this Clarification Note

- 1.1 This clarification note has been prepared in respect of Triton Knoll Offshore Wind Farm Ltd's (TKOWFL or the Applicant) application for a development consent order (DCO) under the Planning Act 2008 (the Application). It has specifically been prepared following the identification of a minor error in the photomontage illustrations which relate to the Intermediate Electrical Compound (IEC) part of the proposed development. The original images which this clarification notes relates to are:
- Volume 5, Annex 2.1, Plate 1-1-1b and 1-1-1c
 - Volume 5, Annex 2.1, Plate 1-1-2b and 1-1-2c
 - Volume 5, Annex 2.1, Plate 1-1-4b and 1-1-4c
 - Volume 5, Annex 2.1, Plate 1-1-7b and 1-1-7c
 - Volume 5, Annex 2.1, Plate 1-1-11d, 1-1-11e, 1-1-11f, 1-1-11g, 1-1-11h and 1-1-11i
- 1.2 The applicant has identified that the building structure which surrounds the Gas Insulated Switchgear (GIS) building has been incorrectly illustrated in the original photomontage images as having the following dimensions:
- 11.5 m in height;
 - 11.0 m in width; and
 - 41.4 m in length
- 1.3 It was identified that these dimensions were not in accordance with the maximum parameters of the GIS building as set out in Table 2-10 in Volume 3, Chapter 2 *Landscape and Visual* (document reference 6.2.3.2) of the ES, which were:
- 13.0 m in height;
 - 12.6 m in width; and
 - 63.0 m in length
- 1.4 The error in the images was identified by the Applicant in September 2015, following the submission of the Triton Knoll DCO application in April 2015. In response to the identification of the error, the applicant has produced revised photomontage images, which are included within this report. To avoid potential confusion with the original photomontages, the revised photomontages are labelled with 'REV01'.
-

1.5 No other errors in the accuracy of the images have been identified.

2. CLARIFICATION

Introduction

- 2.1 The applicant has revisited the original assessment in light of the error and can confirm that, as was stated in Table 2-10 in Volume 3, Chapter 2 *Landscape and Visual*, the assessment was carried out based on the correct dimensions of 13 m x 12.6 m x 63 m.
- 2.2 The original photomontages were provided as supporting illustrative information to aid the written assessment provided. However, it was considered that, given the identification of the error in the photomontages, a desk-based review of the original operational landscape and visual assessments of the IEC should be undertaken to ensure that the assessments reported in Volume 3, Chapter 2 *Landscape and Visual* of the ES remain accurate. Following this desk based review, it has been identified that the increase in the dimensions of the GIS building does not alter any of the findings of the original landscape and visual assessment. The detailed review is set out in **Table 1** of this clarification note.
- 2.3 Following the review of the Year 1 and Year 15 operational assessments, due consideration has been given as to whether the mitigation proposed remains sufficient to mitigate the identified Year 1 significant effects. This consideration has concluded that no change to the embedded mitigation is deemed to be required.
- 2.4 It should be noted that consideration of the revised photomontages would not alter any of the construction or decommissioning phase assessments as these assessments do not require detailed consideration of the final dimensions of any part of the operational development, including the GIS building. However, as the cumulative assessment is most influenced by the operational assessment, the adequacy of the original cumulative assessment has been reviewed in light of the error having been identified.
- 2.5 It should also be noted that the GIS building is one component within the wider IEC and the error identified does not have any impact on the area coverage of the IEC nor the remaining Above Ground Electrical Infrastructure (AGEI). In addition, it remains that there is flexibility in the scheme design such that, while the dimensions of the GIS building may not be exceeded, the building may be positioned anywhere within the GIS siting boundary within the IEC, defined in Figure 1-3 of Volume 3, Chapter 1, *Onshore Project Description* of the ES and Figures 2-2 and 2-4 of Volume 3, Chapter 2 *Landscape and Visual* of the ES.

Review of Operational Assessment

2.6 The following table provides a review of the original landscape and visual operational assessment. However, it must be noted that the review of the assessment focuses on the potential changes to the reported degree of change and the extent of change. The reported susceptibility of the landscape and its value remain unaffected by the change to the scale of the GIS building, as do the geographical extent, duration and reversibility of the change.

Table 1: Review of the original operational landscape and visual assessment

Assessment Type	Reference to original ES assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 2 of the ES)	Review of Assessment	Alteration to original assessment?
Landscape Assessment			
Landscape – Year 1	Paras. 2.472 to 2.481	<p>The original assessment identified a Minor Adverse level of effect which is Not Significant.</p> <p>The assessment of the larger GIS building would not alter the assessment as the difference in scale of the building is not substantial enough that it changes any of the considerations that resulted in the original conclusions regarding landscape effect.</p> <p>Despite the consideration of increased scale of the proposed GIS building: the IEC will remain a conspicuous element in the open landscape of the study area given the relative complexity of its appearance; and it will maintain balance in terms of the scale of built forms facing onto Marsh Lane. The degree of landscape change is therefore considered to remain as Medium.</p>	No alteration

Assessment Type	Reference to original ES assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 2 of the ES)	Review of Assessment	Alteration to original assessment?
		The original assessment remains valid, i.e. a Minor Adverse level of effect which is Not Significant .	
Landscape Year 15	Paras. 2.482 to 2.484	<p>The original assessment identified a Neutral level of effect which is Not Significant.</p> <p>The original assessment stated that the proposed mitigation planting will have established at Year 15 to an extent that it will limit the influence that the development has on the surrounding character due to its screening effect and because it will enhance the site through the inclusion of appropriate woodland species.</p> <p>The limited change in the presentation of the scale of the GIS building, particularly its height from 11.5 m to 13.0 m, does not notably alter the residual Year 15 assessment. The GIS building is one component of the wider development and the expectation is not that the proposed development will be entirely screened at Year 15. However, its influence on the host large-scale landscape is intended to be limited to only partial views of its upper elevation. The level of mitigation planting proposed remains appropriate such that a conclusion that there will be a Neutral landscape effect, which is Not Significant, remains appropriate.</p>	No alteration

Assessment Type	Reference to original ES assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 2 of the ES)	Review of Assessment	Alteration to original assessment?
Visual Assessment			
Viewpoint 1 – Year 1	Paras. 2.489 to 2.494	<p>The original assessment identified a Minor Adverse level of effect, which is Not Significant.</p> <p>Despite the revised assessment of a GIS building which is larger in scale, it remains that intervening vegetation on field boundaries will screen the lower sections of the proposed development. The original assessment identified that the taller elements and upper sections will primarily be visible above and through the intervening vegetation. This assessment still applies, albeit with a consideration that an increase in the scale of the building at a distance of 0.9 km from the site boundary would potentially increase the visibility of the upper sections to a marginal extent.</p> <p>It also remains that the change in view will be set in the context of the existing visibility of the Skegness Stadium, which is located adjacent to the eastern boundary of the site.</p> <p>It therefore still applies that the proposed development will form an apparent, small element in the view and would be visible within a small extent of a wide view of the landscape from here. The degree of visual change is therefore considered to remain as Low.</p> <p>The original assessment remains valid, i.e. a</p>	No alteration

Assessment Type	Reference to original ES assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 2 of the ES)	Review of Assessment	Alteration to original assessment?
		Minor Adverse level of effect which is Not Significant .	
Viewpoint 1 – Year 15	Para. 2.495	<p>The original assessment identified a Neutral level of effect, which is Not Significant.</p> <p>It remains that the proposed mitigation planting will ensure that only the very top levels of the proposed development are visible, limiting the level of effect on this receptor.</p> <p>The original assessment remains valid, i.e. a Neutral level of effect which is Not Significant.</p>	No alteration
Viewpoint 2 – Year 1	Paras. 2.496 to 2.502	<p>The original assessment identified a Minor Adverse level of effect, which is Not Significant.</p> <p>The revised assessment considers a GIS building which is 1.5 m taller. However, it remains that intervening vegetation and the Grain Store buildings will screen much of the proposed IEC. The original assessment identified that the GIS building could potentially be visible through gaps in the intervening vegetation and buildings. This assessment still applies, albeit with a consideration that an increase in the scale of the building, when viewed at a distance of 0.5 km from the site boundary, would marginally increase the visibility of the upper sections of</p>	No alteration

Assessment Type	Reference to original ES assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 2 of the ES)	Review of Assessment	Alteration to original assessment?
		<p>the GIS building.</p> <p>It still applies that the proposed development will form an apparent, small element in the view and would be visible within a small extent of a wide view of the landscape from here. The degree of visual change is therefore considered to remain as Low.</p> <p>The original assessment remains valid, i.e. a Minor Adverse level of effect which is Not Significant.</p>	
Viewpoint 2 – Year 15	Para. 2.503	<p>The original assessment identified a Neutral level of effect, which is Not Significant.</p> <p>It remains that the proposed mitigation planting will ensure that only the very top levels of the proposed development are visible, limiting the level of effect on this receptor. The proposed mitigation planting will be effective in limiting the view of the proposed development to only its upper level, which would be set in the context of existing visibility of the adjacent Grain Store, and has the potential to enhance views of the ground level of the site, the level of effect therefore remains as Neutral which is Not Significant.</p>	No alteration
Viewpoint 3 – Year 1	Paras. 2.504 to 2.510	<p>The original assessment identified a Minor Adverse level of effect, which is Not Significant.</p> <p>The revised assessment considers a GIS</p>	No alteration

Assessment Type	Reference to original ES assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 2 of the ES)	Review of Assessment	Alteration to original assessment?
		<p>building which is 1.5 m taller. However, it remains that the degree of change in view considers the existing visibility of the Grain Store, which is located adjacent to the western boundary of the site, and that only its upper southern and western elevations are visible within the view.</p> <p>The proposed development is still considered to form a small proportion of a wider view. The degree of visual change is therefore considered to remain as Low.</p> <p>The original assessment remains valid, i.e. a Minor Adverse level of effect which is Not Significant.</p>	
Viewpoint 3 – Year 15	Para. 2.511	<p>The original assessment identified a Neutral level of effect, which is Not Significant.</p> <p>It remains that the proposed mitigation planting will ensure that only the very top levels of the proposed development are visible, limiting the level of effect on this receptor.</p> <p>The proposed mitigation planting will be effective in limiting the view of the proposed development to only its upper level and has the potential to enhance views of the ground level of the site, therefore the level of effect remains as Neutral which is Not Significant.</p>	No alteration

Assessment Type	Reference to original ES assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 2 of the ES)	Review of Assessment	Alteration to original assessment?
Viewpoint 4 – Year 1	Paras. 2.512 to 2.518	<p>The original assessment identified a Moderate Adverse level of effect, which is Significant.</p> <p>The revised assessment considers a GIS building which is 1.5 m taller. However, it remains that the proposed development will form only one component of a much wider view, albeit with a consideration that an increase in the scale of the building at a distance of 0.6 km from the site boundary would potentially increase the visibility of the upper sections to a marginal extent.</p> <p>It remains that the development would form a conspicuous element in the view and the degree of visual change is therefore considered to be Medium.</p> <p>The original assessment remains valid, i.e. a Moderate Adverse level of effect which is Significant.</p>	No alteration
Viewpoint 4 – Year 15	Para. 2.519	<p>The original assessment identified a Neutral level of effect, which is Not Significant.</p> <p>It remains that the proposed mitigation planting will ensure that only the very top levels of the proposed development are visible, limiting the level of effect on this receptor. Despite the consideration that the GIS building is assessed here as being 13.0 m in height as opposed to 11.5 m, the proposed mitigation planting will be effective in limiting the view of the proposed</p>	No alteration

Assessment Type	Reference to original ES assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 2 of the ES)	Review of Assessment	Alteration to original assessment?
		development to only its upper level, which would be set in the context of views of the Grain Store, the level of effect therefore remains as Neutral which is Not Significant .	
Viewpoint 5 – Year 1	Paras. 2.520 to 2.526	<p>The original assessment identified a Moderate Adverse level of effect, which is Significant.</p> <p>The revised assessment considers a GIS building which is larger in scale. However, it remains that the proposed development will form only one component of a much wider view, albeit with a consideration that an increase in the scale of the building at a distance of 1.2 km from the site boundary would potentially increase the visibility of the upper sections to a marginal extent.</p> <p>The original assessment remains valid, i.e. a Moderate Adverse level of effect which is Significant.</p>	No alteration
Viewpoint 5 – Year 15	Para. 2.527	<p>The original assessment identified a Neutral level of effect, which is Not Significant.</p> <p>It remains that the proposed mitigation planting will ensure that only the very top levels of the proposed development are visible, limiting the level of effect on this receptor. Despite the consideration that the GIS building would be 13.0 m in height as opposed to 11.5 m, the proposed mitigation planting will be effective in limiting the view of</p>	No alteration

Assessment Type	Reference to original ES assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 2 of the ES)	Review of Assessment	Alteration to original assessment?
		the proposed development to only its upper level, which would be set in the context of views of the Grain Store, the level of effect therefore remains as Neutral which is Not Significant .	
Viewpoint 6 – Year 1 and Year 15	Paras. 2.528 to 2.533	The assessment concluded that the development would not be visible from this viewpoint which remains a valid assessment despite the increase in scale of the GIS building.	No alteration
Viewpoint 7 – Year 1	Paras. 2.534 to 2.540	The original assessment identified a Minor Adverse level of effect, which is Not Significant . Given the distance from the site, which is 2.4 km, it is not considered that an increase in the scale of the GIS building would result in any material alteration to the degree of change to the view. The level of effect therefore remains as Minor Adverse , which is Not Significant .	No alteration
Viewpoint 7 – Year 15	Para. 2.541	The original assessment identified a Neutral level of effect, which is Not Significant . It remains that the proposed mitigation planting will ensure that only the very top levels of the proposed development are visible, limiting the level of effect on this	No alteration

Assessment Type	Reference to original ES assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 2 of the ES)	Review of Assessment	Alteration to original assessment?
		receptor. Despite the consideration that the GIS building would be 13.0 m in height as opposed to 11.5 m, the proposed mitigation planting will be effective in limiting the view of the proposed development to only its upper level, which would be set in the context of views of the Grain Store and Skegness Stadium. The level of effect therefore remains as Neutral which is Not Significant .	
Viewpoint 8 – Year 1	Paras. 2.542 to 2.548	<p>The original assessment identified a Minor Adverse level of effect, which is Not Significant.</p> <p>Given the distance from the site, which is 1.6 km, it is not considered that an increase in the scale of the GIS building, particularly a 1.5 m increase in height, would result in any material alteration to the degree of change to the view.</p> <p>The level of effect therefore remains as Minor Adverse, which is Not Significant.</p>	No alteration
Viewpoint 8 – Year 15	Para. 2.549	<p>The original assessment identified a Neutral level of effect, which is Not Significant.</p> <p>It remains that the proposed mitigation planting will ensure that only the top levels of the proposed development are visible, limiting the level of effect on this receptor. Despite the consideration that the GIS building would be 13.0 m in height as opposed to 11.5 m, the</p>	No alteration

Assessment Type	Reference to original ES assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 2 of the ES)	Review of Assessment	Alteration to original assessment?
		proposed mitigation planting will be effective in limiting the view of the proposed development to only its upper level. The level of effect therefore remains as Neutral which is Not Significant .	
Viewpoint 9 – Year 1 and Year 15	Paras. 2.550 to 2.555	The assessment concluded that the development would not be visible from this viewpoint which remains a valid assessment despite the increase in scale of the GIS building.	No alteration
Viewpoint 10 – Year 1	Paras. 2.556 to 2.561	The assessment concluded that the development would not be visible from this viewpoint which remains a valid assessment despite the increase in scale of the GIS building.	No alteration
Viewpoint 11 – Year 1	Paras. 2.562 to 2.568	<p>The original assessment identified a Minor Adverse level of effect on this viewpoint, which is Not Significant.</p> <p>Despite the proximity of this viewpoint to the site, the increase in the scale of the GIS building would not alter the degree of change from Medium, particularly given that it is one part of a larger development.</p> <p>It therefore remains that the level of effect is Minor Adverse which is Not Significant.</p>	No alteration

Assessment Type	Reference to original ES assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 2 of the ES)	Review of Assessment	Alteration to original assessment?
Viewpoint 11 – Year 15	Para. 2.569	<p>The original assessment identified a Neutral effect on this viewpoint, which is Not Significant.</p> <p>The increase in height of the GIS building would not alter the assessment that the development would be effectively screened from this location, with only glimpsed views of the development through the planting.</p> <p>It therefore remains that the level of effect is Neutral, which is Not Significant.</p>	No alteration
Viewpoint 12 – Year 1	Paras. 2.570 to 2.576	<p>The original assessment identified a Minor Adverse level of effect, which is Not Significant.</p> <p>Given the distance from the site, which is 1.6 km, it is not considered that an increase in the GIS building of 1.5 m in height would result in any material alteration to the degree of change to the view.</p> <p>The level of effect therefore remains as Minor Adverse, which is Not Significant.</p>	No alteration
Viewpoint 12 – Year 15	Para. 2.577	<p>The original assessment identified a Neutral level of effect, which is Not Significant.</p> <p>It remains that the proposed mitigation planting will ensure that only the top levels of the proposed development are visible, limiting the level of effect on this receptor. Despite the</p>	No alteration

Assessment Type	Reference to original ES assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 2 of the ES)	Review of Assessment	Alteration to original assessment?
		consideration that the GIS building would be 13.0 m in height as opposed to 11.5 m, the proposed mitigation planting will be effective in limiting the view of the proposed development to only its upper level. The level of effect therefore remains as Neutral which is Not Significant .	

Review of Cumulative Assessment

- 2.7 The cumulative assessment for the IEC is located in paragraphs 2.763 to 2.768 in Volume 3, Chapter 2 *Landscape and Visual* of the ES. This assessment identified limited potential adverse cumulative landscape and visual effects.
- 2.8 Potential cumulative effects were identified in relation to the nearby proposed Orby Marsh Wind Farm development only. The increased scale of the GIS building would not alter the potential perception of cumulative landscape and effects of the Wind Farm and the original assessment remains valid¹. A review of the original assessment of cumulative landscape and visual effects has concluded that the consideration of a slightly larger GIS building, when considered in the context of the wider IEC proposed development, which is unchanged, would not alter the conclusions of the original assessment.

Review of Proposed Mitigation

- 2.9 The review of the assessment of effects has not identified any change to the original Year 1 or Year 15 assessment. It is considered that the mitigation proposed is sufficient

¹ The Orby Wind Farm proposal was dismissed on appeal on 27 March 2015.

to provide adequate mitigation of the identified adverse effects of the scheme and does not require any alteration or addition.

Clarification Summary

- 2.10 The applicant identified an error in the original photomontage images for Intermediate Electrical Compound Viewpoints 1, 2, 4, 7 and 11. The error referred to a difference in the dimensions stated for the proposed GIS building in Table 2-10 in Volume 3, Chapter 2 *Landscape and Visual* of the ES report and those which were illustrated in the photomontages for Viewpoints 1, 2, 4, 7 and 11 in Volume 5, Annex 2.1 *Photomontages* of the ES.
- 2.11 The applicant has rectified the error by producing revised photomontage images which are appended to this report.

Following a review of the new images and the original assessment, it has been identified that the increase in the dimensions of the GIS building do not alter any of the findings of the original landscape and visual assessment, and no change to the embedded mitigation is deemed to be required.

Annex 1 – Photomontages

Annex 2 - Photomontages
