

Hornsea Project Three  
Offshore Wind Farm



## Hornsea Project Three Offshore Wind Farm

Consultation Report:  
Annex 15 – Phase 2 Responses

PINS Document Reference: A5.1.15

Date: May 2018

  
Hornsea 3  
Offshore Wind Farm



---

**Consultation Report**

**Annex 15 – Phase 2 Responses**

---

Report Number: A5.1.15

Version: Final

Date: May 2018

This report is also downloadable from the Hornsea Project Three offshore wind farm website at:

[www.hornseaproject3.co.uk](http://www.hornseaproject3.co.uk)

Ørsted

5 Howick Place,

London, SW1P 1WG

© Orsted Power (UK) Ltd, 2018. All rights reserved

Front cover picture: Kite surfer near a UK offshore wind farm © Orsted Hornsea Project Three (UK) Ltd., 2018.

Prepared by: Ørsted

Checked by: Emily Woolfenden

Accepted by: Sophie Banham and Oliver Palasmith

Approved by: Sophie Banham

## Table of Contents

3.	Overarching .....	6
3.1	Introduction .....	6
3.2	Site Selection Process .....	7
3.3	Policy .....	55
3.4	Project Description .....	60
3.5	Environmental Impact Assessment .....	127
3.6	HRA .....	141
2.	Offshore .....	148
2.1	Marine Processes .....	148
2.2	Benthic Ecology .....	160
2.3	Fish and Shellfish Ecology .....	196
2.4	Marine Mammals .....	205
2.5	Offshore Ornithology .....	232
2.6	Commercial Fisheries .....	270
2.7	Shipping and Navigation .....	281
2.8	Aviation, military and communication .....	291
2.9	Marine Archaeology .....	294
2.10	Seascape and Visual Resources .....	302
2.11	Infrastructure and other users .....	309
2.12	Inter-related Effects Offshore .....	327
3.	Onshore .....	328
3.1	Geology and Ground Conditions .....	328
3.2	Hydrology and Flood Risk .....	349
3.3	Ecology and Nature Conservation .....	376
3.4	Landscape and Visual Resources .....	450
3.5	Historic Environment .....	507
3.6	Traffic and Transport .....	535
3.7	Land Use and Recreation .....	599
3.8	Noise and Vibration .....	651
3.9	Air Quality .....	682
3.10	Electromagnetic Fields (EMF) .....	697
3.11	Socio-economics .....	723
3.12	Inter-related onshore .....	757
3.13	Landowner Related .....	765
3.14	DCO .....	781
3.15	Consultation / Local Engagement .....	789

## List of Tables

Table 1.1:	Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.A) relating to the Introduction .....	6
Table 1.2:	Summary of consultation responses received as part of the further Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.B) relating to the Introduction .....	6
Table 1.3:	Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.A) relating to the Site Selection Process .....	7
Table 1.4:	Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Further Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.B) relating to the Site Selection Process .....	37
Table 1.5:	Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Focused Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.C) relating to the Site Selection Processes .....	52
Table 1.6:	Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.A) relating to Policy .....	55
Table 1.7:	Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Further Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.B) relating to Policy .....	59
Table 1.8:	Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.A) relating to the Project Description .....	60
Table 1.9:	Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.B) relating to the Project Description .....	119
Table 1.10:	Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.A) relating to EIA .....	127
Table 1.11:	Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Further Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.B) relating to the EIA .....	140
Table 1.12:	Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.A) relating to the HRA .....	141
Table 1.13:	Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.B) relating to the HRA .....	147
Table 2.1:	Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.A) relating to marine processes .....	148
Table 2.2:	Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Further Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.B) relating to marine processes .....	159
Table 2.3:	Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.A) relating to benthic ecology .....	160
Table 2.4:	Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Further Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.B) relating to benthic ecology .....	193
Table 2.5:	Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.A) relating to fish and shellfish ecology .....	196
Table 2.6:	Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Further Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.B) relating to fish and shellfish ecology .....	204
Table 2.7:	Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.A) relating to marine mammals .....	205
Table 2.8:	Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Further Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.B) relating to marine mammals .....	231

Table 2.9:	Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.A) relating to offshore ornithology.....	232	Table 3.8:	Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Focused Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.C) relating to ecology and nature conservation.....	446
Table 2.10:	Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Further Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.B) relating to offshore ornithology.....	268	Table 3.9:	Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.A) relating to landscape and visual resources.....	450
Table 2.11:	Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.A) relating to commercial fisheries.....	270	Table 3.10:	Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Further Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.B) relating to landscape and visual resources.....	499
Table 2.12:	Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Further Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.B) relating to commercial fisheries.....	278	Table 3.11:	Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Focused Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.C) relating to landscape and visual resources.....	504
Table 2.13:	Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.A) relating to shipping and navigation.....	281	Table 3.12:	Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.A) relating to historic environment.....	507
Table 2.14:	Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Further Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.B) relating to shipping and navigation.....	289	Table 3.13:	Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Further Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.B) relating to historic environment.....	531
Table 2.15:	Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.A) relating to aviation, military and communication.....	291	Table 3.14:	Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Focused Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.C) relating to historic environment.....	533
Table 2.16:	Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Further Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.B) relating to aviation, military and communication.....	293	Table 3.15:	Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.A) relating to traffic and transport.....	535
Table 2.17:	Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.A) relating to marine archaeology.....	294	Table 3.16:	Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Further Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.B) relating to traffic and transport.....	576
Table 2.18:	Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Further Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.B) relating to marine archaeology.....	301	Table 3.17:	Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Focused Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.C) relating to traffic and transport.....	587
Table 2.19:	Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.A) relating to seascape and visual resources.....	302	Table 3.18:	Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.A) relating to land use and recreation.....	599
Table 2.20:	Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Further Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.B) relating to seascape and visual resources.....	308	Table 3.19:	Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Further Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.B) relating to land use and recreation.....	642
Table 2.21:	Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.A) relating to infrastructure and other users.....	309	Table 3.20:	Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Focused Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.C) relating to land use and recreation.....	649
Table 2.22:	Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Further Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.B) relating to infrastructure and other users.....	323	Table 3.21:	Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.A) relating to noise and vibration.....	651
Table 2.23:	Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.A) relating to inter-related effects offshore.....	327	Table 3.22:	Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Further Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.B) relating to noise and vibration.....	675
Table 2.24:	Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Further Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.B) relating to inter-related effects offshore.....	328	Table 3.23:	Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Focused Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.C) relating to noise and vibration.....	676
Table 3.1:	Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.A) relating to geology and ground conditions.....	328	Table 3.24:	Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.A) relating to air quality.....	682
Table 3.2:	Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Further Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.B) relating to geology and ground conditions.....	346	Table 3.25:	Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Further Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.B) relating to air quality.....	692
Table 3.3:	Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.A) relating to hydrology and flood risk.....	349	Table 3.26:	Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Focused Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.C) relating to air quality.....	693
Table 3.4:	Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Further Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.B) relating to hydrology and flood risk.....	371	Table 3.27:	Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.A) relating to electromagnetic fields (EMF).....	697
Table 3.5:	Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Focused Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.C) relating to hydrology and flood risk.....	375	Table 3.28:	Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Further Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.B) relating to electromagnetic fields (EMF).....	718
Table 3.6:	Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.A) relating to ecology and nature conservation.....	376	Table 3.29:	Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.A) relating to socio-economics.....	723
Table 3.7:	Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Further Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.B) relating to ecology and nature conservation.....	437	Table 3.30:	Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Further Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.B) relating to socio-economics.....	752



Table 3.31:	Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.A) relating to inter-related onshore.....	757
Table 3.32:	Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Further Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.B) relating to inter-related onshore .....	763
Table 3.33:	Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.A) relating to landowner queries.....	765
Table 3.34:	Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Further Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.B) relating to landowner queries .....	769
Table 3.35:	Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Focused Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.C) relating to landowner queries.....	775
Table 3.36:	Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.A) relating to DCO.....	781
Table 3.37:	Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Further Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.B) relating to DCO .....	788
Table 3.38:	Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.A) relating to consultation/local engagement .....	789
Table 3.39:	Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Further Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.B) relating to consultation/local engagement.....	806
Table 3.40:	Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Focused Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.C) relating to consultation/local engagement.....	813

## 3. Overarching

### 3.1 Introduction

Table 3.1: Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.A) relating to the Introduction.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>1</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 42: Prescribed consultees (The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009: Schedule 1))</b>			
<i>No comments were received from the prescribed consultees relating to the introduction under Phase 2.A.</i>			
<b>Section 42: Local Authorities (prescribed under section 43 of the Act)</b>			
<i>No comments were received from the local authorities relating to the introduction under Phase 2.A.</i>			
<b>Section 42: Persons with an interest in the land (prescribed under section 44 of the Act)</b>			
<i>No comments were received from persons with an interest in land relating to the introduction under Phase 2.A.</i>			
<b>Section 47: Duty to consult local community</b>			
Nigel Rogers	4. General Comment on PEIR: 4.1 The relatively unspoilt nature of North Norfolk is recognised by the PEIR, but it is not clear to us why Dong Energy have chosen to bring the cable onshore in this region, especially given the considerable distance to the National Grid connection in Norwich. We recommend the EIR makes it clear why this particular connection to the national grid was chosen over alternatives.	I	Environmental Statement, volume 3, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives sets out the process of identifying a grid connection location.  The aim of the grid connection option appraisal was to identify the most economic and efficient design option for the connection of a project. Although both National Grid and Orsted input into the appraisal process (in respect to economic and strategic factors), the eventual grid connection offer is determined by National Grid. In May 2016, Hornsea Three was formally offered a grid connection at Norwich Main Substation as a result of this appraisal process.

Table 3.2: Summary of consultation responses received as part of the further Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.B) relating to the Introduction.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 42: Prescribed consultees (The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009: Schedule 1))</b>			
<i>No comments were received from the prescribed consultees relating to the introduction under Phase 2.B.</i>			
<b>Section 42: Local Authorities (prescribed under section 43 of the Act)</b>			
<i>No comments were received from the local authorities relating to the introduction under Phase 2.B.</i>			
<b>Section 42: Persons with an interest in the land (prescribed under section 44 of the Act)</b>			
<i>No comments were received from persons with an interest in land relating to the introduction under Phase 2.B.</i>			
<b>Section 47: Duty to consult local community</b>			
<i>No comments were received from the local community relating to the introduction under Phase 2.B.</i>			
<b>Section 48: Duty to publicise</b>			

<sup>1</sup> Y = Yes change made; N = No change made; I = Incorporated into or considered when producing the assessment or landowner voluntary agreement offer; N/A = Not applicable.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA	Regard had to response (s49)
No comments were received in response to the Public Notice relating to the introduction under Phase 2.B.			

## 3.2 Site Selection Process

Table 3.3: Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.A) relating to the Site Selection Process.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>2</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 42: Prescribed consultees (The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009: Schedule 1)</b>			
Esso Petroleum Company Limited	Further to your letter of 25 July 2017, please can you advise which Esso Petroleum Company, Limited land interests are affected by the proposed offshore wind farm, Hornsea Project Three Offshore Wind Farm.	NA	A reply was sent to Esso confirming that no interests had been identified along the proposed project boundaries & requested final confirmation that they have no interests within a 1km utility search buffer of the route onshore so that Ørsted can consult further or remove them from our consultee list.
Weston Longville Parish Council	I attended the meeting at Hall for All on 10th August as the representative for Weston Longville Parish Council. It was a useful and informative meeting, however I do wish to underline our objection to the siting of the construction compound at Weston given the existing problems created by high volumes of traffic which will be exacerbated when the NDR opens. We would strongly recommend that the suggestion of using the empty Atlas Works site on the A1067 is followed up. Please feel free to get in touch if you would like more information	Y	The Main construction compound proposed near Weston Longville has not been taken forward to the application. The main construction compound for the project will be located at Oulton Airfield, accessed off the B1149.
Premier Transmission Pipeline System (PTPS)	Thank you for forwarding the consultation information on the above project. Your enquiry does not encroach on the Premier Transmission Pipeline System (PTPS); however should you require any further information or safety advice in respect of the PTPS, i.e. for any future works, please do not hesitate to contact us by email or phone (028 9043 7580).	N	Hornsea Three acknowledged that Premier Transmission Pipeline System (PTPS) had no assets impacted by the proposed work. No further action was required
McNicholas	The locations below are not affected by TATA apparatus.  HOW03_s42_02082017, Dong Energy Hornsea Project, Three Offshore Wind Farm  Please quote these references on any correspondence. Please note: McNicholas, on behalf of our client, accept no liability for claims arising from inaccuracies, omissions or errors contained within your plant enquiry request. If you require further information please do not hesitate to contact us.	NA	Ørsted acknowledged that McNicholas on behalf of TATA had no assets impacted by the proposed work. No further action was required.
Shell	Request for the shapefiles for Hornsea Project Three route (onshore and offshore).	NA	Ørsted sent Shell shapefiles of the Hornsea Three export cable corridor for information.
BT	Call from Tabitha at BT requesting information on potentially impacted properties from the current HOW03 plans. Tabitha suggested that BT owns land and properties in the area that they suspect may be impacted by the development. They would like to know if any have been identified by assessments and surveys at this stage.	N/A	Further to BT's response, Hornsea Three has made further contact with Tabitha within the Property Department using the contact details provided.
Gas Networks Ireland (UK)	Gas Networks Ireland (UK) has received written communication (your reference above) in relation to the Hornsea Project Three Offshore Wind Farm. We have no assets at this location off the Norfolk coast or on shore that will be impacted by these proposed works.	N/A	Ørsted acknowledged that Gas Network Ireland (UK) had no assets impacted by the proposed work. No further action was required.

<sup>2</sup> Y = Yes change made; N = No change made; I = Incorporated into or considered when producing the assessment or landowner voluntary agreement offer; N/A = Not applicable.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>2</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Little Melton Parish Council	1.) The PC would like to see the cables routed further away from the village and suggests that the cables can follow the same route as the existing overhead lines that lie to the south of Little Melton	I	Where possible and practicable the cable corridor route selected seeks to avoid passing adjacent to properties and residential centres. This is to reduce impacts associated with construction disturbance. Where properties are located in close proximity, the Project will ensure that sensitive construction management measures, such as noise, dust and traffic control are considered. These are documented in an outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), which forms part of the DCO application.  In respect to routing along the existing overhead lines, Hornsea Three were advised to incorporate a 15 m buffer distance to pylons (as advised by National Grid) . This represented a constraint to routing along the same route as the existing overhead lines.
Little Melton Parish Council	2.) The PC notes that the magnetic field strength is inversely proportional to the distance from the conductor by a factor of $2\pi$ (circumference of a circle) and that reference fields are measured 1m above ground. Someone working in a field or playing rugby may well have their head closer to the ground than 1m . The PC would like to see the cable buried at least 2m deep where it passes under recreational land (including the Parochial Charity land, which potentially may be used for allotments and the growing of fruit trees).	I	Noted. Further information on EMF can be found in Environmental Statement, volume 4, annex 3.3: EMF Compliance Statement.
Swardeston Parish Council	1. The siting of such a large structure so close to a residential area is undesirable. Is there any opportunity to challenge the decision of the National Grid to require Dong Energy to connect Hornsea Project Three to the Norwich Main substation.	N	The grid connection is assessed by both National Grid and the developer from an economic, efficient and strategic perspective, in relation to additional costs and investments required based on the capacity and timing of energy production sought by the developer. One key element of this assessment is the perceived costs that may be passed on to the end user (the public and businesses) and hence both parties seek to minimise this. Hornsea Project Three received the single offer of Norwich Main National Grid Substation and as such, our application includes a grid connection at this point.  Further information is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Alternatives.
Swardeston Parish Council	2. Has Dong Energy exhausted all alternatives before determining the precise site location for the substation?	I	To identify a suitable site for locating the onshore substation, Hornsea Three developed a set of guiding principles to establish a search area (approximately 3 km from the existing Norwich Main substation). A constraints mapping exercise was then applied to this search area, which involved layering known constraints / sensitivities on top of one another to identify the potentially least constrained zones within this area. The results of this exercise, in the form of heat map was presented at our March 2017 consultation events, where members of the local community were invited to highlight aspects that they would like us to take into consideration. At that time, we were still considering which sites were technically viable and hence were not able to present specific options as we could not confirm that these options would have been feasible. This feedback was considered by the Project alongside environmental, commercial and technical considerations in selecting the proposed site. The proposed site was then highlighted in the September 2017 consultation events and within the PEIR document which was formally consulted on under section 42 of the planning process.  More information on our site selection process can be found in volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Considerations of Alternatives.
Swardeston Parish Council	3. Why is the onshore substation not being built adjacent to, and to the South of, the existing Norwich Main substation? This has direct vehicular access off the A140 and is as removed, if not more removed, from existing residential developments as the proposed site.	I	Information pertaining to the site selection for the HVDC converter/HVAC substation is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives. The site selection process was informed by a number of factors including community feedback, technical constraints and environmental constraints.
Swardeston Parish Council	4. The proposed substation is an immensely high structure. Has Dong Energy considered acquiring a portion of the Mangreen quarry site so as to be able to construct the substation at least partially below ground level? This site would have direct access off the A140 and A47 and the added benefit of almost totally screening the finished substation by a combination of building below ground and planting around the circumference.	I	The positioning of complex infrastructure in a quarry or similar, encompasses a range of technical constraints in interest in the land or least the footprint area which is required, accessibility and health and safety considerations. Furthermore, the quarry remains operational, with plans to extend (as assessed in the cumulative assessments in the relevant topic chapters of the Environmental Statement volume 3) and therefore was discounted as an site alternative for the HVDC converter/HVAC substation. Further information relating to the site selection process for the HVDC converter/HVAC substation is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives.
Norfolk Vanguard	We would welcome further details relating to the rationale for the corridor search areas and how the parameters of the onshore and offshore cable route elements were decided.	I	Details are set out in the Environmental Statement Volume 1 Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives.



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>2</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Planning, South Norfolk Council	<p>1) Why the project looks to connect to the Mangreen substation. What where the alternatives assessed and why was Mangreen chosen as the connection point to the National Grid? (why connection within South Norfolk and not closer to the coast). Whilst I appreciate the information set out in HOW03_Peir_Volume 1 Chapter 4_site selection page 31 through to 36. 'The two substation sites were considered, relative to one another, to determine a preferred option, 4.12.4.1 supported by site visits in the summer of 2016. During the site inspections, further consideration was given to matters such as topography, access, landscape framework/screening, hydrology and ground conditions, to supplement the desk top work that was carried out. Furthermore, the sites had been subject of desk top heritage assessment and phase 1 ecology surveys (as part of the early EIA process) since their initial identification and shortlisting, and this information was also considered. The constraints on the physical availability of the land at the two substation options fed into the 4.12.4.2 assessment of "Mitigation and Access" (Table 4.5). It was determined that Option B provides a greater availability of land for potential mitigation to be implemented. Option A is comparatively constrained by the railway line directly to the east and by the Norwich Main National Grid substation to the north. In addition an assessment of the potential access to Option B identified that this was significantly less constrained and would involve less highway works and the associated construction disruption.' This doesn't really answer their questions.</p>	I	Information pertaining to site selection are provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives.
Broadland District Council	<p>The District Council requests that futher detailed investigations and assessments are undertaken in respect of: - The alternative underground cable route to the west of Salle Park as shown in the 'Phase 2 Statutory Consultation Plan' if this becomes part of the proposed route, plan attached. - The additional temporary construction compound identified at Oulton Streen as shown in the 'Phase 2 Statutory Consultation Plan' if this becomes part of the proposed route, plan attached.</p>	I	<p>The Hornsea Three onshore cable corridor has been subject to rerouting since the production of the PEIR and now passes 110 m from Salle Park at its nearest point, thus avoiding any effect on the relationship between the church and Salle Park. An assessment of impacts on heritage assets is provided in Environmental Statement, volume 3, chapter 5: Historic Environment.</p> <p>In respect to the main construction compound at Oulton, Hornsea Three recognises the sensitivity of this location and since its identification as the main construction compound, Hornsea Three has sought to identify measures to minimise any impacts on Oulton village, local residents and the local road network. In this regard, where properties are located in close proximity to the Oulton Airfield, the Project will ensure that sensitive construction management measures, such as noise, dust and traffic control are considered. These are documented in an outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), which accompanies the DCO application, as well as the topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3). Furthermore, it is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this also forms part of the DCO application.</p> <p>Both the alternative route to the west of Salle Park and the construction compound at Oulton are now considered throughout the Environmental Statment (volume 3)</p>
The Wildlife Trust (joint response from Norfolk WT and TWT)	<p>1. Site selection and consideration of alternatives (Volume 1: chapter 4) As you are aware, TWT has concerns regarding the routing of cables through Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ and we are interested as to why zone 4 was discounted, which would have avoided the MCZ. We appreciate that one of the factors in discounting option 4 was to avoid the Norfolk Broads. Please could further information be provided as to why zone 4 was discounted, especially since the proposed cabling route for Norfolk Vanguard1 is located in a similar area to zone 4. Please could a summary also be provided on the differences in the assessment results for zone 2 and 4, particularly as it is outlined in 4.9.3.4 that "the level of interaction with Designated sites...could be reduced through routing to landfall zone 2".</p>	Y	Thank you for your feedback. The further detail has been added to the Environmental Statement, Volume 1. Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>2</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Marine Management Organisation	<p>3. Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives</p> <p>3.1. The MMO notes the 'Horlock Rules' specification in the overall system options and site selection that "consideration must be given to environmental issues from the earliest stage to balance the technical benefits and capital cost requirements for new developments against the consequential environmental effects in order to keep adverse effects to a reasonably practicable minimum." (Table 4.1, Volume 1, Chapter 4 – Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives). The MMO requests that further information is provided in the ES as to how the nearshore export cable corridor route was selected which, as acknowledged elsewhere in the PEIR (Volume 5, Annex 2.3 – Marine Conservation Zones Assessment), would permanently damage designated features of the Cromer Shoals Chalk Reef MCZ. The MMO considers that the selection of a nearshore export cable route making landfall west of the currently proposed location, which would pass through marine protected areas with designated features potentially less significantly impacted by export cable trenching, has not been sufficiently explored by DONG Energy.</p>	I	The nearshore export cable route has now been rerouted to avoid key features of the Cromer Shoals Chalk Beds MCZ. This is detailed in the Environmental Statement, Volume 1, Chapter 4; Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives and associated annexes.
Marine Management Organisation	<p>3.2. It is stated that "the Sheringham Shoal and Pollard Bank bathymetric features were considered to pose potential technical constraints", however these have not been fully explained in the PEIR (paragraph 4.11.2.4, Volume 1, Chapter 4 – Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives). The MMO is aware that routing the export cable away from Cromer Shoals Chalk Reef MCZ may significantly increase its total length, however we advise that further consideration of an export cable route running to the west of the Cromer Shoals Chalk Reef MCZ boundary could better meet DONG Energy's stated intention to "Minimise overlap with the key features of the Cromer Shoal MCZ" (paragraph 4.11.2.1, Volume 1, Chapter 4 – Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives).</p>	I	The nearshore export cable route has now been rerouted to avoid key features of the Cromer Shoals Chalk Beds MCZ. This is detailed in the Environmental Statement, Volume 1, Chapter 4; Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives.
National Grid	<p>Further advice: We would request that the potential impact of the proposed scheme on National Grid's existing assets as set out above and including any proposed diversions is considered in any subsequent reports, including in the Environmental Statement, and as part of any subsequent application.</p> <p>Where any diversion of apparatus may be required to facilitate a scheme, National Grid is unable to give any certainty with the regard to diversions until such time as adequate conceptual design studies have been undertaken by National Grid. Further information relating to this can be obtained by contacting the email address below.</p> <p>Where the promoter intends to acquire land, extinguish rights, or interfere with any of National Grid apparatus protective provisions will be required in a form acceptable to it to be included within the DCO. National Grid 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. All consultations should be sent to the following: box.landandacquisitions( @ )nationalgrid.com or by post to the following address: The Company Secretary 1-3 The Strand London WC2N 5EH</p>	I	Ørsted acknowledged National Grid's advice regarding diversions and has been in further discussions regarding both gas and electrical infrastructure. Further to this consultation, bespoke protective provisions have been included in the DCO.
River Glaven Conservation Group (RGCG) and CPRE Norfolk	<p>The documentation does have an impressive range of methods of approaches in order mitigate to against the adverse impacts which could potentially occur. Much of this is based on a very thorough desk research, but is being supplemented by field surveys in selected areas, and this continues. It is clear that Dong is aware of the high degree of heterogeneity in the geology derived from glacial deposits in the Glaven catchment. We therefore for the requirement for a more detailed study through field studies in the fine tuning of the cabling corridor down to 80 m plus the buffer area to reach the EIA stage which supports the Environmental Statement. We would also add that the geology is more likely to present an unexpected problem along the cabling route, and there is a greater need for awareness of this as regards a response to this in taking mitigation measures.</p>	Y	Potential sensitivities associated with geology and ground conditions has been considered during the refinement of the onshore cable corridor. The project has, for example avoided the Kelling Heath and Weybourne Cliffs SSSI, and committed to undertaking a preliminary risk assessments during the detailed design stage in order to identify any localised areas of contamination. Furthermore additional site specific surveys will be undertaken during detailed design to inform construction methodologies (see Environmental Statement, Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project Description, section 3.7.2).

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>2</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
River Glaven Conservation Group (RGCG) and CPRE Norfolk	Finally on this overview we wish to place to record that we welcome the decision following the Phase 1B consultation to set aside the Hempstead and Pond Hills site for the location of a HVAC booster station. This was a great relief to us, particularly for the Hempstead site which had a high potential for damage to the Glaven, during construction and in operation, and have a severe impact in the landscape. We do understand why many people have a great concern on a booster station, and these are foremost in terms of profile; and understandably due to the complexity and much less obvious the types of damage that can be done but unseen. We add that, as said in the previous response, the selected Little Barningham site is also in attractive and unspoilt countryside, but the contours and woodland on two sides offer more opportunity for screening and other mitigation techniques. The most desirable approach would be of course the use of HVDC and avoid the need for a booster station. We return to this issue later in this document.	I	Noted. Further information pertaining to the alternative locations considered for the HVAC booster station is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Alternatives.
Marlingford and Colton Parish Council	The Chairman of Marlingford and Colton Parish Council, David Wildon, is very appreciative of Dong Energy's efforts to inform all the relevant parties as to what is involved in the Hornsea Three project. The Parish Council, at its meeting held on September 12th, considered the 200m wide corridor for the cable run through Marlingford. The Council's one concern related to the properties on the Bawburgh Road, in particular, the easternmost dwelling. At the Phase 2 community consultation event that was held on September 12th, in Weston Longville Hall for All, the Chairman was pleased to learn that horizontal drilling was being considered to drill below both the Yare and the Bawburgh Road in one continuous operation. It was also indicated that the final corridor possibly could be somewhat to the east side of the 200m corridor.	Y	Noted. Following consultation on the PEIR, Hornsea Three has committed to a number of points at which HDD will be employed as a means to reduce impacts, particularly on roads and rivers.
Weybourne Parish Council	I am instructed to write as follows :- 1. The parish council asks why Weybourne again ? - there are many miles of similar coastline ! There are serious concerns re the impact that the construction works programme will have on the local community and businesses. Weybourne will again have the construction works adjacent to the Beach Road car park significantly compromising the views and remoteness of the area which offers long distance views along both directions of the coast. It will again have huge lorries using roads designed to take traffic in victorian times !	Y	A discussion regarding the options considered for landfall are presented in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives. The beach road car park is not under consideration as a construction compound. Furthermore it is noted that, since the PEIR, a refined landfall location has been identified (western re-route around Kelling) and the area identified for landfall works has reduced. This was informed by a number of factors including community feedback in the area of Kelling and Weybourne, avoidance of the Kelling Heath SSSI/CWS and Holiday Park as well as engineering/technical considerations.  Regardless, the Project will ensure that sensitive construction management measures, such as noise, dust and traffic control are considered. These are documented in an outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), which accompanies the DCO application.
Natural England	Annex 1 Key concerns Natural England has concerns about the site selection Stage 3 (Vol. 1, Chapter 4, Section 4.8), as the grid connection selected resulted in a high risk cable route. Notably the cable routes were only given limited consideration during the Round 3 offshore wind farm (OWF) SEA as no information was available at that time on possible grid connection locations. This has been recognised as a flaw in the consenting and grid connection offer process and Natural England and National Grid Electricity Transmission Limited (NGET) are working together to ensure that the process for future OWF projects has better consideration of environmental constraints.	N	This comment is noted but pertains primarily to the approach taken to managing grid connections for the offshore wind industry as a whole and hence is a matter for discussion between Natural England and National Grid Electricity Transmission Limited (NGET). Hornsea Three notes that Natural England notes that they are working with NGET in relation to future OWF projects.
Natural England	Annex 1 Key concerns We note that DONG Energy is considering a number of locations for the HVAC Substation. We do not consider it appropriate to be considering locations that would result in an impact to a protected site when other locations are available outside the protected sites. As such, we would expect the final application to narrow down the HVAC search area to locations outside the border of the North Norfolk Sandbanks and Saturn Reef (NNSSR) cSAC/SCI.	Y	This comment was considered and taken on board during the further refinements to the offshore HVAC booster station search area. As such this no longer overlaps with the North Norfolk Sandbanks and Saturn Reef SAC.
Natural England	1.23 Whilst Natural England provided input into the Round 3 OWF SEA, limited consideration was given in the SEA to impacts along export cable routes as grid capacity and thus potential grid connection locations were unknown at the time of writing. (Volume 1, chapter 4, section 4.5)	I	This comment is noted.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>2</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Natural England	1.24 Natural England queries why given the location of the Hornsea Zone, grid connection offers to the north of the Zone where not included? (Volume 1, chapter 4, paragraph 4.8.2.2)	I	Further detail has been added to Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives in relation to this comment. No grid connection capacity of the size required was available to the north of the Hornsea Zone in the timeframes required by the project.
Natural England	1.25 Landfall Zone 2 may have been chosen as not overly convoluted by presence of designated sites. However, it does not take into account the interest features of the designated sites as some habitats/species of designated sites are more/less vulnerable than others and using an indicative straight line from array to landfall does not recognise this. (Volume 1, chapter 4, paragraph 4.9.3.4 and 4.11.4.1)	Y	Since the PEIR, a refined landfall location has been identified (western re-route around Kelling) and the area identified for landfall works has reduced. This was informed by a number of factors including community feedback in the area of Kelling and Weybourne, avoidance of the Kelling Heath SSSI/CWS and Holiday Park, nearshore concerns such as the location of the chalk reef within the Cromer Shoals Chalk Beds MCZ as well as engineering/technical considerations. Further details on this change is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives.
Natural England	1.26 Due to the limited information presented at the scoping stage in relation to environmental features Natural England provided a higher level response raising concerns about impacts to the MCZ and identifying suitable alternatives. It should have been made clear at that time that alternatives for cable routing within the near shore area outside of the then scoping area should be included i.e. greater extent of the eastern edge of the Wash and North Norfolk SAC. Therefore we do not agree with 4.10.1.9. (Volume 1, chapter 4, section 4.10)	Y	Noted. The Hornsea Three offshore cable corridor has been rerouted such that it now avoids areas of subtidal chalk and peat and clay exposures within the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ and minimises overall interaction with the MCZ. The assessment of temporary and long term habitat loss/disturbance on benthic features of this site presented in the Environmental Statement in volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology has been updated accordingly.
Natural England	1.27 Natural England and JNCC have provided comments to DONG Energy in relation to the refinements to the offshore export cable corridor as part of the pre-application Evidence Plan process. An alternative route around the northern part of the NNSSR cSAC/SCI was presented in a meeting on 18 May 2017. The SNCBs view the alternative as an appropriate means to mitigate for impacts to the northern part of the cSAC/SCI. We acknowledge that no additional geophysical data will be collected prior to examination. However, we believe that a desk based study of the data sets that Centrica has collected for their Audrey field would help provide missing evidence. In relation to project specific data we advise that additional benthic sampling is done in that section of the proposed alternative cable corridor as part of the offshore benthic survey programme. It is our view that this information will be sufficient for the purposes of impact assessment in the ES and should provide some indication about the feasibility of the route as well. (Volume 1, chapter 4, paragraph 4.11.2)	Y	The offshore cable corridor has now been rerouted to reduce impacts to the NNSSR cSAC/SCI (please see Environmental Statement in volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology)
Natural England	1.28 As set out in the comments to Section 4.10 Natural England did not advise the avoidance of the Wash and North Norfolk SAC. (Volume 1, chapter 3, paragraph 4.11.4.1)	Y	Acknowledged. The nearshore cable route was revised following this and other feedback at PEIR which suggested that a route that reduced interactions with the MCZ but potentially increased interactions with the Wash and North Norfolk SAC could be preferable.
Swardeston Parish Council	Substation - 1 The siting of such a large structure so close to a residential area is undesirable. Is there any opportunity to challenge the decision of the National Grid to require Dong Energy to connect Hornsea Project Three to the Norwich Main substation? 2 Has Dong energy exhausted all alternatives before determining the precise site location for the substation? 3 Why is the onshore substation not being built adjacent to, and to the South of, the existing Norwich Main substation? This site has direct vehicular access off the A140 and is as removed, if not more removed, from existing residential developments as the proposed site. 4 The proposed substation is an immensely high structure. Has Dong Energy considered acquiring a portion of the Mangreen quarry site so as to be able to construct the substation at least partially below ground level? This site would have direct access off the A140 and A47 and the added benefit of almost totally screening the finished substation by a combination of building below ground and planting around the circumference. 5 Whatever the precise location of the substation site, we believe that access to the site should be directly from the A47 (or the A140-A47 slip road), at least for HGVs and "abnormal loads" and preferably for ALL traffic. The B1113 already fails to meet the needs of pedestrians and cyclists and will struggle to cope with the proposed increase in traffic. It is already gridlocked in places at certain times of day, especially at its junction with the A140. 6 The B1113 north of the A47 underpass has a recent history of flooding in heavy rain, with the majority of that flooding caused by water run-off from the field in which the proposed substation is to be sited. Is Dong energy aware of this historic issue and can users of the road be assured that sufficient drainage will be put in place in order to avoid any increased likelihood of these flooding events? 7 How does Dong Energy intend to alleviate any noise and light pollution consequent upon the construction and operation	I	Environmental Statement, volume 3, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives sets out the process of identifying a grid connection location.  The aim of the grid connection option appraisal was to identify the most economic and efficient design option for the connection of a project. Although both National Grid and Orsted input into the appraisal process (in respect to economic and strategic factors), the eventual grid connection offer is determined by National Grid. In May 2016, Hornsea Three was formally offered a grid connection at Norwich Main Substation as a result of this appraisal process.  Information pertaining to the site selection for the HVAC booster station and HVDC converter/HVAC substation is also provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives.  Through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive ecological receptors. For example, the orientation of the HVAC booster station has been optimised to minimise impacts on nearby field boundaries (hedgerows and trees) as well as maximise natural screening. Additional mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project are outlined in topic specific chapters, and include the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts on local road networks; the restoration of habitats (including hedgerows) which cannot be avoided; and landscape planting around the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>2</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>of the substation? 8 Dong Energy representatives have indicated that substantial tree planting will take place to reduce the visual impact of the substation. The proposed site already contains a number of ancient hedgerows and mature trees. Will Dong Energy be taking all necessary steps to ensure that these trees and hedges are protected, both for the sake of their existing ecology and for the immediate screening effect they will have on the finished substation? 9 Given the height of the proposed structure, we believe that 'bundling' the substation and planting along the crest will not of itself significantly reduce its visibility since most native tree varieties are relatively slow growing. Accordingly, we believe that, wherever possible, planting of semi-mature trees should commence immediately, not only around the boundaries of the site but also in other more distant areas where there is anticipated to be line of sight visibility of the substation. 10 Again, given the height of the structure, will Dong Energy be giving consideration to entering into agreements with mobile telephone network operators to enable mobile phone masts to be placed on the substation so as to improve reception in the area? 11 What assurances will Dong Energy give that Parishioners will not suffer financially from the decision to site the substation in the Parish? Clearly some Parishioners will have their homes permanently blighted such that they will become unsaleable. Many others however will find that their properties are reduced in value. For most people, their homes are an important part of their retirement planning. Any loss of value will have serious financial repercussions. How is Dong Energy planning to address this? 12 We understand that Dong Energy has previously established community funds to compensate the community as a whole for the inconvenience suffered during the construction process and whilst the substation is in operation. We have noted the sums being made available by Dong Energy through Grantscape in connection with the Race Bank and Hornsea Project One offshore windfarms. How have these sums been calculated? 13 The Race Bank and Hornsea Project One compensation schemes appear to have been established to compensate communities over a wide area on the basis, presumably, that they are all adversely affected over the long term through sight of the wind turbines. This will not be the case with the Hornsea Project Three. Since the turbines are well out of sight of land, communities along the cable laying route will only be affected during the relatively brief construction phase. Swardeston alone, with the possible inclusion of the area around the HVAC Booster Station if it is needed, will continue to be affected following the completion of the construction phase by the visual impact and polluting aspects of the continued operation of the substation. Will any community fund either be heavily weighted in favour of this locality, or a separate fund established to compensate Swardeston and its close neighbours. 14 Will Swardeston Parish Council have a leading role in determining how any community funds are distributed?</p>		<p>In respect to construction impacts, the Project will ensure that sensitive construction management measures, such as noise, dust and traffic control are implemented where required. These are documented in an outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) and outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP), which accompanies the DCO application.</p> <p>In respect to your final point, Hornsea Project Three will review the interactions of the project, as the proposal is refined and consider an appropriate way to feed benefits back into the local community. However, any decision to establish a community benefit fund for Hornsea Three would be made post financial investment decision (FID).</p>
<b>Section 42: Local Authorities (prescribed under section 43 of the Act)</b>			
<p>Planning, South Norfolk Council</p>	<p>1) Why the project looks to connect to the Mangreen substation. What where the alternatives assessed and why was Mangreen chosen as the connection point to the National Grid? (why connection within South Norfolk and not closer to the coast). Whilst I appreciate the information set out in HOW03_Peir_Volume 1 Chapter 4_site selection page 31 through to 36. 'The two substation sites were considered, relative to one another, to determine a preferred option, 4.12.4.1 supported by site visits in the summer of 2016. During the site inspections, further consideration was given to matters such as topography, access, landscape framework/screening, hydrology and ground conditions, to supplement the desk top work that was carried out. Furthermore, the sites had been subject of desk top heritage assessment and phase 1 ecology surveys (as part of the early EIA process) since their initial identification and shortlisting, and this information was also considered. The constraints on the physical availability of the land at the two substation options fed into the 4.12.4.2 assessment of "Mitigation and Access" (Table 4.5). It was determined that Option B provides a greater availability of land for potential mitigation to be implemented. Option A is comparatively constrained by the railway line directly to the east and by the Norwich Main National Grid substation to the north. In addition an assessment of the potential access to Option B identified that this was significantly less constrained and would involve less highway works and the associated construction disruption.' This doesn't really answer their questions.</p>	<p>I</p>	<p>Information pertaining to site selection are provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives.</p>



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>2</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Broadland District Council	The District Council requests that further detailed investigations and assessments are undertaken in respect of: - The alternative underground cable route to the west of Salle Park as shown in the 'Phase 2 Statutory Consultation Plan' if this becomes part of the proposed route, plan attached. - The additional temporary construction compound identified at Oulton Streen as shown in the 'Phase 2 Statutory Consultation Plan' if this becomes part of the proposed route, plan attached.	I	The Hornsea Three onshore cable corridor has been subject to rerouting since the production of the PEIR and now passes 110 m from Salle Park at its nearest point, thus avoiding any effect on the relationship between the church and Salle Park. An assessment of impacts on heritage assets is provided in Environmental Statement, volume 3, chapter 5: Historic Environment.  In respect to the main construction compound at Oulton, Hornsea Three recognises the sensitivity of this location and since its identification as the main construction compound, Hornsea Three has sought to identify measures to minimise any impacts on Oulton village, local residents and the local road network. In this regard, where properties are located in close proximity to the Oulton Airfield, the Project will ensure that sensitive construction management measures, such as noise, dust and traffic control are considered. These are documented in an outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), which accompanies the DCO application, as well as the topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3). Furthermore, it is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this also forms part of the DCO application.  Both the alternative route to the west of Salle Park and the construction compound at Oulton are now considered throughout the Environmental Statement (volume 3)
<b>Section 42: Persons with an interest in the land (prescribed under section 44 of the Act)</b>			
A Hafford	I am totally against this project affecting this area. Therefore I would suggest that you use the alternative route as marked in mauve on your site plan (top right).	Y	Hornsea Three has taken forward the alternative route at landfall which was presented as part of the Section 42 consultation. This has resulted in the area which will be directly impacted by the landfall works associated with construction of Hornsea Three having been reduced and avoidance of direct impacts on designated sites (including Kelling Heath SSSI). Impacts on the airstrip close to landfall has also been avoided through a commitment to use trenchless technology (e.g. HDD).
BT	Call from Tabitha at BT requesting information on potentially impacted properties from the current HOW03 plans. Tabitha suggested that BT owns land and properties in the area that they suspect may be impacted by the development. They would like to know if any have been identified by assessments and surveys at this stage.	N/A	Further to BT's response, Hornsea Three has made further contact with Tabitha within the Property Department using the contact details provided.
Dr George Carman	Comments in Proposed Landfall In view of the environmental sensitivity at Weybourne we do not understand why DONG is considering two or three scenarios around the hamlet of Weybourne. We would prefer DONG to use existing engineering technology /capability to under-drill the fragile shingle beach and its fishing infrastructure, the shoreline, the village and the busy Coastal Road with a c.1.75 km bore noting that Table 3.4.4 of provided information indicates capability is to use 2.5 km lengths of duct.	Y	Through the design development process, the onshore cable corridor now follows the 'alternative route under consideration' and therefore the onshore cable corridor now avoids the designated sites in close proximity to the landfall. Consideration of alternate landfall locations, as well as justification for the choice of landfall location is set out in Environmental Statement, volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Alternatives.  The technology to be used at landfall will be decided during detailed design, as set out in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description.
Dr George Carman	Comments on Onshore Cable Corridor We are very concerned that the proposed installation of multiple cables at c.1.2m depth will PERMANENTLY restrict future land across the some 55 km of the North Norfolk landscape. At Stakeholders property reference 682336/681157 the family has enjoyed the flexibility of multi-purpose land use including market gardening, cropping, glasshouses, pasture, equine sport, recreation, camping and visual amenity over the past 100 years. Our future generations will not be able to enjoy the same flexibility of amenity. Furthermore we are concerned that the land will be devalued particularly as some 60% of the Stakeholders own meadows will be affected with imposed restrictions. We also have grave concerns on the impact of the installation operations generating disruptive traffic and long term damage to rural landscape	I	Potential impacts on other land uses are considered in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 6: Land Use and Recreation (section 6.11.1). During the construction phase, top soil and sub soils will be stripped and stored in accordance with best practice and the land within the Hornsea Three onshore cable corridor will be restored to its original condition, therefore reducing the potential for sterilisation. Thus, although it would not be possible to place any type of construction (i.e. buildings) or trees above the cables without prior consent to avoid damage, it will be possible to continue farming crops or grazing animals above the cables once construction has completed.  In respect to devaluation, we will compensate landowners who are directly affected by the cable through their land. Compensation is paid for the freehold depreciation of the land affected by the easement and for all reasonable and substantiated losses arising from construction of the project.  Potential impacts on the local landscape and local road network are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources and chapter 7: Traffic and Transport respectively.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>2</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Dr George Carman	<p>Considerations for refining the Corridor down to 80 metres No Hedgerow crossings to be greater than 60 degrees (i.e. to be between 90 degrees to 60 degrees) to minimise impact and preserve ancient hedgerow bio-corridors and scenic amenity of North Norfolk. Offering to replant hedgerows simply does not replace their antiquity.</p>	I	<p>Where possible, Hornsea Three has sought to avoid landscape features (including trees and hedgerows) through cable routing or the use of trenchless technologies.</p> <p>Given the nature of Hornsea Three, there are some hedgerows which cannot be avoided and will be removed to enable construction. Any hedgerows which cannot be avoided will be replaced at the end of the construction phase. Furthermore, restoration of hedgerows, currently in poor condition, provides an opportunity to achieve long term benefits for the biodiversity associated with this habitat type as well as gap up hedgerows providing landscape and visual mitigation. Further details on hedgerow removal, retention and replacement can be found in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation as well as the Outline Ecological Management Plan and the Outline Landscape Management Plan which form part of the DCO application.</p>
Dr George Carman	<p>Comments on Proposed onshore Mannington HVAC booster station at Shrubs Farm We are concerned that the proposed onshore Shrubs Farm Booster Station will create a real and significant risk of a significant adverse impact to our family amenity through (i) long term visual impact from approach roads between our market town Holt and homes (very high likelihood and very high consequence) (ii) long term increased background noise (very high likelihood and very high consequence). Figure 1 shows the results of Viewshed modelling (in green) using the Google Earth Digital Terrain Model and algorithm for a 12.5 m high structure at the proposed HVAC Shrubs Farm site indicating it will be visible<sup>3</sup> (at ground level) over (i) 20 ha of land including houses at Edgefield (intersection of Ramsgate Street and Holt Road- including popular 17th Century country pub -The Pigs. (ii) About 200 ha of land including houses around Little Barningham village and Corpusty Road being 3 km east of the site (iii) 60 ha of land west of the proposed site. Whilst topography and trees provide a screen to the east and south east it is noted that trees are not a permanent feature of the landscape and in fact harvesting of some of the plantation has already commenced. (iv) Some 30 ha of undeveloped land 5 km southwest of the proposed site south of the Corpusty- Briston Road. Figure 2 shows the increased viewshed for the proposed 17.5 metre above ground level lighting proposed for the 2.5Ha site Therefore, there is considerable risk (very high likelihood and very high consequence) the North Norfolk landscapes will be “industrialised” over more than many hundreds of hectares by the 150 x 30 m buildings and the 17.5 m high lighting of the site. We accept that higher resolution DTMs and alternative algorithms may provide alternative interpretations and we respectfully request DONG to supplement their Visual Impact reports with Viewshed analyses. Furthermore, we are concerned the final location of the HVAC booster station may change and move closer to family property. We assess this risk to be of modest likelihood but with an extreme and unacceptable consequence. In Conclusion with respect to the proposed HVAC Booster stations we wish (in order of priority) (i) There be NO onshore HVAC booster station and that this is achieved by (a) constructing all booster stations offshore and/or (b) use of existing/emerging HVDC technology. (ii) Height of Booster station above ground level be reduced by excavating 3 to 5 metre and construction of an appropriate waterproof cellar. (iii) That the noise emission be reduced to the very highest of industry capability and exceeds current Best Industry Practice (not ALARP4 and not the minimum of the Statutory Requirement). It is not acceptable to say the project will meet the minimum regulatory requirements since TIME as shown that previous standards are no longer appropriate e.g. highway driving speeds or the use of asbestos. (iv) Sound mitigation be installed including cladding and berms (to a height equal to the height of the building) (v) We question the need for any lighting – particularly at 17.5 m. above ground level. DONG is respectfully requested to consider the use of infra-red technology for security which would obviate the need for any lighting. Any other security lighting to be kept below 10 metres and installed with motion sensors so that lights are not left on permanently.</p>	N	<p>The maximum parameters associated with the HVAC booster station is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description.</p> <p>Generally, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts to local residential receptors, either through site selection/route refinement or through the identification of suitable mitigation measures. Where there are impacts to residential receptors, these are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3), for example noise during the operation of the HVDC converter/HVAC substation is addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 8: Noise and Vibration.</p> <p>Impacts relating to landscape and visual resources are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual resources. Photographic panels along the cable corridor, as well as indicative visualisations have been prepared to inform the assessment of impacts and are provided in Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 4.5: Photographic Panels, Wireframes and Photomontages. Appropriate mitigation measures for visual disturbance are outlined in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources. This includes, for example, the restoration of habitats (including hedgerows) which cannot be avoided and landscape planting around the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.</p> <p>Due to current uncertainty (see volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives), a decision on which transmission system (HVDC or HVAC) to adopt will not be made until post consent after extensive engagement with potential systems suppliers has taken place. As a result of this, we have conducted our assessments based on a realistic worst-case scenario, which could be either HVDC or HVDC technology depending on the receptor.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>2</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Dr George Carman	Visual and noise impact of Mannington HVAC Booster station with better than best industry practice being targeted (as opposed to minimal statutory requirement)	I	Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 8: Noise and Vibration provides an assessment of the potential noise impacts from the HVAC booster station, along with associated mitigation measures where required. It is noted that a number of measures which represent best practicable means have been designed-in to the project where reasonable, for example: site hoardings and maintenance of equipment and vehicles.
Stephen and Sandra Carman	Comments in Proposed Landfall In view of the environmental sensitivity at Weybourne we do not understand why DONG is considering two or three scenarios around the hamlet of Weybourne. We would prefer DONG to use existing engineering capability to under-drill the fragile shingle beach and its fishing infrastructure, the shoreline, the village and the busy Coastal Road with a c.1.75 km bore noting that Table 3.4.4 of provided information indicates capability is to install 2.5 km lengths of duct.	Y	Through the design development process, the onshore cable corridor now follows the 'alternative route under consideration' and therefore the onshore cable corridor now avoids the designated sites in close proximity to the landfall. Consideration of alternate landfall locations, as well as justification for the choice of landfall location is set out in Environmental Statement, volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Alternatives.  The technology to be used at landfall will be decided during detailed design, as set out in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description.
Stephen and Sandra Carman	Comments on Proposed onshore HVAC booster station at Shrubs Farm We are concerned that the proposed onshore Shrubs Farm Booster Station will create a real and significant risk of a significant adverse impact to our family amenity through (i) long term visual impact from approach roads between our market town Holt and homes (ii) long term increased background noise (iii) Light pollution Figure 1 shows the results of Viewshed modelling (in green) using the Google Earth Digital Terrain Model and algorithm for a 12.5 m high structure at the proposed HVAC Shrubs Farm site indicating it will be visible (at ground level) over (i) 20 ha of land including houses at Edgefield (intersection of Ramsgate Street and Holt Road- including popular 17th Century country pub -The Pigs. (ii) About 200 ha of land including houses around Little Barningham village and Corpusty Road being 3 km east of the site (iii) 60 ha of land west of the proposed site. Whilst topography and trees provide a screen to the east and south east it is noted that trees are not a permanent feature of the landscape and in fact harvesting of some of the plantation has already commenced. (iv) Some 30 ha of undeveloped land 5 km southwest of the proposed site south of the Corpusty- Briston Road. Figure 2 shows the increased viewshed for the proposed 17.5 metre above ground level lighting proposed for the 2.5Ha site Therefore, there is considerable risk the North Norfolk landscapes will be "industrialised" over more than many hundreds of hectares by the 150 x 30 m buildings and the 17.5 m high lighting of the site. Furthermore, we are concerned the final location of the HVAC booster station may change and move closer to family property In Conclusion with respect to the proposed HVAC Booster stations we wish (in order of priority) (i) There be NO onshore HVAC booster station and that this is achieved by (a) constructing all booster stations offshore and/or (b) use of DC current (ii) Height of Booster station above ground level be reduced by excavating 3 to 5 metre and construction of an appropriate waterproof cellar. (iii) That the noise emission be reduced to the very highest of industry capability and exceeds current Best Industry Practice (not ALARP4 and not the minimum of the Statutory Requirement). It is not acceptable to say the project will meet the minimum regulatory requirements since TIME as shown that previous standards are no longer appropriate e.g. highway driving speeds or the use of asbestos. (iv) Sound mitigation be installed including cladding and berms (to a height equal to the height of the building) (v) We question the need for any lighting – particularly at 17.5 m. above ground level. DONG is respectfully requested to consider the use of infra-red technology for security which would obviate the need for any lighting. Any other security lighting to be kept below 10 metres and installed with motion sensors so that lights are not left on permanently	I	The maximum parameters associated with the HVAC booster station is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description.  Generally, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts to local residential receptors, either through site selection/route refinement or through the identification of suitable mitigation measures. Where there are impacts to residential receptors, these are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3), for example noise during the operation of the HVDC converter/HVAC substation is addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 8: Noise and Vibration.  Impacts relating to landscape and visual resources are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual resources. Photographic panels along the cable corridor, as well as indicative visualisations have been prepared to inform the assessment of impacts and are provided in Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 4.5: Photographic Panels, Wireframes and Photomontages. Appropriate mitigation measures for visual disturbance are outlined in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources. This includes, for example, the restoration of habitats (including hedgerows) which cannot be avoided and landscape planting around the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.  Due to current uncertainty (see volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives), a decision on which transmission system (HVDC or HVAC) to adopt will not be made until post consent after extensive engagement with potential systems suppliers has taken place. As a result of this, we have conducted our assessments based on a realistic worst-case scenario, which could be either HVDC or HVDC technology depending on the receptor.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>2</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Stephen and Sandra Carman	<p>Comments on areas identified for temporary construction compounds and potential access routes. We are very concerned that the proposed Oulton Construction Compound is some 5 km from the cable corridor invoking much traffic disruption through Itteringham village for access to corridor north of the River Bure and through Corpusty/Heydon village environs for access to the corridor south of the River Bure.</p> <p>We are also concerned on the Environmental impact on ALL North Norfolk access country routes which are predominantly single-lane, high-earth-banked, and hedge-rowed lanes with fragile flora and fauna. We are exceptionally concerned that access to the south of the River Bure crossing will be heaviest immediately south of the river which is on, and in the vicinity of, stakeholder property.</p>	I	<p>Access routes will be required from the nearby road network at various places along the onshore export cable route to access the construction works as well as the various compounds along the route that may be set-up in advance of the cable laying. Vehicle movements will vary depending on their purpose but will include heavy goods vehicles as well as abnormal indivisible loads. However, during construction, temporary haul roads will be installed within the cable corridor to facilitate the movement of construction vehicles to the site and to allow trench excavation to take place. These haul roads will also help minimise interactions with the local road networks.</p> <p>Measures will be implemented to minimise dust, mud and debris associated with the movement of construction vehicles between the compounds and the route, the details of which will be provided in an outline Code of Construction Practice which forms part of the DCO application. Furthermore, prior to the commencement of traffic generating works, a Construction Traffic Management Plan(s) will be agreed with the relevant Local Highway Authority in consultation with the Highways Agency.</p> <p>Environmental Statement volume 3, Chapter 7: Traffic and Transport provides detailed assessment of potential traffic impacts on the local road network, whilst impacts on ecological receptors are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation.</p>
National Grid	<p>Further advice: We would request that the potential impact of the proposed scheme on National Grid's existing assets as set out above and including any proposed diversions is considered in any subsequent reports, including in the Environmental Statement, and as part of any subsequent application.</p> <p>Where any diversion of apparatus may be required to facilitate a scheme, National Grid is unable to give any certainty with the regard to diversions until such time as adequate conceptual design studies have been undertaken by National Grid. Further information relating to this can be obtained by contacting the email address below.</p> <p>Where the promoter intends to acquire land, extinguish rights, or interfere with any of National Grid apparatus protective provisions will be required in a form acceptable to it to be included within the DCO. National Grid 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. All consultations should be sent to the following: box.landandacquisitions( @ )nationalgrid.com or by post to the following address: The Company Secretary 1-3 The Strand London WC2N 5EH</p>	I	<p>Ørsted acknowledged National Grid's advice regarding diversions and has been in further discussions regarding both gas and electrical infrastructure. Further to this consultation, bespoke protective provisions have been included in the DCO.</p>
D.N Gray	<b>Landfall Zone</b> - Must be left to local people to contribute in a knowledgeable and helpful manner	Y	Noted. See previous comments relating to the landfall. Feedback from the PEIR and other consultation events was considered in the development of the final application for Development Consent.
D.N Gray	<b>Cable Corridor</b> - See attached map - the line (between Bootan and Morton) straightens the current loop and would be accommodated east of Alderford church and west of Alderford common should be worth consideration	Y	Information relating to the routing of the onshore cable corridor is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives. This details that the onshore cable corridor has been routed to the south, as opposed to the west, of Alderford common due to primarily environmental constraints (e.g. the presence of watercourses and drainage channels).
David Bye	<b>Consultation</b> - There are too many 'unkowns' both in terms of route/corridor and technology	I	The Hornsea Three EIA has employed a maximum design scenario approach, which reflects the Rochdale Envelope approach. By identifying, and assessing based on the maximum design scenario, it can therefore be concluded that the all issues have been addressed and any impacts will be no greater for any other design scenario. The full details of the EIA methodology are set out in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 5: EIA Methodology.



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>2</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Simon Willcox	I would like to know why the cable cannot landfall at Great Yarmouth rather than Weybourne? This would avoid the controversial cable route proposed through picturesque and valuable North Norfolk countryside. Why Weybourne and not Great Yarmouth or Kings Lynn? Why scar and wonderful area of countryside when a route from Great Yarmouth to Norwich would have a much reduced impact	I	Further information pertaining to the landfall location and route selection is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives. Where possible, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts to local receptors, either through site selection/route refinement or through the identification of suitable mitigation measures. In this regard, since the PEIR, a refined route at landfall has been identified (western re-route around Kelling) and the area identified for landfall works has reduced. This was informed by a number of factors including community feedback in the area of Kelling and Weybourne, avoidance of the Kelling Heath SSSI/CWS and Holiday Park as well as engineering/technical considerations. Where there are impacts to sensitive receptors from the landfall works, these are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3).
Simon Willcox	The landfall at Weybourne and the immediate route to the South cuts across a unique landscape which despite promised to rectify the damage will never be replaced or rectified	I	Further information pertaining to the landfall location and route selection is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives. Where possible, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts to local receptors, either through site selection/route refinement or through the identification of suitable mitigation measures. In this regard, since the PEIR, a refined route at landfall has been identified (western re-route around Kelling) and the area identified for landfall works has reduced. This was informed by a number of factors including community feedback in the area of Kelling and Weybourne, avoidance of the Kelling Heath SSSI/CWS and Holiday Park as well as engineering/technical considerations. Where there are impacts to sensitive receptors from the landfall works, these are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3). The Outline Ecological Management Plan that forms part of the application for Development Consent details the project commitments to ensure restoration of habitats affected by the construction of the onshore cables.
Simon Willcox	The proposed corridor cuts through some of the most picturesque and unspoilt countryside of North Norfolk. The corridor and proposed sub-station will affect adversely this landscape forever	I	Where possible, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts from the onshore cable corridor and permanent infrastructure to local receptors, either through site selection/route refinement or through the identification of suitable mitigation measures. Mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project are outlined in topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3), and include the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts on local road networks, ecological receptors (e.g. hedgerows) and hydrological features (e.g. main rivers).  Where there are impacts to sensitive receptors, these are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3). It is also noted that prior to construction commencing a Schedule of Condition of the land will be taken and we have an obligation to return the land in the same state. In this regard, any hedgerows which cannot be avoided will be replaced at the end of the construction phase. Furthermore, restoration of hedgerows, currently in poor condition, provides an opportunity to achieve long term benefits for the biodiversity associated with this habitat type as well as gap up hedgerows providing landscape and visual mitigation. Further details on hedgerow removal, retention and replacement can be found in volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation, the Outline Ecological Management Plan and the Outline Landscape Management Plan.
Simon Willcox	Please reconsider the proposal or landfall and Weybourne and consider other sites which will have a reduced impact on North Norfolk	I	Further information pertaining to the landfall location and route selection is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives. Where possible, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts to local receptors, either through site selection/route refinement or through the identification of suitable mitigation measures. In this regard, since the PEIR, a refined route at landfall has been identified (western re-route around Kelling) and the area identified for landfall works has reduced. This was informed by a number of factors including community feedback in the area of Kelling and Weybourne, avoidance of the Kelling Heath SSSI/CWS and Holiday Park as well as engineering/technical considerations. Where there are impacts to sensitive receptors from the landfall works, these are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3), with additional mitigation measures identified where required.



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>2</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Simon Willcox	<b>HVAC Booster Station</b> - Its proposed site will spoil forever a greenfield site in a special part of North Norfolk. The site covers a large area and will have buildings of up to 15m (50 feet) high. This is something that cannot be hidden by 'careful landscaping' and will spoil a very picturesque part of the countryside	I	Information pertaining to the site selection for the HVAC booster station is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives, whilst maximum dimensions are provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description.  Through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive ecological receptors. For example, the orientation of the HVAC booster station has been optimised to minimise impacts on nearby field boundaries (hedgerows and trees) as well as maximise natural screening. Additional mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project are outlined in topic specific chapters, and include the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts on local road networks, ecological receptors (e.g. hedgerows) and hydrological features (e.g. main rivers); and landscape planting around the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.
Simon Willcox	<b>Onshore substation</b> - As above. Above my bedroom window I can see overhead electricity cables criss crossing the fields outside my house carrying electricity from South to North. Indeed your proposed cable corridor will be parallel to these overhead lines. This indicates a complete lack of coordination between yourselves and other villages	I	The need to minimise potential landscape and visual impacts arising from Hornsea Three was identified early in the design process, and led to a commitment by Hornsea Three to bury all onshore export cables (as opposed to using overhead lines), see Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives. Although the presence of existing structures and infrastructure was taken into consideration during the site selection and routing process, the need to cross existing infrastructure could not be avoided given the linear nature of Hornsea Three.  In respect to potential landscape and visual impacts, Hornsea Three has sought to avoid landscape features (including trees and hedgerows) through cable routing or the use of trenchless technologies. Where impacts cannot be avoided, appropriate mitigation measures for visual disturbance are outlined in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources.
Simon Willcox	<b>Construction sites</b> - Your current proposed site at Edgefield will intrude on a 'greenfield' site in an AONB. The size, height and consequential associated development are completely unsuited for this unspoilt part of North Norfolk country side.	Y	Hornsea Three will not be taking forward the Edgefield site, with the onshore HVAC booster located close to Little Barningham (as shown in the plans which accompany the DCO). Information pertaining to the site selection for the HVAC booster station is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives.
Simon Willcox	<b>Further develop mitigation measures</b> - I would suggest that the current route from Weybourne to Norwich is abandoned. In its place take the subsea cable to Great Yarmouth and join it to the National Grid there.	I	Environmental Statement, volume 3, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives sets out the process of identifying a grid connection location.  The aim of the grid connection option appraisal was to identify the most economic and efficient design option for the connection of a project. Although both National Grid and Orsted input into the appraisal process (in respect to economic and strategic factors), the eventual grid connection offer is determined by National Grid. In May 2016, Hornsea Three was formally offered a grid connection at Norwich Main Substation as a result of this appraisal process.  This then informed the landfall location and route selection, for which information is also provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>2</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Simon Willcox	<b>Strongly Oppose</b> - Your proposals are unwanted and unnecessary. The potential longer - and shorter - consequences of your proposed onshore cable corridor will have catastrophic consequences on an unspoilt and treasured landscape. The consequential loss of trees, hedgerow, wildlife habitat disturbance will not outweigh the benefits of offshore wind energy	N	<p>The short term and long term potential impacts of Hornsea Three are assessed within the Environmental Statement, volume 2 and 3. In respect to potential landscape and visual impacts, Hornsea Three has sought to avoid landscape features (including trees and hedgerows) through cable routing or the use of trenchless technologies. Where impacts cannot be avoided, appropriate mitigation measures for visual disturbance are outlined in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources. For example, any hedgerows which cannot be avoided will be replaced at the end of the construction phase. Furthermore, restoration of hedgerows, currently in poor condition, provides an opportunity to achieve long term benefits for the biodiversity associated with this habitat type as well as gap up hedgerows providing landscape and visual mitigation. Further details on hedgerow removal, retention and replacement can be found in volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation, the Outline Ecological Management Plan and the Outline Landscape Management Plan.</p> <p>At the HVAC booster station and HVDC converter/HVAC substation, landscape planting is also proposed to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.</p>
Simon Willcox	Reconsider the route of the onshore cable to come onshore at Kings Lynn or Great Yarmouth	I	<p>Futher information pertaining to the landfall location and route selection is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives. Where possible, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts to local residential receptors, either through site selection/route refinement or through the identification of suitable mitigation measures. In this regard, since the PEIR, a refined route at landfall has been identified (western re-route around Kelling) and the area identified for landfall works has reduced. This was informed by a number of factors including community feedback in the area of Kelling and Weybourne, avoidance of the Kelling Heath SSSI/CWS and Holiday Park as well as engineering/technical considerations. Where there are impacts to residential receptors, these are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3).</p>
Tina Hayward	<b>Onshore cable corridor</b> - I live right on the edge of northern end of the orange route where it passes through Heydon and I think the western (pink) alternative would be much more suitable affecting less properties and less mature trees	Y	<p>Hornsea Three has taken forward the western route, as shown in the plans which accompany the DCO application. The justification for this decision is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives and its accompanying annexes.</p>
Tina Hayward	<b>HVAC Booster Station</b> - I understand if you used a certain type of transmission you will need a booster station at Little Barningham. Surely it is better for everyone involved to use the other type of transmission. A booster station will take a significant piece of precious farmland and be a blot on the landscape forever.	I	<p>As noted in previous comments, there is a certain level of confidence in the UK wind industry that HVDC technology will become more mature before Hornsea Project Three will connect, but there is currently no certainty. Therefore, committing to solely HVDC now could restrict or even prevent the development of the project in the future if we do not see the necessary developments in the market. We may well eventually choose to opt for HVDC transmission technology; however, it is considered that to only seek a consent (planning permission) for such a technology (and excluding HVAC) at this time could make the eventual Project unbuildable and/or unprofitable.</p> <p>Due to current uncertainty, a decision on which transmission system to adopt will not be made until post consent after extensive engagement with potential systems suppliers has taken place. This will be informed by a feasibility study.</p> <p>Information pertaining to the site selection for the HVAC booster station is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives, whilst maximum dimensions are provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description.</p> <p>Through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive ecological receptors. For example, the orientation of the HVAC booster station has been optimised to minimise impacts on nearby field boundaries (hedgerows and trees) as well as maximise natural screening. Additional mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project are outlined in topic specific chapters, and include the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts on local road networks, ecological receptors (e.g. hedgerows) and hydrological features (e.g. main rivers); and landscape planting around the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>2</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 47: Duty to consult local community</b>			
Ray & Diane Pearce	Finally, without any previous mention or indication in your planning, we note that you intend to site a "Construction Compound" (Onshore Key Plan - Map 5 & Onshore Statutory Consultation Plan) immediately adjacent to our property. By doing so, and in addition to our residence being located at the cable crossing point with all the associated issues avoided by your incompetent communication, plus the avoidance of directives and mismanagement of information evidenced by the PEIR, you have seriously blighted our property without one shred of regard for us. Also, your Land Agent are seriously remiss in their terms of reference by not making any attempt to contact us. How do you expect us to run our Holiday Cottage and Bed and Breakfast businesses with a construction compound outside our front door, a cable trench encroaching within 20 metres of our boundary, the road to our property closed with a diversion in place, and, with up to 54 cables being buried on two sides of our house? All this whilst facing the consequential cumulative effects of EMFs on our health. We have communicated all these issues to Dong previously but you have, by some margin, ignored our representations. Why!? As members of the Public, we respectfully request you to acknowledge that your plans will place us, our businesses, our home, our future health and our way of life in jeopardy. The situation of our residence will be placed in a unique, unenviable environment and the omissions from your PEIR has heightened our concerns. Please contact us to arrange a face to face meeting as soon as possible and certainly before your public meeting in September.	Y	The PEIR documentation identified that one main construction compound (with other storage compounds) will be required operating as a central base for the onshore construction works, along with smaller compounds of various sizes along the onshore cable corridor, for laydown and storage of materials, plant and staff, as well as space for small temporary offices, welfare facilities, security and parking. The main construction compound does not need to be located on the route itself but on a suitable site in a central location in close proximity to the export cable route. Hornsea Three initially identified three potential locations for a main compound. As part of ongoing design development work undertaken concurrently to preparing the PEIR a fourth site was identified - amounting to four sites being considered. These were all consulted on as part of the PEIR.  The final site selected was the Oulton site as detailed in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives. This decision took account of feedback such as this in relation to the other potential compound sites.
Councillor David Young (District Councillor for High Heath)	I have seen the mauve shaded alternative route in connection with the latest round of consultation. I can see the advantages in avoiding the heath (SSSI) and the caravan park, though it would put more pressure on The Street through Kelling which is narrow and has lots of parked cars due to the school at the N end of the road. Is this looking to be your first choice? For your original routes, you produced maps with the route in a hatched green which clearly showed the underlying features – is a similar version available for this new route?	I	Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport confirms that traffic does not need to travel through Kelling. Construction traffic associated with the proposed works will travel along A149 through to Weybourne and utilise the haul road constructed as part of the cable installation works which will extend between A149 and Holgate Hill (and ensure that construction vehicle associated with the project can travel off the public highway network).
Dr Moss Taylor (Honorary Warden of the Weybourne Camp Reserve)	Further to my earlier emails concerning the proposed Landfall Zone on Weybourne Camp, I would like to make the following additional points, especially in view of the 'Alternative Route Being Considered' that runs to the west of the Landfall Zone rather than the original PEIR boundary that went due south.	N	This is acknowledged and is responded to under the individual points below.
Dr Moss Taylor (Honorary Warden of the Weybourne Camp Reserve)	I believe that the 'Alternative Route Being Considered', outlined in purple on the latest maps, gives Dong a golden opportunity to reconsider the Landfall Zone that would cause minimal damage to the environment and wildlife on Weybourne Camp, and would also create a direct route from the beach to the 'Alternative Route Being Considered'. There is a flat plateau level with the beach (which would make an ideal Landfall Zone, where all the necessary equipment could be stored) immediately to the west of the three anti-aircraft gun emplacements at the western end of Weybourne Camp (and yet still within the Camp perimeter fence), and immediately to the east of Kelling Hard and the lane that runs from Kelling Village to the beach. The trench could then run due south across the plateau, and join up with the 'Alternative Route Being Considered'. Another great advantage of this 'Alternative Route Being Considered' is that it avoids crossing Kelling Heath. If the original Landfall Site was used and joined up with the 'Alternative Route Being Considered' that passes south of the RAF station, the road used by the University of East Anglia meteorologists would be disrupted as would the airstrip that is used on an almost daily basis by light planes.	Y	Hornsea Three has taken forward the alternative route at landfall which was presented as part of the Section 42 consultation. This has resulted in the area which will be directly impacted by the landfall works associated with construction of Hornsea Three having been reduced and avoidance of direct impacts on designated sites (including Kelling Heath SSSI). Impacts on the airstrip close to landfall has also been avoided through a commitment to use trenchless technology (e.g. HDD).
Ann Abbott	I am in favour of the course running west of the village at Kelling Hard providing it skirts residents homes, the museum, and Kelling Hotel, as it will not impede the Beck stream in Weybourne village which is a rare chalk stream (b) the village should not be disrupted so much (c) it should not affect the tourists coming to the beach or walkers along the coastal path, visitors to the Museum, Hotels B and Bs - although I don't know about the fishermen.	Y	Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport confirms that traffic does not need to travel through Kelling. Construction traffic associated with the proposed works will travel along A149 through to Weybourne and utilise the haul road constructed as part of the cable installation works which will extend between A149 and Holgate Hill (and ensure that construction vehicle associated with the project can travel off the public highway network).  Impacts relating to hydrology, recreational users and tourism are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapters 2: Hydrology and Flood risk; chapter 6: Land Use and Recreation and chapter 10: socio-economics respectively.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>2</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Ann Abbott	Which landfall route does Dong Energy prefer on the 3 suggestions on the map? Are you considering another suggested route starting at Kelling Hard?	N	Since the PEIR, a refined landfall location has been identified (western re-route around Kelling) and the area identified for landfall works has reduced. This was informed by a number of factors including community feedback in the area of Kelling and Weybourne, avoidance of the Kelling Heath SSSI/CWS and Holiday Park as well as engineering/technical considerations.
Nigel Rogers	General Comment on PEIR: The relatively unspoilt nature of North Norfolk is recognised by the PEIR, but it is not clear to us why Dong Energy have chosen to bring the cable onshore in this region, especially given the considerable distance to the National Grid connection in Norwich. We recommend the EIR makes it clear why this particular connection to the national grid was chosen over alternatives.	I	Environmental Statement, volume 3, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives sets out the process of identifying a grid connection location.  The aim of the grid connection option appraisal was to identify the most economic and efficient design option for the connection of a project. Although both National Grid and Orsted input into the appraisal process (in respect to economic and strategic factors), the eventual grid connection offer is determined by National Grid. In May 2016, Hornsea Three was formally offered a grid connection at Norwich Main Substation as a result of this appraisal process.
Robert and Jane Scarfe	Cable Route near Little Melton: Why can't the route run beneath or immediately adjacent to the existing overhead power cables which pass Beckhithe/Holly Tree Farm which would then take it well away from residential housing? The new homes due to be built nearby already terminate well before the buffer zone for the existing high voltage overhead line.	I	Routing of the onshore cable corridor through Little Melton has been informed by a range of factors including technical, engineering and environmental considerations (including sensitive receptors such as residential properties). Further information on the routing process is set out in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives.
Dr. David Lovell-Badge	Whilst generally happy with your proposal we are concerned in relation to the PEIR boundary and alternative near Beckhithe, Little Melton Road and Burnthouse Lane. There is currently a large construction project to the North of Hethersett involving some 1200 homes. We objected to this since there has been no improvement to the infrastructure including the roads. Our main access routes to our property for the last 13 years have been through Little Melton Road and through Back Lane off Hethersett Lane. This development has closed Back Lane. So the only way to access from that direction is a dangerous right turn on to the main Road B1172 and then through Churchfields. This is very difficult at peak periods. Your proposal would appear to have a significant impact on our ability to access our property through Little Melton Road. This would affect many homes around us and the businesses that operate off Little Melton Road e.g. KeyLine. The route is used regularly by many large HGVs and a bus as well as hundreds of cars. It would be essential to ensure that new road links are built before your development and that any work does not interfere with our access.	I	Impacts relating to access are addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport. It is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this forms part of the DCO application.
Shirley Perry	We wish to protest strongly against the proposed Dong Energy Hornsea project three electrical cable. It is dreadful the Norfolk authorities will consider landfall along any part of the North Norfolk Coast line between Hunstanton and Cromer and also the Booster Station options near Holt, Edgefield, Hempstead and Baconsthorpe areas. These locations still manage to retain some semblance of what is left of rural England and must not be damaged by such a project, which is no doubt the cheapest option for Dong Energy. The landfall should be via one of the larger commercial ports either Hull, Grimsby, Boston or Kings Lynn, and then via an underground trench construction, south of Swaffham and Dereham to the Norwich main grid station. This would be far more less disturbing and in the long term more efficient. We need to save North Norfolk from decimation. Unfortunately it is now too late to save the majority of southern England, which is currently undergoing dramatic ruination. A stand is needed in North Norfolk!	N	Further information pertaining to the landfall location and route selection is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives.
Paul Craske	As a resident of Weybourne, I attended your Community Consultation Event on the 7th September. I am writing to strongly oppose your decision to come ashore at Weybourne. Why Weybourne again, we have just recovered from Dudgeon?	Y	Through the design development process, the proposed route now limits the area of landfall to an area in and around Muckleberry Military Collection (approximately 350m west of the beach car park). Works then head south west, to the east of Kelling, avoiding Kelling Heath SSSI. Further information on the justification for the chosen landfall is provided Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives.
Paul Craske	Now your proposed piping routes, yes the centre one does seem the most obvious given the layout, but the second choice should be via Kelling. The thought of the third option, boring through the cliffs, along side sacred burial ground, most of the residents would be strongly opposed to this. We may be old, but we are still living, and will definitely fight you on this, approved or not!!	Y	Through design development, the area which will be directly impacted by the landfall works associated with construction of Hornsea Three has been reduced. As a result of the route refinement, the onshore cable corridor now avoids Kelling Heath SSSI. The potential impacts of the construction works at landfall are addressed in topic specific chapters.



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>2</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Paul Craske	If as Dudgeon you propose to turn off the A148 at Sandy Hill Lane ,then I suggest talks are started with the owner of Abbey Farm , as where the road passes over the bridge, the farm depot is on the right hand side, past the station. The farm has an access road to the A149 which would mean that 50% of the village would be spared disruption ,although this is still not an acceptable route.The preferred route would be via Kelling from the A148, which would then join your new road before coming into our village.	I	Impacts relating to access are addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport. It is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this forms part of the DCO application.
Matthew Martin	If this is the Non Technical summary I dread to think what the Technical Report consists of! My view about all this is that I cannot work out why the proposed corridor for the southern end of the onshore route cannot be made to run next to the Norwich Southern by-pass. The environmental damage has already been done by the road and by the overhead cables next to the road	I	Further information on the route selection and refinement process is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Alternatives.
Cllr Graham Everett (District Councillor for Reepham) - Broadland District Council	2) I would wish to see serious consideration given to the cable route around the Salle area as this is an area of great sensitivity and has been raised to myself by many people. I firmly believe the alternative route, shown in purple, should be fully investigated and explored in detail before a final decision is made, and I ask that local residents, landowners and relevant local authorities are duly consulted and updated.	Y	Following on from the design refinement process, which took into consideration consultation responses, the onshore cable corridor is now located within the area previously marked as 'alternatives under consideration' during the Phase 2 consultation. It therefore is located to the west of Salle. Further details on route refinement is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives.
Friends of North Norfolk	3.Dong Energy have applied what is known as 'The Rochdale Envelope Approach' and reserve the option to choose between High Voltage Direct Current, (HVDC) or High Voltage Alternating Current (HVAC) Transmission schemes if they receive approval for both within the one application. The Rochdale Envelope Approach enables a Developer to avoid repeated applications for approval to changes in the design of a project and consequential delays in implementation. It should be used to encourage better designs and allowance for rapid advances in technology, which can reduce environmental impacts. In short, it is to allow for a project to evolve over a number of years but within clearly defined parameters. However, we strongly argue that the Rochdale Envelope Approach should not be allowed in cases such as this when changes in the features/ specifications of the design options are so fundamental, and where it allows for a Developer to manipulate a consent for purely profit motives rather than to gain a superior solution from an environmental perspective.	N	The Hornsea Three EIA has employed a maximum design scenario approach, in accordance with the Rochdale Envelope approach. By identifying, and assessing based on the maximum design scenario, it can therefore be concluded that the all issues have been addressed and any impacts will be no greater for any other design scenario.  The full details of the EIA methodology are set out in Volume 1, chapter 5: EIA Methodology.
Friends of North Norfolk	8. It is noteworthy that Dong Energy changed the original consent for Hornsea Project One to add the option to use HVAC Transmission and have subsequently chosen the HVAC Transmission option albeit in a less sensitive landfall and cabling area. In the case of Race Bank, Dong Energy have changed the position of offshore substations so that where originally they were to be out of sight over the horizon they have been moved to within the turbine array area and will now be visible from many highly sensitive viewpoints within the Norfolk Coast AONB and the Norfolk Coast National Trail.	N	Whilst the original proposals for Hornsea Project One did not include HVAC transmission technology, this was added in the pre-application phase and was granted in the original consent for the project. This was therefore not a change to the original consent for Hornsea Project One as suggested by the comment. This does, however, reflect the position of Hornsea Three in including both transmission options at the point of application. Impacts on the AONB and PRoW are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapters 4: Landscape and Visual Resources and 6: Land Use and Recreation respectively.
Friends of North Norfolk	9. There are clear and significant advantages of HVDC Transmission over HVAC Transmission. HVDC is used in long distance sub-sea and underground transmission systems linked to offshore and on-land power generation operations. Indeed it has cost advantages in terms of fewer cables and lower power losses for transmission distances over 50km. Hornsea Project Three Transmission will be over 170km in total length from offshore substations to the proposed grid connection at Norwich Main Substation. Most importantly in this case HVDC would clearly have a much less harmful environmental impact since it will not require massive offshore or onshore Reactive Compensation Booster Stations sited and visible in extremely sensitive locations.	I	As noted in previous comments, there is a certain level of confidence in the UK wind industry that HVDC technology will become more mature before Hornsea Project Three will connect, but there is currently no certainty. Therefore, committing to solely HVDC now could restrict or even prevent the development of the project in the future if we do not see the necessary developments in the market. Hornsea Three may well eventually choose to opt for HVDC transmission technology; however, it is considered that to only seek a consent (planning permission) for such a technology (and excluding HVAC) at this time could make the eventual Project unbuildable and/or unprofitable.  Due to current uncertainty, a decision on which transmission system to adopt will not be made until post consent after extensive engagement with potential systems suppliers has taken place. This will be informed by a feasibility study. However, at this time, both options are retained to ensure both can be considered post-consent.
David and Julie Brooks	Why has Weybourne beach been chosen as the landfall site for the offshore cables? This will mean 3 offshore cable routes coming into Weybourne and all the associated disruption. Also security of supply could be jeopardised with a concentration of cables being a potential target for terrorist attacks. (re: PEIR 2.1.1.4).	I	Information pertaining to the site selection and route refinement process is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Alternatives, whilst consideration of security at the onshore infrastructure is discussed in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description.



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>2</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
David and Julie Brooks	At the recent community consultation events there was a vague response to questions about the 3 route options around Weybourne and the proposed timescales for work being carried out. Comments were made that the 3rd cable route had been introduced due to technical problems with the other routes. Can you clarify this and give more detail?	I	Information pertaining to the site selection and route refinement process is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Alternatives, whilst a more detailed description of the chosen route is discussed in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description.
Robert and Jane Scarfe	Alternative route We have proposed an alternative route to Dong roughly following the path of the existing high voltage overhead National Grid distribution cables, which would not go as close to large numbers of residential homes. Despite this being the “consultation period” they have completely ignored our proposal. They have also ignored a question about vibration transmitted through the soil. The closing date for the consultation is 20th September. It is tempting to wonder if this is procrastination as a planning tactic.	N	The alternative route that was suggested is not viable:- We are unable to avoid this area around Little Melton due to the cable needing to pass between the settlements of Little Melton and Hethersett. Developing a route around the north of Little Melton was discounted as it is built up all the way along School Land/Green Lane up to the junction with B1108 / A47. Developing a route further south was discounted to avoid the large new Taylor Wimpey housing development north of Hethersett, Little Melton Food Park and there being narrow pinch points between woodland on the boundary of Little Melton Food Park and the Taylor Wimpey development (40 metres) and to avoid the route running broadly in line with the National Grid high voltage pylons.
Sarah Small	I am very concerned about the proposed onshore cable route near to the village Little Melton where I live with my family. This route runs very close to the village and crosses 4 roads that lead in and out of the village. My children and I travel along those roads up to 16 times a day and would therefore be crossing the cable up to 16 times a day. I cannot find any research to show that myself and my children would not be at increased risk of leukaemia and other cancers from the increased exposure we would get from the electromagnetic radiation from the underground cables	I	Environmental Statement, volume 3, annex 3.3: EMF Compliance Statement comprises an assessment of the static and extremely low frequency (ELF) EMFs that will be generated by the Hornsea Project Three onshore transmission infrastructure (cabling), giving maximum predicted field strengths to assess compliance with health protection guidelines for public exposure to EMFs.  Annex 3.3 concludes that the maximum magnetic field strength directly above a cable, using worst-case assumptions where required, is also well below the guideline public exposure limits set to protect health. The cables eventually selected for the project will be required to fall within the envelope assessed and meet the prescribed standards and hence will not generate greater EMF.  Relevant to this, it is noted that the view of health protection bodies, based on a wide-ranging health evidence base (including studies of reproductive and developmental effects, cardiovascular disease, neurodegenerative disorders, the immune system, and genotoxic effects), is that low-frequency EMF is not a cause of health risks and that the guideline exposure standards in place (based on well-established effects on the body) are appropriate to protect health.
Sarah Small	Please could the cable be routed further away from the village and cross fewer of the roads that lead into and out of the village.	I	Environmental Statement, volume 3, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives sets out the process of route refinement which considered, amongst other factors, technical and environmental factors.  Where possible and practicable the cable corridor route selected seeks to avoid passing adjacent to properties. This is to reduce impacts associated with construction disturbance and to seek to minimise conflicts such as Heavy Goods Vehicle (HGV) traffic movements. However, it is not possible to avoid passing in close proximity to all properties on the route. Where properties are located in close proximity, the Project will ensure that sensitive construction management measures, such as noise, dust and traffic control are considered. These are documented in an outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), which accompanies the DCO application.
Dr. William Brian Ankers (on behalf of Yvette Gibson)	1). Your conclusion that Option A – Pond Hills is the least preferred option out of the three candidate sites for the HVAC booster station (Option A – Pond Hills; Option B – Holt Farm; Option C – Little Barningham) and that the cable corridor associated with Option A has been removed from the onshore export cable route (ECR) is welcome.	Y	The Little Barningham site has been taken forward for the HVAC booster station, as discussed in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives.
Dr. William Brian Ankers (on behalf of Yvette Gibson)	Option C – Little Barningham is the preferred option and taking this forwards for assessment at the PEIR stage has revealed new information in the associated documents that lends considerable weight to my previous representation of March 2017 that Pond Hills is totally unsuitable as a site for the HVAC booster station given the adverse environmental impacts that would result. For example:	Y	The Little Barningham site has been taken forward for the HVAC booster station, as discussed in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives. Impacts associated with this option is therefore assessed within the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3)
Mervyn & Maureen Bibb	The original proposed route (yellow on your map) took the cable corridor across the field at the back of our house, potentially immediately adjacent to our fence (our garden hedge forms a boundary on one side of your originally proposed corridor) and in full view of our living room and kitchen. Hopefully the final route would be located some distance (200 m?) away. The latter would have minimal impact on the residents of the four barns located at this site and on other nearby properties.	Y	The final route is shown in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description. Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts to local residential receptors, either through site selection/route refinement or through the identification of suitable mitigation measures. Where there are impacts to residential receptors, these are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3).

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>2</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Mervyn & Maureen Bibb	At the above event we discovered that the corridor during construction will be much wider than we had been led to believe from an earlier meeting (three cables rather than one, and a final corridor width during construction of 80 m). We also learned that an alternative route was being considered (purple on your map) that would place the corridor immediately adjacent to two of our neighbours' properties (numbers 3 and 4) and probably closer to ours, and would impact considerably on all three residences.	I	<p>Hornsea Three has sought to minimise direct impacts on sensitive receptors by reducing the onshore cable corridor from 200 m to approximately 80 m. The final route is shown in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description. A number of factors have fed into this refinement process, including technical and environmental. The Environmental Impact Assessment applies a Rochdale Envelope approach, and as such assesses impacts based on a maximum design scenario (i.e. a worst case), and has identified mitigation on the basis of the findings. (see Environmental Statement volume 3).</p> <p>Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts to local residential receptors, either through site selection/route refinement or through the identification of suitable mitigation measures. Where there are impacts to residential receptors, these are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3).</p>
Mervyn & Maureen Bibb	We would like to ask why this alternative and much more disruptive route is being considered. What is the problem with the originally proposed yellow corridor, which if placed some distance from our properties, would be much better for all of us?	I	<p>Hornsea Three has sought to minimise direct impacts on sensitive receptors by reducing the onshore cable corridor from 200 m to approximately 80 m. The final route is shown in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description. A number of factors have fed into this refinement process, including technical and environmental. The Environmental Impact Assessment applies a Rochdale Envelope approach, and as such assesses impacts based on a maximum design scenario (i.e. a worst case), and has identified mitigation on the basis of the findings. (see Environmental Statement volume 3).</p> <p>Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts to local residential receptors, either through site selection/route refinement or through the identification of suitable mitigation measures. Where there are impacts to residential receptors, these are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3).</p>
Mervyn & Maureen Bibb	Also, can you please tell us how long the excavations will be in place? That is, from the commencement of the work adjacent to our property to the restoration of the terrain. I understand that this may be for a prolonged period, and if so it is difficult to understand why the alternative route is being considered. The latter would have a major impact on our neighbors, and likely to be more disruptive for us too.	I	<p>During the design refinement Hornsea Three has sought to minimise the duration of any disruption, and has reduced the total duration of the construction phase onshore to eight years. Within this, the maximum duration for construction of the onshore cable corridor is approximately 2.5 years, this therefore means that the maximum duration over which construction could occur would be 5.5 years incorporating two phases (assuming a three-year gap between the two phases). The work associated with each phase is expected to progress along the Hornsea Three onshore cable corridor with a typical active construction works duration of three months at any particular location.</p> <p>See earlier comments regarding alternative route selection.</p>
Anne Harrap	I would like to make a comment as part of the consultation. I am a resident of Edgefield in Norfolk and I am deeply concerned about the prospect of an onshore booster station at Little Barningham. I feel that the size of the proposed installation, both in terms of its footprint and its height, is wholly inappropriate for such a rural location, and am worried that any lighting at this installation could seriously impinge on one of the few remaining 'dark skies' in southern England. It would also change the nature of the nearby footpath and the pretty, unspoiled valley. No mitigations are suggested, and I feel that nothing could be done to make this booster station acceptable in this location. I understand that there may be alternatives to having a booster station, and suggest that every possible effort is made to use these alternative technologies.	I	<p>Information pertaining to the site selection for the HVAC booster station is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives.</p> <p>Through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive ecological receptors. For example, the orientation of the HVAC booster station has been optimised to minimise impacts on nearby field boundaries (hedgerows and trees) as well as maximise natural screening. Additional mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project are outlined in topic specific chapters, and include the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts on local road networks, ecological receptors (e.g. hedgerows) and hydrological features (e.g. main rivers).</p> <p>In respect to ecology, landscape and heritage impacts this includes, for example, the restoration of habitats (including hedgerows) which cannot be avoided and landscape planting around the HVAC booster to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>2</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Anne Harrap	It would also change the nature of the nearby footpath and the pretty, unspoiled valley. No mitigations are suggested, and I feel that nothing could be done to make this booster station acceptable in this location. I understand that there may be alternatives to having a booster station, and suggest that every possible effort is made to use these alternative technologies.	I	Due to current uncertainty (see volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives), a decision on which transmission system (HVDC or HVAC) to adopt will not be made until post consent after extensive engagement with potential systems suppliers has taken place. As a result of this, we have conducted our assessments based on a realistic maximum design scenario, which could be either HVDC or HVDC technology depending on the receptor. Where appropriate, mitigation is considered for the maximum design scenario throughout the Environmental Statement.  Impacts on PRoW are assessed within Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 6: Land Use and Recreation.
Simon Harrap	I would like to make a comment as part of the consultation. I am a resident of Edgefield in Norfolk and I am deeply concerned about the prospect of an onshore booster station at Little Barningham. I feel that the size of the proposed installation, both in terms of its footprint and its height, is wholly inappropriate for such a rural location, and am worried that any lighting at this installation could seriously impinge on one of the few remaining 'dark skies' in southern England. I understand that there may be alternatives to having booster station, and suggest that every possible effort is made to use these alternative technologies.	I	Information pertaining to the site selection for the HVAC booster station is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives.  Through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive ecological receptors. For example, the orientation of the HVAC booster station has been optimised to minimise impacts on nearby field boundaries (hedgerows and trees) as well as maximise natural screening. Additional mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project are outlined in topic specific chapters, and include the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts on local road networks, ecological receptors (e.g. hedgerows) and hydrological features (e.g. main rivers).  In respect to ecology, landscape and heritage impacts this includes, for example, the restoration of habitats (including hedgerows) which cannot be avoided and landscape planting around the HVAC booster to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.
Robert & Christine Strong	We object to the proposed siting of underground electricity cables adjacent to Gt Melton Road, Little Melton. Our concerns are with regard to the potential adverse effects upon our health and the health risks generally. We make the following comments.	N	Noted, responses provided to individual comments.
Robert & Christine Strong	Siting of cables close to line of dwelling At Little Melton, the proposed corridor runs adjacent and close to a line of several houses. The only other place throughout the proposed route from the North Norfolk coast where the corridor runs adjacent and close to a line of several houses is at High Kelling. This results in many houses and their occupants being affected by the electricity passing through the cables.  In addition, the proposed corridor running along Great Melton Road is very narrow, narrower than the width of the corridor at most other places throughout its length from North Norfolk to South Norfolk. This results in the cables having to be closer to the edge of the corridor and therefore closer to any nearby properties.	N	Noted, see specific response regarding EMF associated with Hornsea Three.
Robert & Christine Strong	We wish Dong to choose an alternative route for the corridor at Little Melton so that there is not a narrow corridor running close to and adjacent to several houses along Great Melton Road.	I	Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts to local residential receptors, either through site selection/route refinement or through the identification of suitable mitigation measures. Further details on the site selection process can be found in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives. Where there are impacts to residential receptors, these are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3) and the Project will ensure that sensitive construction management measures, such as noise, dust and traffic control are considered. These are documented in an outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), which accompanies the DCO application.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>2</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Ray & Diane Pearce	<p>Construction Yard: A 'Construction Compound' is proposed to be located adjacent to our property in accordance with the PEIR's Onshore Key Plan Map 5. This was not communicated to us until the issuance of the PEIR. Coupled with the location of the cable crossing point, the additional disruption of locating a construction compound adjacent to our property will have a severe and negative impact upon us. The cumulative effects of the location of construction compounds on private residents and members of the public is not discussed in the PEIR. The disruption we will experience if the planned construction compound is located thus will be untenable and could be for a prolonged period not detailed in the PEIR. Clearly, there will also be an environmental impact on the location of construction yards and the PEIR is deficient in discussing this impact on the population.</p> <p>The proposed construction yards, in general, will also have an impact on the appearance and character of the planned areas with implications in respect of agriculture during a prolonged construction phase which is not evident in the PEIR. A prolonged period of disruption could ensue as the construction phase for the project is not time limited.</p>	Y	<p>The main construction compound for the project will be located at Oulton Airfield, accessed off the B1149. Since the PEIR, Hornsea Three has refined the proposals for the secondary compounds, with five compounds located along the onshore cable corridor. The locations of the proposed secondary compounds are shown in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description.</p> <p>Impacts on sensitive receptors are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3). Impacts on agricultural land use in particular is assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 6: Land Use and Recreation.</p> <p>The construction programme for Hornsea Three is set out in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Projects Description and confirms a maximum duration of the onshore construction works of eight years, within this, the maximum duration for construction of the onshore cable corridor is approximately 2.5 years, this therefore means that the maximum duration over which construction could occur would be 5.5 years incorporating two phases (assuming a three-year gap between the two phases). The work associated with each phase is expected to progress along the Hornsea Three onshore cable corridor with a typical active construction works duration of three months at any particular location. Secondary construction compounds and storage areas would only remain in place while works were being undertaken in the nearby area, after which they would be restored back to the baseline conditions (as set out in the outline CoCP which accompanies the DCO application).</p>
Joanna and Anshuman Mondal	<p>We are concerned about the alternative route that is being considered, which is purple on your map. This route would be closer to our property than the original, yellow route, and would have considerable impact on our property and our neighbours. Could you please let us know why this alternative and more disruptive route is being considered? Also, can you please tell us how long the excavations will be in place? That is, from the commencement of the work around [REDACTED], to the restoration of the terrain.</p>	I	<p>Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts to local residential receptors, either through site selection/route refinement or through the identification of suitable mitigation measures. Where there are impacts to residential receptors, these are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3). Justification for the route refinement changes during the pre-application phase are set out in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives.</p>
Dominic Everett	<p>Yes. The cable corridor is too long. Joining the National Grid at another location, that would be much closer to the coast should be considered. National Grid should be challenged to offer a less distant connection.</p>	I	<p>Environmental Statement, volume 3, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives sets out the process of identifying a grid connection location.</p> <p>The aim of the grid connection option appraisal was to identify the most economic and efficient design option for the connection of a project. Although both National Grid and Orsted input into the appraisal process (in respect to economic and strategic factors), the eventual grid connection offer is determined by National Grid. In July 2016, Hornsea Three was formally offered a grid connection at Norwich Main Substation as a result of this appraisal process.</p>
David Young (NNDC Councillor)	<p><b>General Comment</b> - The lack of information on 3rd landfall route via Kelling, and the fact that there are alternative methods yet to be chosen, inevitably meant that responses from representatives at consultation meetings were not satisfying, albeit that they were friendly and helpful.</p>	I	<p>Information pertaining to site selection and route refinement, particularly in respect to landfall, is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives.</p>
David Young (NNDC Councillor)	<p><b>Local matters landfall</b> - 3rd alternative route passes the near the Quag and Kelling Water Meadow which is much used by birdwatchers as the area has frequent sightings of unusual birds. Most of Kelling area has no mobile signal.</p>	I	<p>Environmental Statement volume 6, annexes 3.1 - 3.14 report on the full suite of ecological baseline surveys undertaken to inform the assessment of impacts on ecology and nature conservation as reported in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation. Environmental Statement volume 6, annexes 3.9 and 3.10 provide a description of the currently baseline in respect to ornithology (wintering, migratory and breeding birds).</p>
T.W.E Wilkinson	<p><b>Onshore Substation</b> - Location appears to be a sensible option. Im glad that the rugby club is not affected</p>	N	<p>Noted.</p>
Patricia Dodge (Weybourne Village Hall)	<p><b>Temporary Construction</b> - Please avoid beach car park as it is an integral part of living in Weybourne. As a keen dog walker I would be devastated if I was unable to walk down the Beach Road or use the car park. It is the reason I moved into the village. Dugeon have already put us through extensive disruption and we do not relish further upheaval to our small coastal village</p>	Y	<p>The beach road car park is not under consideration as a construction compound. Furthermore it is noted that, since the PEIR, a refined landfall location has been identified (western re-route around Kelling) and the area identified for landfall works has reduced. This was informed by a number of factors including community feedback in the area of Kelling and Weybourne, avoidance of the Kelling Heath SSSI/CWS and Holiday Park as well as engineering/technical considerations. Impacts associated with works at the landfall are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3).</p>



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>2</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Stephen Huntley	<b>EIA</b> - At the consultation meeting, I did not get the feeling that alternative sites had been adequately considered. When asked, the team merely said 'it cannot go there' without any proper explanation why not.	I	Further information pertaining to the alternative sites considered for the permanent infrastructure and route selection is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives.
John Walker, (SHOOT)	<b>Landfall Zone</b> - Weybourne and its vicinity has already had 2 cables causing disruption. If you cannot afford to go to the Power Station at Immingham. Why not come offshore nearer Norwich e.g. Bacton	I	Environmental Statement, volume 3, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives sets out the process of identifying a grid connection location.  The aim of the grid connection option appraisal was to identify the most economic and efficient design option for the connection of a project. Although both National Grid and Orsted input into the appraisal process (in respect to economic and strategic factors), the eventual grid connection offer is determined by National Grid. In May 2016, Hornsea Three was formally offered a grid connection at Norwich Main Substation as a result of this appraisal process.
John Walker, (SHOOT)	<b>Proposal</b> - Think the energy companies make lavish priorities of support for the local community (i.e. buying off opposition) you are not prepared to use a longer route under the sea (to Immingham) to save a bit of money	I	Environmental Statement, volume 3, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives sets out the process of identifying a grid connection location including the technical constraints to other connection and route options.  The aim of the grid connection option appraisal was to identify the most economic and efficient design option for the connection of a project. Although both National Grid and Orsted input into the appraisal process (in respect to economic and strategic factors), the eventual grid connection offer is determined by National Grid. In July 2016, Hornsea Three was formally offered a grid connection at Norwich Main Substation as a result of this appraisal process.
Hugh Guyatt	<b>Landfall Zone</b> - Why Weybourne yet again? We have recently had cables/piping and are only just recovering - Kelling is just as acceptable.	I	Further information pertaining to the landfall location and route selection is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives. Where possible, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts to local residential receptors, either through site selection/route refinement or through the identification of suitable mitigation measures. Where there are impacts to residential receptors, these are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3).
Hugh Guyatt	<b>Cable Corridor</b> - Cable corridor to the east of beach car park would go through cliffs, totally unacceptable. Corridor to the west hits Weybourne again, go for the purple Kelling corridor.	Y	The beach road car park is not under consideration as a construction compound. Furthermore it is noted that, since the PEIR, a refined landfall location has been identified (western re-route around Kelling) and the area identified for landfall works has reduced. This was informed by a number of factors including community feedback in the area of Kelling and Weybourne, avoidance of the Kelling Heath SSSI/CWS and Holiday Park as well as engineering/technical considerations.
Pat Floyd	<b>Offshore Array</b> - Weybourne is a small and central village in an AONB. The village may be reached by the Coast Road or Station Road. This however has an overhead railway bridge if approaching from Sheringham, too low for high vehicles and the latter is totally unsuitable for large vehicles due to the width in some places and the need to cram a Victorian railway bridge built originally for horses and carts. Weybourne has recently been the landfall sight for Dudgeon Wind Farm and has carried many problems with roads etc plus affecting the tourism industry on which this village relies. Weybourne has had enough and in danger of becoming a building site	I	Since the PEIR, a refined landfall location has been identified (western re-route around Kelling) and the area identified for landfall works has reduced. This was informed by a number of factors including community feedback in the area of Kelling and Weybourne, avoidance of the Kelling Heath SSSI/CWS and Holiday Park as well as engineering/technical considerations.  Impacts related to access are assessed within Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport, with principles for the traffic management measures outlined in the outline CTMP which forms part of the DCO application.  Impacts on the AONB are assessed within the relevant topic specific chapters, most notably Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources.
Pat Floyd	<b>Landfall Zone</b> - As on previous page, Weybourne has had enough. Please find somewhere else.	I	Further information pertaining to the landfall location and route selection is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives. Where possible, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts to local residential receptors, either through site selection/route refinement or through the identification of suitable mitigation measures. Where there are impacts to residential receptors, these are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3).



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>2</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Peter Youart	<b>PEIR Surveys</b> - Insufficient information on the Little Barningham booster station. Negligible noise information provided. Use of vague terminology e.g. 'appropriate measures'	I	Where there are impacts to sensitive receptors associated with the HVDC converter/HVAC substation and/or HVAC booster station, these are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3), for example noise during the operation of the permanent infrastructure is assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 8: Noise and Vibration, with mitigation measures also identified in this chapter where relevant.  In respect to construction, where properties are located in close proximity, the Project will ensure that sensitive construction management measures, such as noise, dust and traffic control are considered. These are documented in an outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), which accompanies the DCO application.
Ray Bennett	<b>Proposal</b> - I prefer them at sea as long as where they come onshore the infrastructure is done sympathetically into the national grid	I	Noted. Both offshore and onshore HVAC boosters remain in the project envelope.
Matthew Martin	<b>Onshore Cable Corridor</b> - Given the proposed location of the HVDC Converter/HVAC substation it makes every sense to locate the corridor next to the Norwich southern by-pass and not swing it out to the South	I	Information pertaining to the routing of the onshore cable corridor is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives. This includes information on the constraints that must be considered when designing the route for onshore cables.
Matthew Martin	<b>HVAC</b> - This should be as low as possible so as to be as inobtrusive as possible in what is a largely rural area. Measures should be put in place to keep noise levels as low as possible	I	The dimensions of the HVDC converter/HVAC substation is set out in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description. The maximum height would be up to 25 m.  Where there are impacts to sensitive receptors associated with the HVDC converter/HVAC substation and/or HVAC booster station, these are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3), for example noise during the operation of the permanent infrastructure is assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 8: Noise and Vibration, with mitigation measures also identified in this chapter where relevant.  Appropriate mitigation measures for visual disturbance are outlined in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources. This includes, for example, the restoration of habitats (including hedgerows) which cannot be avoided and landscape planting around the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.
George Francis - Swardston Village Hall	<b>HVAC</b> - Site B does not seem to be substantially more advantageous than Site A, but I could not argue that it was significantly less advantageous	I	Hornsea Three has taken forward the HVDC converter/HVAC substation option located at Little Barningham (Site B) based on a review of a range of factors including technical and engineering constraints. Further information on site selection is set out in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives.
Valerie Stubbs	<b>Onshore Cable</b> - In Weybourne the route to the east of the village goes very close to a lot of homes. Pink-footed geese graze on the fields in that area. Many of the properties in the village are holiday lets, which will be very sensitive to noise disturbance (and other disruption). The peak holiday season is May to the end of September, but runs April to the end of October.	I	Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts to local residential receptors, either through site selection/route refinement or through the identification of suitable mitigation measures. Where there are impacts to residential receptors, these are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3). Impacts on socio-economics and tourism in particular is assessed within Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 10: Socio-Economics.  Environmental Statement, volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation considers potential impacts on ecological receptors as a result of Hornsea Three. This includes potential impacts on species such as Pink-footed Geese.
John Evans	<b>Onshore Cable</b> - As a resident of High Kelling living in Pineheath Road north side, I am concerned that the cable(s) (new to me - 6 cables) route is close to several properties. I would be much happier if the route were moved further away from Warren Farm and closer to Squirrel Wood Farm, and thus unable to kink to be straightened, so that the cable can be laid further away from Pineheath Road. NB we already have overhead power cables running 2 metres from our properties on that north side. Also our trees have TPOs and I would not wish any trees to be destroyed by trenching	I	Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts to local residential receptors, either through site selection/route refinement or through the identification of suitable mitigation measures. Where there are impacts to residential receptors, these are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3).  Impacts from Hornsea Three on ecological features, including hedgerows and trees (including woodlands) has been avoided where possible through commitments to use trenchless technologies such as Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD). We recognise that protection and sensitive restoration of hedgerows and trees is important to minimise any negative impact on biodiversity or landscape.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>2</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
John Evans	<b>80m Refinement</b> - Yes, please take into account point 8 above and select a route on the north side of the pathway shown in map top right opposite.	I	Information relating to cable corridor routing is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives. Cable corridor routing was informed by a number of factors including technical and environmental constraints.
John Evans	<b>Proposal</b> - Overall, I am in agreement, but the proposed route could be too close to Pineheath Road	I	Noted, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts to local residential receptors, either through site selection/route refinement or through the identification of suitable mitigation measures. Where there are impacts to residential receptors, these are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3)
Christine Walton	<b>PEIR Surveys</b> - You do not have any idea of the impact of this, otherwise you would not be considering doing it. I love Norfolk and do not want to built on. As I have mentioned before once our countryside and its birds/animals/wildlife/woodland are gone - they cannot be replaced. Please consider looking at the sheer amount of other building projects in this area. What do you think the impact of all of these if they all great passed will be? We are in grave danger of losing something really precious which is irreplaceable.	I	We recognise that protection and sensitive restoration of hedgerows and trees is important to minimise any negative impact on biodiversity or landscape. Therefore Hornsea Three has avoided sensitive ecological receptors (e.g. hedgerows/trees) where possible through commitments to use trenchless technologies such as Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD).  Where this has not been possible, impacts on ecological receptors are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3; Ecology and Nature Conservation.
Christine Walton	<b>Baseline Information</b> - My opinion is that its all very technical and doesn't look as the real value of what is there already. As there are already two Hornsea projects 'on the go' and there are many other ways of getting energy I do not think this Project Three is necessary. We will lose far more than we would gain by having it and I do not think that future generations will thank us.	I	Impacts associated with Hornsea Three are assessed within the Environmental Statement (volume 2 and 3). Further information on Hornsea Three's relationship with other Hornsea projects is discussed in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 1: Introduction.
Christine Walton	<b>80m Refinement</b> - Try and be joined up in your thinking! East Anglia is being built on willy nilly. This building project seems to go against the wishes of the people who live there	I	Cumulative impacts are assessed within the relevant topic chapter of the Environmental Statement (volume 3).
G. Dansey-Smith	<b>Substation</b> - Siting the HVDC converter and HVAC substation on the proposed site south of A47 and north of Swardeston will pose difficulties with its position and construction. The building will be an absolute eyesore if it is not bunkered to a large extent. It will be difficult to access with large heavy items, such as turbines on large vehicles. The B1113 is totally unsuitable due to its width and tight bends. The only access point by road could be the access road off the A140 to the A47 in a westerly direction. The road could then run parallel to the A47 to the site	I	Impacts relating to access are addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport. It is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this forms part of the DCO application.
Sue Lowther	<b>Landfall Zone</b> - Why can the landfall zone not be located to the east or west of Weybourne so that Weybourne residents are less affected	Y	Environmental Statement, volume 3, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives sets out the process of identifying a grid connection location and landfall. The choice of landfall was informed by, amongst others, technical and environmental factors.  It is noted that, since the PEIR, a refined landfall location has been identified (western re-route around Kelling) and the area identified for landfall works has reduced. This was informed by a number of factors including community feedback in the area of Kelling and Weybourne, avoidance of the Kelling Heath SSSI/CWS and Holiday Park as well as engineering/technical considerations.
Sue Lowther	<b>Onshore Cable</b> - I believe any effort must be made to preserve our heritage, i.e. not to disturb old buildings and monuments, as well as old trees and hedges. Residential areas should be avoided	I	Hornsea Three has sought to avoid residential areas, as well as sensitive historic receptors through site selection and cable routing, this has included scheduled monuments, listed buildings, registered park and gardens etc. Hornsea Three has also committed to the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts on local road networks, ecological receptors (e.g. trees, hedgerows) and hydrological features (e.g. main rivers).
Sue Lowther	<b>80m Refinement</b> - I am concerned for the residents along his corridor. They should be fully taken into account and receive compensation. Again, old trees, hedges, woodland, monuments etc.	I	Hornsea Three has sought to avoid residential areas, as well as sensitive historic receptors through site selection and cable routing, this has included scheduled monuments, listed buildings, registered park and gardens etc. Hornsea Three has also committed to the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts on local road networks, ecological receptors (e.g. trees, hedgerows) and hydrological features (e.g. main rivers).  Compensation is paid for the freehold depreciation of the land directly affected by the easement and for all reasonable and substantiated losses arising from construction of the project.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>2</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Sue Lowther	<b>HVAC</b> - Why can this booster station not be located next to the national grid station (where there are no residents) to reduce the impact on Mangreen as a whole. Or locate it in the fields that are being evacuated at the moment. Why do residents of Mangreen need to be surrounded by electricity stations?	I	Information pertaining to the site selection for the HVDC converter/HVAC substation station is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives, whilst maximum dimensions are provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description.  Through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive ecological receptors. Additional mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project are outlined in topic specific chapters, and include the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts on local road networks, ecological receptors (e.g. hedgerows) and hydrological features (e.g. main rivers); and landscape planting around the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.
Neil Buxton	<b>Export Cable</b> - Why does the cable have to come ashore at Weybourne? At the consultation there was detail of a number of other options along the Norfolk coast and in Lincolnshire. When questioned some of the team on duty at the Weybourne consultation were not able to give any credible answers apart from saying it was the cheapest options	I	Environmental Statement, volume 3, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives sets out the process of identifying a grid connection location and associated landfall locations.  The aim of the grid connection option appraisal was to identify the most economic and efficient design option for the connection of a project. Although both National Grid and Orsted input into the appraisal process (in respect to economic and strategic factors), the eventual grid connection offer is determined by National Grid. In May 2016, Hornsea Three was formally offered a grid connection at Norwich Main Substation as a result of this appraisal process.  The grid connection point informed the landfall location, as well as a suite of other considerations including technical feasibility and environmental constraints.
Neil Buxton	<b>Onshore Cable</b> - Your proposals are vague in the Weybourne/Norfolk zone.	I	Further clarification on the landfall is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description.
Neil Buxton	<b>HVAC</b> - More ugly buildings in the countryside	I	Appropriate mitigation measures for visual disturbance are outlined in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources. This includes, for example, the restoration of habitats (including hedgerows) which cannot be avoided and landscape planting around the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.
John Mangan	<b>Onshore Cable</b> - Yes, the proximity of the corridor to the properties on Pineheath Road in High Kelling - and Warren Farm. The impact on Bodham Wood as the corridor runs beneath/through it	Y	In respect to Pineheath Road, the onshore cable corridor passes to the north. Given the proximity of residential properties, Hornsea Three will ensure that sensitive construction management measures, such as noise, dust and traffic control are applied where appropriate. These are documented in an outline CoCP, which forms part of the DCO application.  Hornsea Three has committed to cross Bodham Wood using HDD, this is shown on the plans which accompany the DCO application.
John Mangan	<b>80m Refinement</b> - Please bias it away from Pineheath Road in High kelling and away from Warren Farm	I	In respect to Pineheath Road, the onshore cable corridor passes to the north. Given the proximity of residential properties, Hornsea Three will ensure that sensitive construction management measures, such as noise, dust and traffic control are applied where appropriate. These are documented in an outline CoCP, which forms part of the DCO application.
Louisa Peaver	<b>HVAC</b> - The size of the propoed Booster Station is enormous. It will be in the middle of a very rural area, of which residents are rightly proud. This project will result in a significant, permanent impact on my local environment as a result of the booster station - you are industrialising our countryside. A brownfield site would be far more preferable. Holt industrial estate is currently up for sale, as is a nextdoor field. I appreciate underground existing utilities would be challenging. The necessary noise insulation/mitigation expesnive and local access disruption during construction significant but it would not be impossible and would put our countrysides protection rightfully at the top of your priorities	I	Information pertaining to the site selection for the HVAC booster station is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives.  Through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive ecological receptors. For example, the orientation of the HVAC booster station has been optimised to minimise impacts on nearby field boundaries (hedgerows and trees) as well as maximise natural screening. Additional mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project are outlined in topic specific chapters, and include the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts on local road networks, ecological receptors (e.g. hedgerows) and hydrological features (e.g. main rivers).

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>2</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Merlyn Bibb	<b>Onshore Cable</b> - The corridor during construction is much wider than we originally thought (3 cables rather than 1). The original proposal took it across afield at the back of our house, potentially immediately adjacent to our face but preferably some distance away. The latter would have minimal impact on current residents. See location of our property on opposite page. Our garden hedge forms a boundary on one side of your initially proposed corridor?	I	Hornsea Three has sought to minimise direct impacts on sensitive receptors by reducing the onshore cable corridor from 200 m to approximately 80 m. A number of factors have fed into this refinement process, including technical and environmental, as summarised in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives.  The project parameters, including the number of cable circuits is set out in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description. There would be up to a maximum of six cable circuits, in six trenches.
Merlyn Bibb	<b>80m Refinement</b> - The alternative route being considered would place the corridor immediately adjacent to two of our neighbours properties and probably closer to ours, and would impact considerably on all three residences. Why is this alternative and likely more disruptive route being considered? What is the problem with the originally proposed (orange) corridor?	I	Information relating to the routing of the onshore cable corridor is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives. The routing was informed by a number of factors including, community feedback, technical constraints and environmental constraints.
Merlyn Bibb	<b>Proposal</b> - Overall, I strongly support the concept but I am concerned about the precise location of the cable with respect to our property and seek clarification. Hence my rating of 'support' above.	I	Where possible and practicable the cable corridor route selected seeks to avoid passing adjacent to properties. However, it is not possible to avoid passing in close proximity to all properties on the route. Where properties are located in close proximity, the Project will ensure that sensitive construction management measures, such as noise, dust and traffic control are considered. These are documented in an outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), which accompanies the DCO application.
Merlyn Bibb	<b>Information</b> - Please respond to my question about the proposed alternative route around my property	N	Noted, responses are provided to the individual points above.
Sarah Griggs-Smith	<b>Substation</b> - This is in the field directly opposite my house. Why cannot this be next to the Main Grid on a field just to the south of it. No uses there. Concerns about links to the Main Grid - electric magnetic field. Please ensure tree planting prior to the building. Noise - views ruined. House value slashed. Unable to move/se;; - compensation? Access and water supplies to Mangreen? Need to know level of disruption/noise/safety. Cables (80m?) as far from house as possible e.g. in the next field - put substation next to the main grid. Ancient hedges 400 years old. Sink substation under ground level. Embankment around it to reduce view/noise	I	Hornsea Three has sought to avoid residential areas, as well as sensitive historic receptors through site selection and cable routing, this has included scheduled monuments, listed buildings, registered park and gardens etc. Hornsea Three has also committed to the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts on local road networks, ecological receptors (e.g. trees, hedgerows) and hydrological features (e.g. main rivers).  Compensation is paid for the freehold depreciation of the land directly affected by the easement and for all reasonable and substantiated losses arising from construction of the project.  Impacts related to access, noise, disruption and hedgerows are all assessed in topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3).
Sarah Griggs-Smith	<b>PEIR Construction Methods</b> - Safety of underground cables from substation to main grid. Why not put the substation next to the main grid? Without need for cables next to homes. Why not put substation on the existing gravel pit area?	I	Information pertaining to the site selection for the HVDC converter/HVAC substation is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives, whilst maximum dimensions are provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description.
Sarah Griggs-Smith	<b>Proposal</b> - I support wind power but would like as much as possible to mitigate the negative effects this will have on my home of 35 years. Please consider putting the substation nearer to mains - not in the field behind my garden. My house will definitely not be sellable and will lose a lot of value. Please can we arrange a face to face meeting with Mangreen residents/ Embankment around the site would be very important	I	Information pertaining to the site selection for the HVDC converter/HVAC substation is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives. The site selection process was informed by a number of factors including community feedback, technical constraints and environmental constraints.  Through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts from the HVDC converter/HVAC substation. For example, Hornsea Three has proposed landscape planting around the HVDC converter/HVAC substation to provide additional natural screening to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.
Karen Saunders	<b>Proposal</b> - The proposed hvac station at Little Barningham is too close to domestic property, there are much less populated areas close by which should be considered.	I	Information pertaining to the site selection for the HVDC converter/HVAC substation is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives.  Where there are impacts to residential receptors, these are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3), for example noise during the operation of the HVDC converter/HVAC substation is addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 8: Noise and Vibration.



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>2</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Brian Donovan	<b>Landfall</b> - Weybourne already has suffered much disruption because of telephone cables, Sheringham Shoal and Dudgeon cables. Please only land the sea cables the way Dudgeon did it, by drilling down from the land behind the beach and staying under the ground until they surface some 800m out to sea.	I	Since the PEIR, a refined landfall location has been identified (western re-route around Kelling) and the area identified for landfall works has reduced. This was informed by a number of factors including community feedback in the area of Kelling and Weybourne, avoidance of the Kelling Heath SSSI/CWS and Holiday Park as well as engineering/technical considerations. The construction methodologies considered at landfall are outlined in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description, on this basis the EIA therefore conducts the assessments based on a realistic worst-case scenario, which could be either HDD or open cut technology depending on the receptor.
John Humberstone	<b>80m Refinement</b> - Yes, continue to avoid the 'built up' area	I	Noted, Hornsea Three has sought to avoid sensitive receptors, including residential receptors through the site selection and route refinement process. This is detailed in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives.
John Humberstone	<b>EIA</b> - Seems the route runs from countryside and therefore needs to demolish any type of building	I	The onshore cable route runs primarily through agricultural land. The final route that has been selected does not require any buildings to be demolished.
John Humberstone	<b>Information</b> - Advise any proposed changed to route - at the moment of course the footpath at the top of High Kelling away from human habitation	I	Information relating to onshore cable corridor route refinement is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives. Impacts on PRoW are specifically assessed within Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 6: Land Use and Recreation.
Simon Clarke	<b>Strongly Oppose</b> - The entire proposal is only feasible due to government subsidies. I do not consider wind energy to be an efficient means of supplying energy and whatever the concerns raised by local residents, these consultations are merely an exercise in lip service. If the project is given the go ahead, Weybourne has already been chosen as the onshore connection point.	N	This comment is noted. Details on the requirements for consultation and how the project has adhered to and ensured that consultation is considered is detailed in the Consultation Report that is submitted with this application for Development Consent. The need for renewable energy is defined through government policy and further information on this can be found in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 2: Policy and Legislation.
Simon Willcox	I would like to know why the cable cannot landfall at Great Yarmouth rather than Weybourne? This would avoid the controversial cable route proposed through picturesque and valuable North Norfolk countryside. Why Weybourne and not Great Yarmouth or Kings Lynn? Why scar and wonderful area of countryside when a route from Great Yarmouth to Norwich would have a much reduced impact	I	Further information pertaining to the landfall location and route selection is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives. Where possible, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts to local receptors, either through site selection/route refinement or through the identification of suitable mitigation measures. In this regard, since the PEIR, a refined route at landfall has been identified (western re-route around Kelling) and the area identified for landfall works has reduced. This was informed by a number of factors including community feedback in the area of Kelling and Weybourne, avoidance of the Kelling Heath SSSI/CWS and Holiday Park as well as engineering/technical considerations. Where there are impacts to sensitive receptors from the landfall works, these are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3).
Simon Willcox	The landfall at Weybourne and the immediate route to the South cuts across a unique landscape which despite promised to rectify the damage will never be replaced or rectified	I	Further information pertaining to the landfall location and route selection is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives. Where possible, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts to local receptors, either through site selection/route refinement or through the identification of suitable mitigation measures. In this regard, since the PEIR, a refined route at landfall has been identified (western re-route around Kelling) and the area identified for landfall works has reduced. This was informed by a number of factors including community feedback in the area of Kelling and Weybourne, avoidance of the Kelling Heath SSSI/CWS and Holiday Park as well as engineering/technical considerations. Where there are impacts to sensitive receptors from the landfall works, these are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3). The Outline Ecological Management Plan that forms part of the application for Development Consent details the project commitments to ensure restoration of habitats affected by the construction of the onshore cables.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>2</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Simon Willcox	The proposed corridor cuts through some of the most picturesque and unspoilt countryside of North Norfolk. The corridor and proposed sub-station will affect adversely this landscape forever	I	Where possible, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts from the onshore cable corridor and permanent infrastructure to local receptors, either through site selection/route refinement or through the identification of suitable mitigation measures. Mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project are outlined in topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3), and include the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts on local road networks, ecological receptors (e.g. hedgerows) and hydrological features (e.g. main rivers).  Where there are impacts to sensitive receptors, these are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3). It is also noted that prior to construction commencing a Schedule of Condition of the land will be taken and we have an obligation to return the land in the same state. In this regard, any hedgerows which cannot be avoided will be replaced at the end of the construction phase. Furthermore, restoration of hedgerows, currently in poor condition, provides an opportunity to achieve long term benefits for the biodiversity associated with this habitat type as well as gap up hedgerows providing landscape and visual mitigation. Further details on hedgerow removal, retention and replacement can be found in volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation, the Outline Ecological Management Plan and the Outline Landscape Management Plan.
Simon Willcox	Please reconsider the proposal or landfall and Weybourne and consider other sites which will have a reduced impact on North Norfolk	I	Further information pertaining to the landfall location and route selection is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives. Where possible, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts to local receptors, either through site selection/route refinement or through the identification of suitable mitigation measures. In this regard, since the PEIR, a refined route at landfall has been identified (western re-route around Kelling) and the area identified for landfall works has reduced. This was informed by a number of factors including community feedback in the area of Kelling and Weybourne, avoidance of the Kelling Heath SSSI/CWS and Holiday Park as well as engineering/technical considerations. Where there are impacts to sensitive receptors from the landfall works, these are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3), with additional mitigation measures identified where required.
Simon Willcox	<b>HVAC Booster Station</b> - Its proposed site will spoil forever a greenfield site in a special part of North Norfolk. The site covers a large area and will have buildings of up to 15m (50 feet) high. This is something that cannot be hidden by 'careful landscaping' and will spoil a very picturesque part of the countryside	I	Information pertaining to the site selection for the HVAC booster station is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives, whilst maximum dimensions are provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description.  Through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive ecological receptors. For example, the orientation of the HVAC booster station has been optimised to minimise impacts on nearby field boundaries (hedgerows and trees) as well as maximise natural screening. Additional mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project are outlined in topic specific chapters, and include the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts on local road networks, ecological receptors (e.g. hedgerows) and hydrological features (e.g. main rivers); and landscape planting around the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.
Simon Willcox	<b>Onshore substation</b> - As above. Above my bedroom window I can see overhead electricity cables criss crossing the fields outside my house carrying electricity from South to North. Indeed your proposed cable corridor will be parallel to these overhead lines. This indicates a complete lack of coordination between yourselves and other villages	I	The need to minimise potential landscape and visual impacts arising from Hornsea Three was identified early in the design process, and led to a commitment by Hornsea Three to bury all onshore export cables (as opposed to using overhead lines), see Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives. Although the presence of existing structures and infrastructure was taken into consideration during the site selection and routing process, the need to cross existing infrastructure could not be avoided given the linear nature of Hornsea Three.  In respect to potential landscape and visual impacts, Hornsea Three has sought to avoid landscape features (including trees and hedgerows) through cable routing or the use of trenchless technologies. Where impacts cannot be avoided, appropriate mitigation measures for visual disturbance are outlined in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>2</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Simon Willcox	<b>Construction sites</b> - Your current proposed site at Edgefield will intrude on a 'greenfield' site in an AONB. The size, height and consequential associated development are completely unsuited for this unspoilt part of North Norfolk country side.	Y	Hornsea Three will not be taking forward the Edgefield site, with the onshore HVAC booster located close to Little Barningham (as shown in the plans which accompany the DCO). Information pertaining to the site selection for the HVAC booster station is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives.
Simon Willcox	<b>Further develop mitigation measures</b> - I would suggest that the current route from Weybourne to Norwich is abandoned. In its place take the subsea cable to Great Yarmouth and join it to the National Grid there.	I	Environmental Statement, volume 3, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives sets out the process of identifying a grid connection location.  The aim of the grid connection option appraisal was to identify the most economic and efficient design option for the connection of a project. Although both National Grid and Orsted input into the appraisal process (in respect to economic and strategic factors), the eventual grid connection offer is determined by National Grid. In May 2016, Hornsea Three was formally offered a grid connection at Norwich Main Substation as a result of this appraisal process.  This then informed the landfall location and route selection, for which information is also provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives.
Simon Willcox	<b>Strongly Oppose</b> - Your proposals are unwanted and unnecessary. The potential longer - and shorter - consequences of your proposed onshore cable corridor will have catastrophic consequences on an unspoilt and treasured landscape. The consequential loss of trees, hedgerow, wildlife habitat disturbance will not outweigh the benefits of offshore wind energy	N	The short term and long term potential impacts of Hornsea Three are assessed within the Environmental Statement, volume 2 and 3. In respect to potential landscape and visual impacts, Hornsea Three has sought to avoid landscape features (including trees and hedgerows) through cable routing or the use of trenchless technologies. Where impacts cannot be avoided, appropriate mitigation measures for visual disturbance are outlined in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources. For example, any hedgerows which cannot be avoided will be replaced at the end of the construction phase. Furthermore, restoration of hedgerows, currently in poor condition, provides an opportunity to achieve long term benefits for the biodiversity associated with this habitat type as well as gap up hedgerows providing landscape and visual mitigation. Further details on hedgerow removal, retention and replacement can be found in volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation, the Outline Ecological Management Plan and the Outline Landscape Management Plan.  At the HVAC booster station and HVDC converter/HVAC substation, landscape planting is also proposed to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.
Simon Willcox	Reconsider the route of the onshore cable to come onshore at Kings Lynn or Great Yarmouth	I	Further information pertaining to the landfall location and route selection is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives. Where possible, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts to local residential receptors, either through site selection/route refinement or through the identification of suitable mitigation measures. In this regard, since the PEIR, a refined route at landfall has been identified (western re-route around Kelling) and the area identified for landfall works has reduced. This was informed by a number of factors including community feedback in the area of Kelling and Weybourne, avoidance of the Kelling Heath SSSI/CWS and Holiday Park as well as engineering/technical considerations. Where there are impacts to residential receptors, these are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3).
Graham & Susan Mette	<b>Landfall</b> - The flood does not only affect the car park, it affects up to Watermill Cottage, beyond The Rocket House. But also concerned of Beach Lane is to be used for any transportation, as it is really only a single-lane track.	Y	Following design refinement, the area identified for landfall works has reduced and the beach lane car park is not under consideration as a construction compound. Further details on the proposed landfall, including access are set out in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description and volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>2</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Graham & Susan Mette	<b>Landfall - Yes</b> - The Rocket House is located immediately prior to the Beach Lane, Weybourne car park. A proposed site for a works compound for up to 11 years! The car park area has been vulnerable shingle bank which has been breached twice in the last few years and flooded our garden. Very concerned about the activity and the effect it might have on the bank.	Y	Following design refinement, the area identified for landfall works has reduced and the beach lane car park is not under consideration as a construction compound. Further details on the proposed landfall, including access are set out in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description and volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport.  Appropriate mitigation measures have been designed-in to Hornsea Three to minimise impacts on drainage and flooding. Details are provided in volume 3, chapter 2: Hydrology and Flood Risk (see Table 2.17) as well as the outline CoCP which forms part of the DCO application. A flood risk assessment is also provided in Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 2.1: Onshore Infrastructure FRAs and identifies historic flooding events relevant to Hornsea Three. This has been developed in accordance with the NPS, NPPF, PPG ID7 and the SuDS Manual. The Flood Risk Assessment which has been undertaken for the Project concludes that Hornsea Three meets the requirements of NPS EN-1 and the NPPF.
Tina Hayward	<b>Onshore cable corridor</b> - I live right on the edge of northern end of the orange route where it passes through Heydon and I think the western (pink) alternative would be much more suitable affecting less properties and less mature trees	Y	Hornsea Three has taken forward the western route, as shown in the plans which accompany the DCO application. The justification for this decision is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives and its accompanying annexes.
Tina Hayward	<b>HVAC Booster Station</b> - I understand if you used a certain type of transmission you will need a booster station at Little Barningham. Surely it is better for everyone involved to use the other type of transmission. A booster station will take a significant piece of precious farmland and be a blot on the landscape forever.	I	As noted in previous comments, there is a certain level of confidence in the UK wind industry that HVDC technology will become more mature before Hornsea Project Three will connect, but there is currently no certainty. Therefore, committing to solely HVDC now could restrict or even prevent the development of the project in the future if we do not see the necessary developments in the market. We may well eventually choose to opt for HVDC transmission technology; however, it is considered that to only seek a consent (planning permission) for such a technology (and excluding HVAC) at this time could make the eventual Project unbuildable and/or unprofitable.  Due to current uncertainty, a decision on which transmission system to adopt will not be made until post consent after extensive engagement with potential systems suppliers has taken place. This will be informed by a feasibility study.  Information pertaining to the site selection for the HVAC booster station is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives, whilst maximum dimensions are provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description.  Through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive ecological receptors. For example, the orientation of the HVAC booster station has been optimised to minimise impacts on nearby field boundaries (hedgerows and trees) as well as maximise natural screening. Additional mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project are outlined in topic specific chapters, and include the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts on local road networks, ecological receptors (e.g. hedgerows) and hydrological features (e.g. main rivers); and landscape planting around the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.
<b>Section 48: Duty to publicise</b>			
No comments were received in response to the Public Notice relating to the Site Selection Process under Phase 2.A.			



Table 3.4: Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Further Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.B) relating to the Site Selection Process

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>3</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 42: Prescribed consultees (The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009: Schedule 1)</b>			
Estelle Hook, Norfolk Coast Partnership	Onshore We question the decision to come ashore at Weybourne, given the long onshore cable route required to connect to the National Grid. We also question why the previous route, of the Dudgeon cables or Hornsea One or Two, cannot be reused or other collaborative ways of working be investigated to minimise local disruption.	I	Further information pertaining to the landfall location and route selection is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives. Where possible, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts to local residential receptors, either through site selection/route refinement or through the identification of suitable mitigation measures. Where there are impacts to residential receptors, these are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3).
Ministry of Defence (MoD)	Having reviewed the proposed amendments I can confirm that MOD has no safeguarding concerns relating to the alternative locations identified.	N	Hornsea Three acknowledges that MOD has no safeguarding concerns relating to the alternative locations. No further action was required.
Instalcom Limited	Our Ref: 12170005 With reference to your enquiry regarding the above noted location, I can confirm that LEVEL 3, GLOBAL CROSSING (UK) LTD, GLOBAL CROSSING PEC, FIBERNET UK LTD and FIBRESPAN LTD networks <u><b>DO NOT</b></u> have any apparatus within the immediate proximity of your proposed works. Instalcom responds to plant enquiries for LEVEL 3, GLOBAL CROSSING (UK) LTD, GLOBAL CROSSING PEC, FIBERNET UK LTD and FIBRESPAN LTD simultaneously and therefore you only need send one copy of a plant enquiry to cover all of these companies. If you would like to query the location further, please email us accordingly and we can arrange an in depth survey, which will be charged at a cost. As we are moving towards a fully electronic database we urge our customers to request plant enquiries by email which will result in a higher level of service, please forward future plant enquiries to plantenquiries( @ )instalcom.co.uk	N/A	The response from Instalcom confirming that no assets were impacted by the Hornsea Three project was noted and the new contact details were updated accordingly. No further action was required.
CPRE Norfolk	We attach the CPRE Norfolk response to the further documentation. We make some comments on the onshore changes, and do with reference to the maps provided. To make these clearer, we attach the Spring and Autumn editions of the RGCG Newsletter, which refer to two recently restored farmland ponds, and their location, under the heading of Map 2 again. Reference: 1078116-s201721-1758282	N	Noted, responses provided to individual comments.
Southern Gas Networks	SGN is responsible for managing the network that distributes natural, and green, gas to homes and businesses across Scotland and the south of England. Illustrative plans, which show the geographic extent of the network managed by SGN, are enclosed with this letter. You should note that SGN's network does not extend into that area affected by the Wind Farm, that being the area located off the Norfolk and Yorkshire Coast.	N/A	Hornsea Three acknowledged SNG's response and the company was removed from the distribution list.
Southern Gas Networks	For avoidance of doubt SNG maintains that the Wind Farm will not interact with its gas network. As such, Hornsea does not need to consult with SGN in respect of its plans, development and/or construction for, and of the wind farm.	N/A	Hornsea Three acknowledged SNG's response and the company was removed from the distribution list.
Premier Transmission	Your enquiry doesn't encroach on the Premier Transmission Pipeline System (PTPS). However, should you require any further information or safety advice in respect of the PTPS, i.e. for any future works, please do not hesitate to contact us by email or phone (028 9043 7580).	N/A	Hornsea Three acknowledges that Premier Transmission assets are not affected by the potential offshore alternative routes. No further action required.
Phillips 66 Limited	Please note Phillips 66 Limited have no land interests in the area affected by this proposal. Please therefore remove us from the consultation process.	N/A	Phillips 66 was noted and it was subsequently removed from the distribution list.
NATS	NATS acknowledges receipt of the consultation regarding changes to the scheme. With regards to the cable corridors, NATS will review the detailed proposals when final locations are known. However, from the Overview plan received, NATS anticipates no impact from any structure/route within the currently defined area.	N	Hornsea Three acknowledges that NATS anticipates no impact regarding changes to the Hornsea Three offshore cable corridor from the potential offshore alternative routes. No further action was required.

<sup>3</sup> Y = Yes change made; N = No change made; I = Incorporated into or considered when producing the assessment or landowner voluntary agreement offer; N/A = Not applicable

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>3</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
High Kelling Parish Council	<p>I have noted from your latest consultation stuff the proposed additional access route from Bridge Road, High Kelling across the field track, along part of Warren Road, etc. My concern is about the use of Bridge Road, the field road and Warren Road for access. There are already a lot of people concerned about the railway bridge. I am sure that allowing a number of large vehicles to use the bridge will only cause even more problems. Access to Bridge Road from the A148: I think this would need to be looked into professionally by the Highways people. The A148 junction is probably not suitable for large vehicles turning into Bridge Road – and the junction with the field road even more so. I am sure the residents of privately maintained Warren Road will be out in force at the mere thought of the use of Warren Road!</p>	I	<p>Hornsea Three will utilise the northern section of Warren Road, however in developing the access strategy we have sought to avoid the nearby residential receptors through the use of a unnamed street to the north-west which links Bridge Road to the northern section of Warren Road. The comments associated with Bridge Road have been taken into consideration and associated impacts addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport.</p> <p>It is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this forms part of the DCO application.</p>
Energy Assets	<p>With regards to your request for details of existing services, we can confirm that based on the details provided to us, we have no buried plant or equipment in the identified area.</p>	N/A	<p>Hornsea Three acknowledged Energy Assets' response, no further action was required</p>
Gamma	<p>Having examined our records, I can confirm that Gamma has no owned apparatus within the search area of your proposed Works. All future enquiries can be done via the FREE to use LinesearchbeforeUdig service. To access the LinesearchbeforeUdig service please go to <a href="http://www.linesearchbeforeudig.co.uk">www.linesearchbeforeudig.co.uk</a> We have changed our Plant Protection process and have become a member of the LinesearchbeforeUdig service, this means that you will be able to place an enquiry via the FREE LinesearchbeforeUdig service which will then qualify if Gamma have assets at your proposed work site. If your proposed site DOES affect our assets we will then respond directly to you with our plans and information. If your proposed site DOES NOT affect our assets you will be notified immediately on screen and you will receive a confirmation email from LinesearchbeforeUdig.</p>	N/A	<p>Hornsea Three acknowledged Gamma's response, no further action was required</p>
Gas Networks Ireland (UK)	<p>I just wish to confirm with you as per my earlier email below that Gas Networks Ireland (UK) are not impacted by your works. Can you please remove us from further consultation on this project?</p>	N/A	<p>Gas Networks Ireland's response was noted by Hornsea Three and it was subsequently removed from the distribution list</p>
ESP Utilities Group Ltd	<p>I can confirm that ESP Gas Group Ltd has no gas or electricity apparatus in the vicinity of this site address and will not be affected by your proposed works. ESP are continually laying new gas and electricity networks and this notification is valid for 90 days from the date of this letter. If your proposed works start after this period of time, please re-submit your enquiry. <b>Important Notice</b> Please be advised that any enquiries for ESP Connections Ltd, formerly known as British Gas Connections Ltd, should be sent directly to us at the address shown above or alternatively you can email us at: <a href="mailto:PlantResponses@espipelines.com">PlantResponses( @ )espipelines.com</a></p>	N/A	<p>ESP Utilities Group Ltd's response was noted, no further action was required</p>
Colt Technology Services	<p>Please Note: Our search criteria has changed. We previously searched for Colt Network which was within 200 metres, this has now changed to 50 metres. The negative response will be for all enquiries that the network is 50 metres or more away from the place of enquiry.  We can confirm that Colt Technology Services do not have apparatus near the above location as presented on your submitted plan, if any development or scheme amendments fall outside the 50 metre perimeter new plans must be submitted for review.  Search is based on Overseeing Organisation Agent data supplied; we do not accept responsibility for O.O. Agent inaccurate data.</p>	N/A	<p>Colt Technology Services' response was noted, no further action was required</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>3</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Natural England	<p><b>Offshore cable corridor</b></p> <p>The current consultation presents two potential re-route options for the offshore cable corridor search area. Natural England has the following comments:</p> <p>Seaward potential re-route</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- We support the proposed re-route in the seaward part of the corridor (closest to the array). The proposed alternative would reduce the direct impact to the North Norfolk Sandbanks and Saturn Reef (NNSSR) SAC due to the cable laying activities. It is our view that impacts to designated sites should be avoided and while the re-route does not take the cable fully outside the NNSSR SAC, it has a potential to minimise the overall impact to the site.</li> <li>- We also note that the site-specific benthic sampling was carried out for the proposed re-route as part of the project benthic sampling programme. It is our view that there is sufficient data to adequately characterise the baseline for that area.</li> </ul>	Y	<p>The seaward re-route has been taken forwards for the final application for Development Consent. Details of the Hornsea Three offshore cable corridor reroute in the offshore area are outlined in paragraph 2.6.1.4 of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology. All impacts, where relevant, on designated features of the North Norfolk Sandbanks and Saturn Reef SAC are assessed in section 2.11 of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology. Conclusions on the effects of Hornsea Three on the conservation objectives of the North Norfolk Sandbanks and Saturn Reef SAC are presented in full within the RIAA for Hornsea Three.</p> <p>The baseline characterisation of benthic habitats and species in the offshore cable corridor, including those within designated sites, is presented in section 2.7.1 of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology.</p>
Natural England	<p>Near-shore potential re-route</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Natural England is pleased to note that Orsted is considering an alternative route in the near-shore area, which has the potential to avoid most of the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ. However, the proposed re-route has a larger footprint within The Wash and Norfolk Norfolk Coast SAC. We note that the Environmental Statement should include detailed consideration of the potential impacts on the SAC.</li> <li>- We note that no site-specific data collection has been done or is proposed for the section of the re-route that deviates from the original cable corridor. The consultation document provides a list of evidence sources available for characterisation of the baseline benthic environment. Natural England provided comments in the Evidence Plan meeting on 4 December 2017, where we specified that we have low confidence in the outputs of Sheringham Shoal and Dudgeon OWFs benthic surveys and have not signed off their survey reports. The data from the OWFs and other surveys was collected in 2006-2013 and may not necessarily represent the most up to date picture of the benthic habitats in the area. We therefore advise Hornsea Three to treat these data with caution and provide a detailed confidence assessment of the evidence sources used for the baseline characterisation of the re-route. Natural England recommends that Hornsea Three project specific data is used as the main source of evidence where possible.</li> </ul> <p>As discussed with Orsted on 4 December 2017, Natural England would be keen to review a 'side by side' comparison of the habitats along each route and potential impacts, their magnitude and proposed mitigation for the two near-shore route options prior to the formal application submission. The information provided should include careful consideration of the pre-construction preparation activities that may be required, different cable installation methods and their feasibility, confidence in achieving the optimum cable burial depth, potential need for cable protection and sensitivity and recoverability of the benthic features along the two routes.</p>	I	<p>Details of the Hornsea Three offshore cable corridor reroute in the nearshore area are outlined in paragraph 2.6.1.4 of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology. All impacts, where relevant, on designated features of The Wash and North Norfolk Coast SAC and the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ are assessed in section 2.11 of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology.</p> <p>With respect to the data used to characterise the baseline in the nearshore area, it was agreed with the Benthic and Fish Ecology and Marine Processes Expert Working Group (EWG) at the meeting on 4 December 2017 that the nearshore area, including the re-route (i.e. in the vicinity of the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ), is characterised by a combination of site specific and desktop data sources. These are fully discussed in volume 5, annex 2.1: Benthic Ecology Technical Report and summarised in section 2.7.1 of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology.</p> <p>Natural England's concerns on the use of the Sheringham Shoal and Dudgeon OWFs data are assumed to relate to the design of these surveys and aims of the monitoring, as opposed to sampling technique and laboratory analyses. The data have been used to inform the Hornsea Three characterisation (i.e. identification of biotopes based on grab sample data collected and analyses by a participating member of the NMBACQ), therefore it is considered such concerns should be allayed. The use of these data in combination with a range of other datasets to support the analyses of the Hornsea Three site specific survey data is considered appropriate and the consistency in the reported sediment and community composition across all site specific and desktop data sources provides confidence in the characterisation for the Hornsea Three project.</p> <p>A note was provided with Natural England, following the Benthic and Fish Ecology and Marine Processes Expert Working Group (EWG) meeting on 4 December 2017, presenting further detail on the approach to baseline characterisation of the nearshore area, including Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ, and the use of site specific survey data and desktop data sources. This note also presented a 'side by side' comparison of each route as requested (see Table 1.1 in volume 5, annex 2.3: MCZ Assessment for full details on the consultation undertaken).</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>3</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Natural England	We would like to re-iterate that Natural England does not support rock placement for cable protection with designated sites. The use of permanent rock placement around structures should be minimised as much as possible in soft sediment environments.	I	Hornsea Three intend to bury the export cable wherever possible but, in locations where this is not feasible, cable protection will be required. Within areas of designated sites that coincide with Hornsea Three, sensitive cable and scour protection measures will be employed. These cable and scour protection measures will not include concrete mattresses. The cable and scour protection will consider the local seabed conditions, including sediment/substrate type. The measures proposed for each site are as follows and are outlined in Table 2.18 of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Within the North Norfolk Sandbanks and Saturn Reef SAC: this may include measures which may encourage the burial of the scour/cable protection by the surrounding sediment or rock protection which takes into account the typical grain sizes known to occur naturally within the SAC (i.e. coarse gravel, cobbles and boulders);</li> <li>• Within The Wash and North Norfolk Coast SAC: this may include measures which may encourage the burial of the scour/cable protection by the surrounding sediment or rock protection which takes into account the typical grain sizes known to occur naturally within the SAC (i.e. coarse gravel and cobbles);</li> <li>• Within the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ: cable protection may comprise gravel and cobbles with a mean grain size of 100 mm, maximum grain size of 250 mm; and</li> <li>• Within the Markham's Triangle rMCZ: cable protection may comprise gravel and cobbles with a mean grain size of 100 mm, maximum grain size of 250 mm, while scour protection for foundations, if required, may have a maximum diameter of 360 mm.</li> </ul>
Natural England	The inclusion of the alternative route options will not affect the proposed approach to the EIA, but greater consideration of the interest features of the Wash and North Norfolk Coast SAC may be required in the RIAA depending on the outcome of the high level review above. Orsted should refer to Natural England's comments to the PEI consultation for more detailed views on the methodology.	I	A full assessment of the effects of Hornsea Three on benthic ecology, including on features of designated sites, including The Wash and North Norfolk Coast SAC, is presented in volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Subtidal and Intertidal Ecology. Conclusions on the effects of Hornsea Three on the conservation objectives of The Wash and North Norfolk Coast SAC are presented in full within the RIAA for Hornsea Three.
Costessey Town Council	Costessey Town Councillors have concerns regarding the cable corridor route and ask that particular considerations be given to the points where <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Cables are not buried very deep so different companies' cable routes may conflict with each other and cause issues with existing utilities and proposed major infrastructure routes – eg dualling of A47 and the proposed Norwich Western Link Road</li> <li>b) Routes will cross the Norfolk Vanguard cable corridor (from the latest proposed Vattenfall route)</li> <li>c) Routes cross the Wensum Valley &amp; might affect the proposed Norwich Western Link.</li> </ul>	I	Parameters of the cable trench are provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description, with a minimum depth of cables of 1.2 m.  Where cumulative schemes are sufficiently progressed, potential cumulative effects have been identified and assessed within the relevant topic chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3).
Anglian Water	<b>Potential offshore alternatives routes supporting information</b> We have no comments to make in respect of the alternative offshore cable routes which have been identified following the previous consultation.	N/A	Hornsea Three acknowledged Anglian Water's response, no further action was required
Norfolk Vanguard (Vattenfall Wind Power Ltd)	<b>1. Interactions with Norfolk Vanguard</b> On the basis of the information provided, we do not consider that the alterations results in any material changes to the interaction between both Norfolk Vanguard and Hornsea 3. We will however review this in further detail and welcome sight of the assessment once it has been undertaken.	N	Hornsea Three acknowledges the response from Norfolk Vanguard.
Sky Telecommunications Services Ltd	Further to your enquiry at the location above, the following SKY route(s) are indirectly affected: Virgin Media(NTL)-WBPT-Wisbech-Peterborough. The SKY route(s) is indirectly affected as we only lease telecoms infrastructure from Virgin Media, who own and are responsible for the maintenance or diversion thereof. For further information or detailed plans for this area, please contact their Enquiry Team.  You may be able to contact Virgin Media, by email: plant.enquiries.team( @ )virginmedia.co.uk or Phone: 0870 888 3116 Option 2. Please be aware that their contact details may have changed and we do not manage their updates. Please visit their company website for more information.  Please note that if our apparatus is deemed to be affected by your proposal and requires relocation or diversion in any way, you will need to contact SKY to provide estimates as per NRSWA Diversionary Works process.	N/A	Sky Telecommunications Services Limited's response was noted and it was confirmed through further dialogue that their assets are located within Virgin Media infrastructure. Protection for this Virgin Media infrastructure is included within the protective provisions of the DCO application.



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>3</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Health & Safety Executive	<p>We have checked through the proposed alterations i.e. on the onshore re-routes and have concluded that nothing has changed from previous responses which is repeated below:</p> <p>The 3 fixed sites within the Hornsea 3 Export Cable Route search area are: #0649 Bernard Matthews, Weston Green #3374 Bernard Matthews, Great Witchingham #3374 Bernard Matthews, North Site, Great Witchingham</p> <p>The search area is also crossed by 8 pipelines operated by National Grid: They are: NGG 1720 No 4 Feeder Bacton to Great Ryburgh. NGG 2739 No 27 Feeder Bacton to Kings Lynn, Comp. NGG 1709 No 3 Feeder Bacton to Roudham Heath NGG1686 Bowthorpe to Drayton, NGG1684 Bowthorpe Supply NGG1644 Yelverton to East Carleton NGG1640 Silfield Tee to East Carleton.</p> <p>HSE recommends that the applicant contacts National Grid to discuss up to date information on pipeline location, as the applicant is advised not to rely solely on the information in this response in establishing where encroachment on pipelines could occur.</p>	N	Noted.
Marine Management Organisation	<p>Information provided on the role of the MMO [See full for details]. Potential alternative offshore export cable routes. The MMO has reviewed the consultation documents received on 16 November 2017. Three specific questions were asked of consultees with regard to the information, which has been addressed. The 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><b>1. Do consultees have any comments on the location of the potential offshore alternative routes?</b> 1.1. The MMO acknowledges that the proposed alternative routes have been investigated due to PEIR consultation comments. Consideration of alternative cable routes which potentially reduce the impacts of the development upon highly sensitive features of marine protected areas if welcomed. The MMO notes that the applicant has not incorporated justification or reasoning for the selection of the two alternative offshore cable routes, aside from stating that the two alternative routes may be feasible. The reasons and constraints for the selection of the offshore alternative routes should be justified in the Environmental Statement.</p>	I	Comments from the MMO are acknowledged. The reasons for site selection are provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives.
Marine Management Organisation	<p><b>3. Do consultees have any comments on the approach to the EIA if the potential offshore alternative routes are taken forward?</b> 3.1. The MMO considers the EIA assessment methodology and the assessment of potential impacts to fish ecology and commercial fisheries proposed in the PEIR to be appropriate.</p>	N	Comments acknowledged from the MMO.
Little Melton Parish Council	<p><b>Church Farms Barns</b> A third (southern) route has been proposed and this is the option preferred by CFB residents. The middle route is the least favoured of the three and is considered to be impractical.</p>	Y	Hornsea Three has chosen the alternative route proposed (as shown on the consultation documents) as part of the route refinement process. This was chosen based on a number of reasons including environmental constraints and community feedback. Further information on the route refinement process is set out in Environmental Statement, volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>3</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Little Melton Parish Council	<b>Great Melton Road</b> A site entrance from GM Rd is required because the haul road is interrupted both to the east and west where the cables will be placed under roads by directional drilling. LMPC has pointed out that GM Rd is not suitable for HGVs and that there is a 7.5tonne restriction on part of Burnthouse Lane. The preferred access point is from the lorry route on Burnthouse Lane. Ørsted will provide information about the traffic predicted to use the GM Rd site entrance.	I	It is acknowledged that Hornsea Three proposes two access off of Great Melton Road, these are primarily to facilitate initial site preparation until the haul road from Little Melton Road to Market Lane is established. The main access for HGV movements will be from Little Melton Road, from Burnthouse Lane as it routes south from Little Melton.  It is furthermore noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this forms part of the DCO application. Impacts relating to access are addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport.
Little Melton Parish Council	<b>Great Melton Road</b> Ørsted have considered routing the cable to the south of the business park but there is insufficient space between the park and the new housing developments,	I	Environmental Statement, volume 3, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives sets out the process of route refinement which has been informed by a range of technical, engineering and environmental constraints.
Little Melton Parish Council	<b>Great Melton Road</b> Ørsted prefer to route the cable close to GM Rd in order to avoid the garden of a property on Little Melton Rd. Residents of GM Rd are still concerned that the magnetic field extends further than is calculated by Ørsted and a response to the calculations submitted by George Stronge is needed urgently so that people can be properly informed.	I	In respect to EMF, Environmental Statement, volume 3, annex 3.3: EMF Compliance Statement comprises an assessment of the static and extremely low frequency (ELF) EMFs that will be generated by the Hornsea Project Three onshore transmission infrastructure (cabling), giving maximum predicted field strengths to assess compliance with health protection guidelines for public exposure to EMFs.  Annex 3.3 concludes that the maximum magnetic field strength directly above a cable, using worst-case assumptions where required, is also well below the guideline public exposure limits set to protect health. The cables eventually selected for the project will be required to fall within the envelope assessed and meet the prescribed standards and hence will not generate greater EMF.
<b>Section 42: Local Authorities (prescribed under section 43 of the Act)</b>			
No comments were received from the local authorities relating to the Site Selection Process under Phase 2.B.			
<b>Section 42: Persons with an interest in the land (prescribed under section 44 of the Act)</b>			
Christopher Bond Bidwells on behalf of Ms M Lofty	(2) As the cable route (working width) will cross two hedges (one of conifers), a line of poplar trees and the paddocks, we request that the cables are installed by HDD and not open cut in order to minimise the disruption and depreciation to this property and maintain the existing access to the farmhouse. Please contact C Bond if any further explanation is required. C Bond would be prepared to meet on site with Orsted representatives.	Y	The cables will be installed here via HDD.
C F Bond, Bidwells (on behalf of clients) on behalf of Nicholas Edward Evans-Lombe, Frances Marilyn Evans-Lombe & Great Melton Farms Limited	We now respond and comment, on a without prejudice basis, as follows:- Access to the west of Beech Grove – we assume that access is required around Beech Grove, as Beech Grove itself is to remain in situ with the cable route installed by Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD) beneath it. Could you please confirm this is the case-if so we have no objection to this access route.  Please contact Christopher Bond if any further explanation is required on the points raised. Christopher Bond would be prepared to meet on site with Ørsted's representatives if required. Please could you acknowledge receipt of this email.	Y	The cables are proposed to be installed under Beech Grove via HDD as suggested, with the access to the west being outside of the woodland to avoid this being directly impacted.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>3</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
CJC Lee (via agent, Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co)	<p>Part of the land owned and occupied by CJC Lee (Saxthorpe) Ltd at Bodham has been identified as being on a potential revised cable route by Orsted for the Hornsea 3 project. During previous consultations CJC Lee (Saxthorpe) Ltd, hereafter referred to as “the Company” did not raise specific objections to the inclusion of land at Bodham in the proposed cable route. These proposed interactions are shown on the left-hand image below, which is an extract from the Orsted consultation document. Areas where the company’s land and the original corridor interact are shown with red edging. The area affected under the proposed alternate route are shown on the right-hand image as edged red with the blue route passing through.</p> <p>Original Route</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cut the corners off two fields and potentially interacted with a pit hole</li> <li>• Limited impact on farming business – inconvenient but deemed to be manageable as no one field would be overly impacted.</li> </ul> <p>Proposed Route</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Still impacts field north of road, but to no greater extent</li> <li>• Missed the corner of the eastern field and the pit hole in the south field</li> <li>• Cuts diagonally through the middle of Stone Lodge field</li> <li>• Expected corridor areas is 2.35 ha from a 6.21 ha field – this is 39% of the field</li> <li>• The company strongly opposes the proposed alternative route.</li> <li>• Route cuts off areas either side of the corridor making them unusable during works year</li> <li>• The impact on this field is very high and failure to restore soil and drainage could reduce efficacy and value of the entire field</li> <li>• Given the very high impact on the land affected by the new route there is a need to understand the exact reasons why the original route cannot be adopted, and why this new route is preferred.</li> </ul>	N	<p>Hornsea Three responded as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It is acknowledged that the alternative route will impact different areas of land than previously. The opposition to this is noted and was fed into the route design consideration.</li> <li>2. If areas of land are segregated by the construction corridor and become unfarmable, then compensation will be payable for any reasonable losses on a proven loss basis. However, landowners are expected to mitigate their losses, where possible.</li> <li>3. The land will be fully reinstated following the work to a comparable condition of that recorded in the schedule of condition, with compensation being payable on a proven loss basis for any ongoing losses or where reinstatement is not possible. Drainage will also be reinstated, or installed as required, with compensation being payable on the same terms as above.</li> <li>4. The alternative route that was previously proposed had difficulties including: poor visibility on the highways crossings, proximity to two listed buildings, proximity to some ponds with ecological merit and restricted space adjacent to an established tree belt and hedgerow. The alternative route avoids these, whilst also crossing fewer roads and being shorter, therefore having a lesser environmental impact.</li> </ol>
WJF Ross Ltd (via agent, Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co)	<p>Part of the land owned and occupied by WJF Ross Ltd at Hurricane Farm, Bodham has been identified as being on a potential revised cable route by Orsted for the Hornsea 3 project. These proposed interactions are shown on the image below left, which is an extract from the Orsted consultation document, with the company’s land being edged red. The original cable corridor is shown as a yellow polygon. The proposed alternate route is shown as the blue route passing down the eastern side of the field. The image on the right (taken from Google Earth) shows the impact of the cables on the property.</p> <p>Original Route</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cut the corner off one field</li> <li>• Limited impact on farming business – inconvenient but deemed to be manageable as no one field would be overly impacted.</li> </ul> <p>Proposed Route</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Expected corridor areas is 3.68 ha from a 31 ha field – this is 12% of the field</li> <li>• Route cuts off an area to the east of the corridor making it unusable during works year</li> <li>• The company strongly opposes the proposed alternative route.</li> <li>• The impact on this field is high and failure to restore soil and drainage could reduce efficacy and value of the entire field</li> <li>• Given the very high impact on the land affected by the new route there is a need to understand the exact reasons why the original route cannot be adopted, and why this new route is preferred.</li> </ul>	N	<p>Hornsea Three responded as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It is acknowledged that the alternative route will impact different areas of the landowner’s field compared with the previous proposal. The opposition to this is noted and was fed into the route design considerations.</li> <li>2. The land will be fully reinstated following the work to a comparable condition of that recorded in the schedule of condition, with compensation being payable on a proven loss basis for any ongoing losses or where reinstatement is not possible. Drainage will also be reinstated, or installed as required, with compensation being payable on the same terms as above.</li> <li>3. The alternative route that was previously proposed had difficulties including: poor visibility on the highways crossings, proximity to two listed buildings, proximity to some ponds with ecological merit and restricted space adjacent to an established tree belt and hedgerow. The alternative route avoids these, whilst also crossing fewer roads and being shorter, therefore having a lesser environmental impact.</li> </ol>
AV Youngs Ltd (via agent, Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co)	<p>Part of Pitt Farm has been identified as part of a potential cable route by Orsted for the Hornsea 3 project. The original proposal for the cable corridor cut through the middle of the farm and came close to the farmstead and campsite, thus potentially resulting in high levels of disturbance during the works. Following submission of responses to the PEIR an alternative route has been suggested by Orsted, which is shown below.</p>	Y	<p>Hornsea Three responded to AV Youngs Ltd. concerns as follows: Concern regarding the route and the wish for it to be further amended is noted, Regarding point A, the revised route corridor is located to the west of the pit described. Regarding point B, the revised route corridor now follows this suggested route and crosses the road at the south-west corner of field A.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>3</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>AV Youngs Ltd thanks Orsted for considering the representations made to the PEIR, however the proposed route change does not go far enough to alleviate the concerns raised in the previous response, and it is believed that greater variation to the cable route is possible. Evidence of the ability to significantly alter the route is shown on Statutory Consultation Plan Map 2 of 9 and Map 5 of 9. These examples are shown below. AV Youngs Ltd wishes to make suggestions detailed below as to how the disruption from the works might be reduced.</p> <p>Reference is made to the plan titled AV Youngs Ltd – Alternative Route, which is taken from Google earth.</p> <p>Field A. Orsted Alteration: Top of field the route is moved west of the pit. AV Youngs Ltd comments: Supports the changes down to the point where the cable leaves the pit.</p> <p>Field A. Orsted Alteration: Cable has moved west but straightens back to a north south drop into field B. AV Youngs Ltd comments: The cable should move to the far south west corner of Field A and prepare to drop into Field C.</p> <p>Field B. Orsted Alteration: Cable has moved west but remains in Field B. AV Youngs Ltd comments: Field B is circa 4.19ha and the corridor at 1.65ha accounts for 40% of the field. Thus, the field will be totally compromised by the works and the proposed route cuts off the south-western corner of the field. This location is adjacent to the campsite</p> <p>Field C. Orsted Alteration: Orsted Cable Route avoids this field. AV Youngs Ltd comments: Field C is circa 24.10 ha and the corridor at 7.31 ha would account for 30% of the field. The AV Youngs proposed routing of the cable down the eastern side of the field leaves a regular, easier to work area of 16.79 ha. This is preferable as the corridor has a more proportionate impact on the field and simply acts to narrow it. There is a small copse at the top of Field C where the cable would cross from Field A. This copse is due to be felled within the next 24 months for firewood. The owner would agree to offer the same area of land to match woodland lost to the cable for replanting.</p> <p>Field D. Orsted Alteration: Cable has moved west in the top half of the field then re-joins the original corridor. AV Youngs Ltd comments: Field D is large enough to accommodate the cable route in the same way as Field C is, however the top part of the field is still close to the campsite and will cause disruption.</p> <p>Field E. Orsted Alteration: Cable has moved back onto original line to cross the public highway into Field E. It is assumed that the road will be closed and trenched the trees south of Field E will be felled to allow the cable through. AV Youngs Ltd comments: Moving the cable back into Field E will mean disruption to another field that could be avoided. Field E is only 7.63 ha and the corridor will account for 1.15 ha, which is 15%. If it is vital for engineering reasons to cross the woodland block F where shown, then the proposed route could follow the course in Field C and then cross into E at the lower end. This is shown as Exit B. A preference would be to exit Field C at Exit A. If the cable is to be installed by HDD under the road and woodland then launching at Exit A is preferred.</p> <p>The proposed changes do not go far enough to alleviate the concerns of the land owner. It is clear from other alterations shown on the route that the Owners proposed alterations should be feasible, especially as all the changes occur within the same title. A V Youngs Ltd seeks reasons for why their proposed alternative route cannot be adopted.</p> <p>Google Earth Image is next and final page of this document.</p>		<p>Regarding points C and D, the revised route corridor now avoids field B &amp; D, and has moved west into field C. The offer of the area of land for potential replanting is appreciated and noted.</p> <p>Comments on field E are noted, therevised route now exits the field to the south with the proposed installation method under the road and woodland being via Horizontal Directional Drill.</p> <p>Hornsea Three has now altered the proposed route in response to the landowner feedback.</p>



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>3</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Jane Kenny, Savills, on behalf of Mrs C Barratt – Church Farm (Booton)	<p>POTENTIAL ONSHORE CABLE CORRIDOR RE-ROUTES</p> <p>There are a number of requested route changes which have not been considered. In particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mrs C Barratt – [REDACTED] – an alternative route for the cable has been provided for consideration to avoid all the sensitivities of the current proposed route including a SSSI, newly built grainstore with associated infrastructure, land drains and unforgiving heavy land. The alternative access route is noted and is not suitable for any construction type vehicles and no approval will be granted. The proposed route is inaccessible by normal farm machinery. Furthermore it is not acceptable for the route to pass south from Marriott's Way to Moor Farm due to the impact upon the occupiers of Moor Farm. It may be possible to negotiate a more acceptable route by negotiation with the Landowner.</li> </ul>	Y	The requested alterations to the route crossing land owned by Mrs Barratt is subject to ongoing discussions. The alternative route request was however adopted.
Rullion Real Estate Ltd on behalf of Crusaders RFC, Little Melton	<p>1. Grounds for response</p> <p>We would suggest that amendments be made to your proposals to bypass the club completely, rendering it unaffected by your proposals.</p> <p>RFC is a community sports facility that has been in existence for 57 years. It is the freehold owner of this site, as shown in the attachment. It caters for various levels of age and ability, from senior club rugby, to girls rugby, youth teams and minis. The club serves around 350 local members, the vast majority being children from the age of 6 upwards, and has been expanding steadily year on year recently. To absorb this the club has plans to physically expand, with a planning application for extension of the clubhouse imminent, as well as plans to improve the overall playing facilities through the installation of a new drainage system to its main training pitch. Outside of the rugby season the club is used for youth cricket.</p> <p>The proposed impact of the ground works/ underground export cables poses a serious concern for the club, which utilises the facility 12 months a year, every year. Your plans show land required across both senior playing pitches, as well as the Mini's training pitch, which would rendering them unplayable, with no capacity onsite to re-provide an alternative.</p> <p>Even if the proposed works were to be carried out during the Rugby off-season, the pitches would not have sufficient time to re-surface sufficiently to enable safe play. The club does not want to consider a relocation, either temporarily or permanently. This would prove difficult logistically, would be at a significant cost to the club, and would likely have a negative impact on membership/ annual income. All work completed on growth initiatives to date, time spent on fundraising, clubhouse expansion, and pitch improvement would be rendered abortive.</p> <p>We would be happy to arrange for an inspection/ viewing of the facility and to open a dialogue with you on this matter.</p> <p>[Image included in response see original online]</p>	Y	Crusaders RFC was originally included within the proposed 80m wide cable corridor and would have clipped the northern part of the land ownership. However, it has now been deliberately clipped out of the scheme (by virtue of creating a pinch-point down to approx. 60m) to avoid the impacts noted here.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>3</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
John Innes Centre	<p>We have been working with Dong for a large part of 2017 in connection with our land at Bawburgh. We had thought that the new trench had been agreed due to the number of site meetings and their understanding of how important it is to our institute that the land through our research area is left undisturbed. If this proposal was to go ahead it would be catastrophic to our crop trials, and future possibility's that if access was required to the land for maintenance or repair you may find we would not be able to accommodate access until the soil and crop have been sterilised causing you in some cases weeks before access would be granted.</p> <p>Part of our consultation period with Dong it was agreed that we would work with you, an agreement by both parties was that we would only agree to the enclosed trench as marked on the attached drawing.</p> <p>I am sure all the visits to our site and institute have been well documented and still on file within your organisation. However, can you please update your files for future communication as your recent correspondence went to the old landowners, and in doing so delayed this information coming to our attention to only this week.</p> <p>John Innes agreed this year to accommodate the section that has been marked in Red, Dong had agreed that due to our land being designated for science research, any disturbance to our fields would and will cause future problems due to soil disturbance. Also as this land is not used for food production it would be difficult to allow future maintenance on to the site during trial periods, as this could interrupt years of trails and findings, putting some work back by over a year due to the seasons but also the risk of your vehicles transferring crop seed or matter off site which could cause contamination to other areas of the county side. The Government have recently invested £7 million in preparing this area for crop trials and it would be catastrophic to cut through the main heart of our trial area.</p> <p>Again we will work with you to run in the area marked in red.</p>	Y	<p>Hornsea Three responded to the John Innes Centre as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The refined route corridor takes into account the proposed alternative to the west in order to minimise impact to crop trials in line with discussions to date and feedback received.</li> <li>2. Records have been updated to ensure documentation is sent to the correct contact at JIC going forward.</li> <li>3. The revised route now adopts the use of this field as requested. However, it does cross the corner of the adjacent field slightly still, due to the angle and route required as it heads north. This has been discussed with Dalcour Maclaren recently and will be done so in more detail during negotiation of Heads of Terms for an option agreement.</li> </ol>
Christopher Bond, Bidwells on behalf of Nicholas Edward Evans-Lombe & Great Melton Farms Limited	<p>2. Nicholas Edward Evans-Lombe [REDACTED] &amp; Great Melton Farms Limited, [REDACTED] (Map 7 of 9)</p> <p>Potential onshore cable corridor re-routes (Inset 1)</p> <p>We note the potential cable corridor re-route to the south of the existing route, we assume to avoid the Church Farm Barns complex. We do not raise any objection to this proposed re-route on the assumption that the area of wood to the south of Little Melton Reservoir will be crossed by HDD —can you please confirm this is the case.</p> <p>Proposed access routes (Inset 1)</p> <p>We also note and approve the potential access route.</p>	Y	<p>Hornsea Three confirmed this woodland would be crossed via HDD, as suggested.</p>
Christopher Bond, Bidwells on behalf of Martin Kemp	<p>3. Martin P Kemp [REDACTED] (Map 8 of 9)</p> <p>Potential onshore cable corridor re-routes</p> <p>We note the potential cable re-route (alternative route) which is totally unacceptable to our client. As stressed in the earlier representation of 19 September 2017, the future development of the Kemp's land is of primary importance and, hence, all measures suggested in the earlier representation must be made to reduce the impact of the cable route proposed on their land. The proposed re-route in no way complies with this request and would, if anything, sterilise a greater area of the Kemp's farm.</p> <p>Potential access routes</p> <p>We note the potential access corridor to the cable route. This is unacceptable and must be kept closed for security purposes. There is a potential access available directly to the preferred route from the Norwich Road which should be used (see attached plan A).</p>	Y	<p>Hornsea Three addressed the landowner's response as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Concern regarding the alternative route option is noted. This has since been discounted following accurate identification of the route of the disused MOD pipeline on this land.</li> <li>2. The alternative access route suggested has now been added to proposals, with the other option also being maintained in case this is required as a back-up option.</li> </ol>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>3</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Christopher Bond, Bidwells on behalf of Charles Watt	<p>Charles Jonathan Watt [REDACTED] (Map 8 of 9)</p> <p>Potential onshore cable corridor re-routes</p> <p>We note the potential re-route and associated proposed storage areas to the east of the preferred route which is totally unacceptable to our client for the following reasons:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- It is too close to Wychwood House, a substantial property standing in a parkland setting.</li> <li>- It will cross historic parkland of ancient grass (unimproved for many years) known as The Old Hethersett Racecourse where it is proposed to open cut which cannot be readily reinstated.</li> <li>- The alternative route will cross (by HDD) areas of substantial woodland including Wychwood adjoining the Norwich Road. Under no circumstances should the roots of these substantial trees be disturbed which would occur if HDD takes place</li> <li>- The alternative route will be in close vicinity to The Lodge at the entrance to Wychwood House drive.</li> <li>- We cannot understand why the preferred route cannot be adopted, bearing in mind it is a disused MOD pipeline that appears to be blocking the route.</li> <li>- The preferred route crosses open farmland with the exception of the wood (The Glade)</li> </ul> <p>Proposed access route</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- We note a proposed access from the Norwich Road southwards to the preferred route which is acceptable.</li> <li>- We note the proposed access to Mr Kemp's land leads off the Norwich Road directly opposite the Lodge- clearly, a traffic hazard which would lead to traffic using the Lodge drive as a run off area which is totally unacceptable.</li> <li>- We note a proposed access route to the south of the All on this land — could you please confirm the construction and reinstatement details</li> </ul>	Y	<p>Hornsea Three addressed the landowner's response as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Concern regarding the alternative route option is noted. This has since been discounted following accurate identification of the route of the discussed MOD pipeline on this land.</li> <li>2.a. An alternative access route into land north of Norwich Road has now been incorporated following feedback received.</li> <li>b. The access to the south of the A11 will be required in relation to the proposed HDD under the A11 and railway. This will likely be constructed to facilitate vehicle access and will be fully reinstated following completion of the work.</li> </ol>
Christopher Bond, Bidwells on behalf of Benjamin Robert Goodfellow & Phillip George Day	<p>Benjamin Robert Goodfellow, [REDACTED] (map 8 of 9)</p> <p>Potential onshore cable corridor re-routes</p> <p>We note the potential corridor cable re-route to the west of the preferred route which is unacceptable to our clients as this will be more intrusive into their fields and further affect agricultural operations.</p> <p>Proposed access routes</p> <p>We note 2 proposed access routes and comment as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- (Northern) across the River meadows — this is impractical being low lying land prone to flooding (very wet in winter) and follows the line of an Anglian Water sewer.</li> <li>- (Southern) known as Racecourse track — This is an existing track which we believe would need to be upgraded before use by heavy vehicles — can we have details of what is proposed.</li> </ul>	Y	<p>Hornsea Three addressed the landowner's response as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Concern regarding the alternative route option is noted. This has since been discounted following accurate identification of the route of the discussed MOD pipeline on this land.</li> <li>2.a. Information regarding the land on this proposed access route is noted and appreciated, an alternative route has now also been incorporated following receipt of this feedback.</li> <li>b. Where required, existing tracks would be upgraded prior to be used for access by the project, and also reinstated following completion of the work as required and in accordance with the schedule of condition. Detail on the specific construction of access tracks will be available in due course and once a construction contractor has been appointed.</li> </ol>
North Norfolk Railway	<p>The North Norfolk Railway plc has no objection to either the 'west' or 'east' route as your proposed cable crosses Kelling Heath. However, we would prefer the 'west' route based on our experience of the SCIRA cable route installed by Carillion in 2010. On that occasion the HDD was drilled uphill from the north side of the track (as it would be on your 'east' route). The bore suffered multiple fracouts of bentonite, uphill from the railway and also loss of bentonite back into the launch put leading to the collapse of our earthworks into the void, with a resulting 94mm settlement of the rails with potentially serious operational consequences. I appreciate that this is not the norm in HDD works, but we do not wish to attract that risk again and so prefer the 'flat' crossing of the 'west' route.</p> <p>See previous response for engineering conditions that shall be applied to the proposed crossing of the North Norfolk Railway for Hornsea Project Three onshore cables.</p>	Y	<p>Comments and detail regarding previous issues encountered with Sherringham Shoal project are gratefully received and noted. The west route option has now been adopted in order to maintain a 'flat' crossing as suggested.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>3</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Michael and Louise Savory The Muckleburgh Military Collection	<p>There is currently a public access agreement in place with the Council for the use of the public coastal footpath on the beach-side of the fence.</p> <p>Currently in the process of renewing the said fence, and would want this reinstated to the same condition if damaged or temporarily removed by Orsted's work.</p> <p>There is an informal agreement in place with a number of fisherman to park on Muckleburgh Collection land just to the east of the MOD radar station and take access through a gate to the beach. This is done so on an ad-hoc basis.</p> <p>Public vehicle rides take place during Spring &amp; Summer months using military vehicles on the internal and boundary tracks of the Muckleburgh Collection.</p> <p>Tank driving also takes place on these tracks at any time of the year, but predominantly Spring &amp; Summer, for people who pay to drive tanks themselves.</p> <p>Due to these afore mentioned reasons, and other security concerns, any temporary footpath diversion into the Muckleburgh Collection would be very inconvenient, and therefore unwanted.</p> <p>Any footpath diversion on the beach would be much preferred and agreeable in principle.</p>	Y	<p>The fence, and any other areas damaged or removed by engineering work, will be reinstated or replaced on completion to a condition comparable to a photographic schedule of condition prior to access being taken.</p> <p>Concerns regarding the potential temporary diversion of the footpath through private land are noted from this and previous correspondence. This is currently an option should this be required for engineering and safety reasons, and not yet a definite requirement. Should this be required, more detailed discussions will be held nearer the time, with a diversion or solution on the beach being pursued in the first instance.</p>
Michael and Louise Savory The Muckleburgh Military Collection	<p>With regard to the cable route on the land: Access to the landfall area would be considered via either the existing site entrance, or across the arable field to the east Reaffirm the request for the airfield to not be open cut, if the route is taken in this direction A waterproof membrane or similar may need to be considered to reinstate the scrape adjacent to where the borehole were drilled.</p>	Y	<p>The main proposed access route to the point of cable landfall is via the existing entrance to the Muckleburgh Collection in order to utilise the existing track. The cables are proposed to be installed under the airfield via Horizontal Direction Drill (HDD) as opposed to open cut. Reinstatement will be undertaken in line with the proposed schedule of condition, with a waterproof membrane, or similar, being considered here if required.</p>
Mr & Mrs Bullimore	<p>You buy a nice plot of land for [REDACTED] utility and amenity not agricultural for 10 years summer house, store sheds, pony 180 trees, pony, wildlife, camping parties, stay for days have water put on fence if spend another [REDACTED] on it. 8 gardens plots at Kelling or 1 sugar beet field that makes sense! Multimillion job like this has to go and cross the beet fields not our little gardens. The buzz from the cables will drive wildlife away, drive my pony crazy and give you cancer. We live in our field sleep camp eat nobody lives in a beet field get it!!!</p>	N	<p>Land has not been and will not be accessed without prior consent or authority. The project has confirmed that the intention is to directional drill under all of the land in this vicinity, rather than open-cut trench.</p>
<b>Section 47: Duty to consult local community</b>			
Diana Jenkinson	<p>I am writing to protest against the wind farm at High Kelling. I keep my horse at Kelling Heath stables, this simply isn't suitable to be near horses. There would only be one field in between the wind farm and the field where my horse is kept, she is a very nervous horse and is 20 years old, such a construction would cause her a massive amount of stress. In addition we would lose a huge amount of our hacking as we will be unable to ride our horses past the wind farm to get onto Kelling Heath as they will be too frightened. During the winter months, the Heath is our best option for riding as the Bodham woods get too muddy. Riding across Kelling Heath gives us so many options to go further afield whereas through Bodham woods there is no safe access to Weybourne and Salthouse etc. We pay a lot of money to keep our horses here and spend a lot of time, they are a huge part of our lives.</p>	Y	<p>Since the PEIR, a refined landfall location has been identified (western re-route around Kelling) and the area identified for landfall works has reduced. This was informed by a number of factors including engineering/technical considerations, community feedback in the area of Kelling and Weybourne, avoidance of the Kelling Heath SSSI/CWS and Holiday Park.</p>
Mark Flatman on behalf of Mr & Mrs DW Flatman	<p>Therefore of the three alternative routing corridors proposed within the consultation, the most westerly corridor immediately east of Kelling and on the western side of Croft Hill represents the least-worst option.</p>	Y	<p>Noted, this is the option taken forward by Hornsea Three.</p>



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>3</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Mark Flatman on behalf of Mr & Mrs DW Flatman	<b>Alternative Cable Corridor</b> Due to express exclusion from earlier consultation exercises, I am consequently therefore unaware of the full scope of alternative routing from the sea via Norfolk Coast to Norwich that previously was considered by Orsted. Notwithstanding, it is particularly perverse to propose a landing place on the coast that immediately requires traversing through or very close to an a SSSI, that provides a particularly valuable and niche habitat supporting a range of rare UK Biodiversity Priority Species. It is also noted that all three alternative corridors would need to bisect the North Norfolk AONB and heritage Coast and is one of 32 designated coasts in England. These are specifically subject to the provisions of paragraph 114 of the NPPF. In contrast, and by reference to the extent of the North Norfolk AONB shown on the map below, it is noted that there is a logical gap adjoining the coast and not subject to AONB or Heritage Coast status that extends approximately between Mundesley and Sea Palling and as indicated graphically by reference to the white arrow on the plan (see full response).	Y	Since the PEIR, a refined landfall location has been identified (western re-route around Kelling) and the area identified for landfall works has reduced. This was informed by a number of factors including engineering/technical considerations, community feedback in the area of Kelling and Weybourne, avoidance of the Kelling Heath SSSI/CWS and Holiday Park. Environmental Statement, volume 3, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives sets out the process of identifying a landfall location and the route refinement process.  Impacts relating to landscape and visual resources are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual resources. Particular consideration has been given to the AONB as a sensitive receptor, and it is noted that Hornsea Three has consulted with the Norfolk Coast Partnership to agree viewpoints to inform the assessment of impacts on the AONB.
Mark Flatman on behalf of Mr & Mrs DW Flatman	Furthermore, when this location is considered in proximity to the final destination of the Norwich Main National Grid Substation, south of Norwich, a landing point between Mundesley and Sea Palling would suggest a far more logical approach and one that would also offer a shorter and more direct onshore cable corridor routing to Norwich. This is depicted on the full response and is suggested that a detailed investigation would undoubtedly reveal and more direct onshore alternative route that would avoid statutory landscape and heritage designations. It is suggested that Orsted investigate this alternative route (see full response for marked plan).	I	Environmental Statement, volume 3, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives sets out the process of identifying a grid connection location and landfall. It describes the alternative routes considered and justification for the chosen route.
Councillor Greg Peck, Broadland District Council	I am very concerned about the lack of coordination between yourselves and Vattenfall. I believe we are in danger of doing untold damage to the Norfolk countryside which can only be mitigated by the two of you working together. There will be more such projects possibly requiring further cables being laid across Norfolk in the future and without an overarching plan and some joined up thinking this could prove totally chaotic.	N	We are in close contact with Vattenfall at all levels of the project in relation to their proposed Norfolk Vanguard and Norfolk Boreas projects; we liaise on environmental consents, communications, stakeholder engagement, technical aspects etc., so it's not just one point of contact for both businesses. We are of course paying extra attention to where the proposed projects may cross in terms of the underground cables, as we recognise that, if both projects are built simultaneously, coordinating construction works will minimise disruption. Additionally, we are in close consultation regarding any areas where there could be potential for cumulative impacts to arise as a result of both developments to ensure we progress the projects appropriately and sensitively.  Notwithstanding the above, it is important to note that Norfolk Vanguard is a project with its own technical and environmental characteristics and constraints, and is subject to a separate DCO process.
Councillor Greg Peck, Broadland District Council	There is a specific issue on the Reepham/Salle boundary at the proposed crossing point of both the Orsted and Vattenfall schemes, which I know you are aware of. You need to revisit your plans and move the cable routes and the cross over point further away from the effected residents. I seek your assurance that you will work together to make this happen.	I	The potential for impacts arising as a result of Hornsea Three to combine with other planned developments (including the Vattenfall projects) is assessed in each respective topic chapter of the Environmental Statement (volume 3), under the heading 'Cumulative Effect Assessment'. Where relevant, specific mitigation measures have been identified to minimise the cumulative effects.
Judy Holland	I am now extremely concerned about the entire wind farm cabling routes by both Ørsted and Vattenfall (I have written to them too) which will cross in the field behind our home (address below) and which will have far more impact on us than we previously thought now that the working corridors, site access routes and construction compounds/marshalling yards are coming to light. If plans are passed this will have a massive long term impact on us with noise, dust and access in and out of our home.	I	Where sensitive receptors are located in close proximity to the onshore cable corridor, the Project will ensure That sensitive management measures, such as noise, dust and traffic control are considered. These are Documented in an outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), which accompanies the DCO application.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>3</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Councillor Jo Copplestone, Broadland District Council	Finally I support the use of Oulton Airfield as a compound and storage site, subject to local concerns being addressed. I have concerns about the proposed cable crossing point at Salle (Orsted & Vattenfall Schemes) and I hope there will be collaborative working between both companies to mitigate the disruption to the community there.	Y	<p>Following this consultation, Hornsea Three has confirmed that the Oulton Airfield will be used as the Main Construction Compound.</p> <p>We are in close contact with Vattenfall at all levels of the project in relation to their proposed Norfolk Vanguard and Norfolk Boreas projects; we liaise on environmental consents, communications, stakeholder engagement, technical aspects etc., so it's not just one point of contact for both businesses. We are of course paying extra attention to where the proposed projects may cross in terms of the underground cables, as we recognise that, if both projects are built simultaneously, coordinating construction works will minimise disruption. Additionally, we are in close consultation regarding any areas where there could be potential for cumulative impacts to arise as a result of both developments to ensure we progress the projects appropriately and sensitively.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, it is important to note that Norfolk Vanguard is a project with its own technical and environmental characteristics and constraints, and is subject to a separate DCO process.</p>
CPRE Norfolk	We attach the CPRE Norfolk response to the further documentation. We make some comments on the onshore changes, and do with reference to the maps provided. To make these clearer, we attach the Spring and Autumn editions of the RGCG Newsletter, which refer to two recently restored farmland ponds, and their location, under the heading of Map 2 again. Reference: 1078116-s201721-1758282	N	Noted, responses provided to individual comments.
Michael and Felicity Walmsley	Following the meeting for Parish councillors at Bawburgh Golf Club we have considered the three routes for the cables, to pass Church Farm BArns, Little Melton. The best route that we would absolutely support would be the third option - the blue route. This takes the cables a good way from our barns. However we would support the original route if it went through the middle of the field a good distance from the barns. We would definitely not support the second route which would closely border our property.	Y	As set out in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives, the alternate option has been taken forward by Hornsea Three (shown in blue on the consultation documents). This route is shown on the plans which are submitted in support of the DCO application and has been chosen based on a review of technical and environmental constraints as well as community feedback.
Councillor Graham Everett, Broadland District Council	2) The alternative route around Salle appears to be better than the original route, however, I still have concerns around the sensitivity of this whole area, therefore I seek assurances that residents and business concerns are fully addressed, also that the impact on this area is kept to the absolute minimum time period required for the works to be completed with a minimal land area being affected and disrupted.	I	<p>Noted, where sensitive receptors are located in close proximity to the onshore cable corridor, the Project will ensure that sensitive construction management measures, such as noise, dust and traffic control are considered. These are documented in an outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), which accompanies the DCO application.</p> <p>During the design refinement Hornsea Three has sought to minimise the duration of any disruption, and has reduced the total duration of the construction phase onshore to eight years. Within this, the maximum duration for construction of the onshore cable corridor is approximately 2.5 years, this therefore means that the maximum duration over which construction could occur would be 5.5 years incorporating two phases (assuming a three-year gap between the two phases). The work associated with each phase is expected to progress along the Hornsea Three onshore cable corridor with a typical active construction works duration of three months at any particular location.</p>
D & J Perry-Warnes	Further to correspondence which we receive from yourselves from time to time and to a report this week in the local paper (Eastern Daily Press) it occurred to ourselves that our Unit [REDACTED] which has 5 modern livestock buildings (building 4 and 5 being erected this year and the first three erected three years ago) and which site your proposed cable will run along side will actually go across two of our fields (enclosed is a copy of your plan sent to us with [REDACTED] marked and our plan showing the buildings) you may be able to utilize our livestock buildings for your purposes i.e. to house storage batteries and/or your Relay Station if the proposed site at Edgefield proves difficult to get approval on. Our site might not be in the right position for your purposes but if you think it maybe a viable option we would be happy to discuss it with you.	N	This alternative was considered by the project, but it is not suitable for the booster site in terms of location along the route or available space.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>3</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
John Walmsley	I would like to state my complete support for the alternative rout outlined on map7 in you further consultation document. If this route were taken on the far side of the lake as opposed to being adjacent to our property, [REDACTED] if it would be a huge relief to me and my wife. I imagine also welcomed by the occupants of The Stewards Cottage whose property the prior alternative route would have gone straight through although of course I cannot speak for them. I sincerely hope the new alternative route on map 7 is chosen Yours Michael and Felicity Walmsley	Y	As set out in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives, the alternate option has been taken forward by Hornsea Three (on the opposite site of the lake). This route is shown on the plans which are submitted in support of the DCO application and has been chosen based on a review of technical and environmental constraints as well as community feedback.
Tim Prail	I am referring to the recently circulated further statutory consultation documents: in them you set out proposed access routes. I am the chairman of Swannington with Alderford and Little Witchingham Parish Council, but I write this in a personal capacity. I refer specifically to the access route proposed off of Hall Road Alderford (NR9 5NF). Hall Road is a narrow country lane which has a 7.5 tonne weight limit. The narrowest point of the road is exactly where you have proposed to put the access. Directly opposite the access point is a high brick retaining wall which making it impossible to turn large vehicles into the proposed route. I am the owner of the property opposite this access, hence writing in a personal capacity. Two hundred metres to the east you have proposed another access route, going through the same meadow, off of the Reepham Road. This does not have the constraints of the Hall Road proposal. I suggest that the Reepham Road access be used and not the Hall Road one. I have discussed this issue with the owner of the meadows affected, Edward Jones of Harold Jones Farms, who agrees that this is the sensible thing to do.	I	Hall Road is proposed as an access point for Hornsea Three, as is Reepham Road, although the latter is proposed only for HDD monitoring. The access constraints associated with Hall Road are noted and associated impacts addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport. It is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this forms part of the DCO application.
Mervyn Bibb	As I said, we are greatly in favour of wind energy, so we hope that all goes well with the project (hopefully avoiding route 2 – the first alternative proposed that lies immediately adjacent to the gardens of three of our four barns!).	Y	This comment was acknowledged by Ørsted.  The final onshore cable route avoids route 2 in the vicinity of Little Melton, which originally was the alternative route presented in the Statutory Consultation Plans (Phase 2.A).
Chris Cotton	This is all my personal opinion. I have just read some of the consultation on the hornsea project, and find it quite worrying. The local fishermen are not allowed the drop crab/lobster pots off Cromer/sheringham as they will damage the chalk reef out there. The whole area is an S.A.C., R.A.M.S.A.R, A.O.N.B. etc,etc,etc, and yet if the map and my interpretation is correct, you are going to drag a few cables right through it from north to south and come ashore .What kind of double standards have we got here. Why not bring the cables ashore at Mundesley or Happisburgh in an arc to miss the chalk reef, it is no further , and then a shorter distance to the connection south of Norwich,which will be less disturbance across the land. I see common sence here, or does that not come into the 21st century. Look forward to hearing from you soon	Y	Due to the re-reroute of the Hornsea Three offshore cable corridor in the nearshore environment, there will be no direct impact from cable installation on the Subtidal Chalk feature of the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ. A full assessment of the effects of Hornsea Three on benthic ecology, including on features of designated sites, is presented in volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Subtidal and Intertidal Ecology. Discussions on the effects of Hornsea Three on the qualifying benthic habitats of the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ is presented in volume 5, annex 2.3: MCZ Assessment.
Mr Brian Boydell	RICGR called on 27 November and left a voicemail. He then called again on 12 December at approx. 7pm and spoke to Mr Boydell. Mr Boydell lives very close at [REDACTED] and had seen the consultation on the proposed new access route along Warren Road (Map 2 of the Further Supplementary Information Plans) and inquired about how it would be used and for how long. RICGR explained what type of construction traffic would use it and that it has been designed to avoid coming too close to the residential properties. Mr Boydell was satisfied with the responses and said that he was grateful for both the call and the efforts to minimise disruption on the properties and had nothing further to add to his original verbal conversation at the community consultation events in September.	N/A	The landowner response was noted and no further action was required.
Mervyn and Maureen Bibb	We are writing to comment on the alternatives proposed for the cable route close to Church Farm Barns in Little Melton as detailed in your Map 7 (attached, together with an expanded version of the area around the dwellings). [SEE ATTACHED PLAN] For clarity, we refer to the originally proposed north-eastern route as route 1, the first alternative that runs adjacent to the gardens of three of the barns as route 2, and the more recent second alternative route to the south-west (shown in blue on your map) as route 3.	N	Noted, responses provided to individual comments.
Mervyn and Maureen Bibb	Route 3 - we have no objections to this proposed route.	Y	Noted, this is the option taken forward by Hornsea Three.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>3</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Mervyn and Maureen Bibb	Route 2 - we are vehemently opposed. The 80 metre corridor would run immediately adjacent to the gardens of [REDACTED], which are used regularly by all three resident families, including eight children and seven grandchildren (11 years and under). In addition to the disruption caused during construction, and while recognising that the proximity of the planned installation falls within current guidelines, it is not inconceivable that there may be some deleterious biological/developmental effect of long term exposure to low levels of electromagnetic radiation (we also note that Ørsted has not yet complied with the request of Little Melton Parish Council to respond to the proposal by George Strong that the company has markedly under-estimated the extent of the resulting electromagnetic field). Given these uncertainties, we believe that it is irresponsible to consider installing multiple high voltage cables in such close proximity to residences, particularly those with so many young children, when there is a viable alternative (Route 3). Moreover, although we understand that Ørsted is not aware of any detrimental impact of the installation of high voltage cables on the market value of properties located in close proximity, the company has not provided any evidence to support this view. Given that such installations have been in existence for some time, we believe that it is incumbent on the company to provide the data to support their contention. It is not acceptable to simply say that it is not aware of a negative impact on property prices. While there may be no logical reason for such an installation to have a detrimental effect on the market value of nearby residential property, public perception does not always follow logic.	Y	This option has not been taken forward by Hornsea Three based on community feedback, as well as technical and environmental constraints including for example, close proximity to Listed Buildings. Further information is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives.
P.M. Head on behalf of Thickthorn Residents (1992) Ltd	You are presumably aware of the Highway Agency's proposals for a road crossing the Norwich Road near us as a consequence of the alterations to the Thickthorn Roundabout.	N/A	Hornsea Three confirmed that it is aware of these proposals.
<b>Section 48: Duty to publicise</b>			
No comments were received in response to the Public Notice relating to the Site Selection Process under Phase 2.B.			

Table 3.5: Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Focused Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.C) relating to the Site Selection Processes.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>4?</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 42: Prescribed consultees (The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009: Schedule )</b>			
Bidwells on behalf of Edward Christopher Evans-Lombe & Great Melton Farms Ltd	Further to the email received from Orsted Hornsea Project Here on 12th February 2018 with the attached web link to the interactive map, I write with further comments on behalf of my clients, on a without prejudice basis as follows: Edward Christopher Evans-Lombe [REDACTED] We note that access to the working width is still via the mail drive to Algarsthorpe Farmhouse and, bearing in mind the comments we submitted in our representation on 20th December 2017, can we please discuss the practicalities of how this will work.	N	The access along the track to Algarsthorpe Farm is required in order to access the area to the south of the River Yare in relation to the proposed HDDs under the adjacent woodland and river. Where possible, access will be taken to these areas from the public roads either side of the section of the route in order to avoid impact to the users of this track. Once a construction contractor is appointed and prior to commencement of the work it is suggested a meeting is held on site to assess the potential traffic interference here and how this can be managed.
Bidwells on behalf of Edward Christopher Evans-Lombe & Great Melton Farms Ltd	We note and support the proposed HDD for the route immediately south of the Bawburgh-Marlingford Road and the wood immediately west of Algarsthorpe Farmhouse. Would it be possible to HDD the intervening section (not open cut) so that the full length of the route from the Bawburgh-Marlingford Road to the south of the wood is installed by HDD, particularly bearing in mind that the HDD plant will already be on site.	N	The suggested HDD would be over 500m in length raising technical concerns, especially given the proximity to the River Yare and wet land either side. There is also a slight bend in the route here which, although not impossible to achieve, would add further complexities to the HDD, in addition to the change in topography leading down towards the river. At this stage of the project, it is too early to commit to a complete HDD of this section given there is suitable land available to support two shorter HDD's.

<sup>4</sup> Y = Yes change made; N = No change made; I = Incorporated into or considered when producing the assessment or landowner voluntary agreement offer; N/A = Not applicable.



<p>Bidwells on behalf of Charles Watt</p>	<p>Charles Jonathan Watt [REDACTED]</p> <p>As referred to in the representation submitted on 20th December 2017, we note that one of proposed accesses to Mr. Kemp's land still leads off the Norwich Road directly opposite the Lodge - Clearly a traffic hazard which would lead to traffic using the Lodge drive as a run off area which is totally unacceptable. We, therefore, request that this access route in not used.</p> <p>Please come back to me if any further explanation on the above points or if a site meeting is required</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Response noted. An alternative access route into the field in question has been added following receipt of earlier feedback. The proposed access in question remains as an alternative option, should this be required, with the western access being the preferred point of entry.</p>
<p>Bidwells - On behalf of Benjamin Goodfellow and Philip Day</p>	<p>Benjamin Robert Goodfellow [REDACTED] and Philip George Day [REDACTED] (Map 5 of 6)</p> <p>The proposed Potential Access Route (New) is approved in principle but may involve moving the Anglian Water monitoring Kiosk and also cross the manholes that give access to the balancing tank situated beneath the proposed access. We request a site meeting to agree the exact route as soon as possible.</p> <p>We assume that the alternative route cooured purple on the plan across the meadows will no longer be required - can this be confirmed?</p> <p>Christopher Bond would be prepared to meet on site with Orsted representatives to address individual client concerns.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Both routes shown will remain as options, with the more recently added southern option being the preferred point of entry. Hornsea Three has suggested that a meeting takes place on site once a construction contractor has been appointed and prior to work commencing in order to discuss and agree any specific details relating to this access. Should any amendments to the existing Anglian Water assets be required, Hornsea Three will liaise with them accordingly.</p>
<p>Savills - (Jane Kenny) on behalf of Church Farm (Booton)</p>	<p>I am writing on behalf of our client [REDACTED] who are landowners affected by the third consultation "Focused Statutory Consultation". There has been no discussion with our client or us as agents, with regards to access point across the holding from the road to the onshore cable route corridor. In addition the appropriate notification of this change via a S.42 has not been received by our client or us as agent. Our client notes the route that you have selected across Church Farm (Booton). This is not acceptable. Our clients preferred route is the original proposal with it extending further south before coming east so that it runs as close as possible to the boundaries to minimise the impact on the croppable area of the fields. I have attached a plan showing this route hatched red. The reasons for this are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It is likely the area of woodland the route would pass through will be felled by the time you commence works.</li> <li>2. it will affect less land drains.</li> <li>3. It will avoid the grain store, the associated infrastructure and underground cabling.</li> <li>4. There will be less disruption to farming as it will only affect two arable fields rather than four.</li> <li>5. It will avoid Moor Farm and the associated impact on the occupants.</li> </ol> <p>Th proposed access route is also not acceptable. Our client would like to propose the route that I have marked on the plan colored blue, subject to the proposed access to the north of Marriott's Way being acceptable to the Salle Estate. Please note the track you have selected as an access route is actually a permissive path provided by our client, for the villagers of Reepham to access Marriott's Way.</p> <p>It is also not clear that the road between our clients land to the north and the woodland to the south will be directionally drilled however, this is a requirement and mitigate the disturbance to the area. I have shown yellow on the attached plan.</p> <p>Our client would consider the use of their new access road from Booton by the contractors, if deemed helpful, and on the appropriate terms. I have marked this in brown on the attached plan. It is also proposed a compound has been designated on our clients land. Again this has been down with no consultation / discussions with our client or us as the agent. Our client in not against the compound however before making any commitments needs to understand what it is required for, the visual impact and the length of time required.</p> <p>A meeting to discuss these changes has been requested but we have heard no further. I trust you find this self - explanatory but should you have any queries please do not hesitate to contact me otherwise we look forward to having the opportunity to meet and discuss these changes at your earliest convenience. In the meantime please can you acknowledge safe receipt of this email.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>The notices issued to your respective clients, as consultation on the access and cable route amendments referred to, were done so via contact addresses on record and to which earlier correspondence has been sent with no issues raised. Should these contact addresses be incorrect, we would be grateful if these could be confirmed by providing completed LIQ forms. Copies of S42 notices issued for your clients have since been provided upon request.</p> <p>The objection to the two proposed routes across the landowner's land are noted, despite the eastern option being added to proposals following earlier feedback from the landowner to recent consultation. The new requested alternative route option to the west would run adjacent to residential receptors and listed buildings, in addition to Booton Common SSSI. The existing eastern route option would not have any direct impact on access to Moor Farm, whereas a western alternative route could impact the road to Moor Farm if the cables were installed here by direct burial. This route would also avoid the landowner's new barn development and would not impact the associated infrastructure.</p> <p>The suggested possible use of the landowner's new access road off Church Road is noted and appreciated. The temporary compound mentioned would be required for the temporary storage of materials and equipment to assist with the cable route construction and also the two proposed adjacent Horizontal Directional Drills (HDDs).</p>

**Section 42: Local Authorities (prescribed under section 43 of the Act)**

No comments were received from the local authorities relating to the Site Selection Process under Phase 2.C.

Section 42: Persons with an interest in the land (prescribed under section 44 of the Act)			
Bidwells (Christopher Bond) on behalf of Edward Christopher Evans-Lombe & Great Melton Farms Ltd	<p>Further to the email received from Orsted Hornsea Project Here on 12th February 2018 with the attached web link to the interactive map, I write with further comments on behalf of my clients, on a without prejudice basis as follows: Edward Christopher Evans- [REDACTED] &amp; Great Melton Farms Limited, [REDACTED].</p> <p>We note that access to the working width is still via the mail drive to Algarsthorpe Farmhouse and, bearing in mind the comments we submitted in our representation on 20th December 2017, can we please discuss the practicalities of how this will work.</p>	N	The access along the track to Algarsthorpe Farm is required in order to access the area to the south of the River Yare in relation to the proposed HDDs under the adjacent woodland and river. Where possible, access will be taken to these areas from the public roads either side of the section of the route in order to avoid impact to the users of this track. Once a construction contractor is appointed and prior to commencement of the work it is suggested a meeting is held on site to assess the potential traffic interference here and how this can be managed.
Bidwells (Christopher Bond) on behalf of Edward Christopher Evans-Lombe & Great Melton Farms Ltd	We note and support the proposed HDD for the route immediately south of the Bawburgh-Marlingford Road and the wood immediately west of Algarsthorpe Farmhouse. Would it be possible to HDD the intervening section (not open cut) so that the full length of the route from the Bawburgh-Marlingford Road to the south of the wood is installed by HDD, particularly bearing in mind that the HDD plant will already be on site.	N	The suggested HDD would be over 500m in length raising technical concerns, especially given the proximity to the River Yare and wet land either side. There is also a slight bend in the route here which, although not impossible to achieve, would add further complexities to the HDD, in addition to the change in topography leading down towards the river. At this stage of the project, it is too early to commit to a complete HDD of this section given there is suitable land available to support two shorter HDD's.
Bidwells (Christopher Bond) on behalf of Charles Watt	<p>Charles Jonathan Watt, [REDACTED].</p> <p>As referred to in the representation submitted on 20th December 2017, we note that one of proposed accesses to Mr. Kemp's land still leads off the Norwich Road directly opposite the Lodge - Clearly a traffic hazard which would lead to traffic using the Lodge drive as a run off area which is totally unacceptable. We, therefore, request that this access route in not used.</p> <p>Please come bac to me if any further explanation on the above points or if a site meeting is required</p>	N	Response noted. An alternative access route into the field in question has been added following receipt of earlier feedback. The proposed access in question remains as an alternative option, should this be required, with the western access being the preferred point of entry.
Bidwells (Christopher Bond) - On behalf of Benjamin Goodfellow and Philip Day	<p>Benjamin Robert Goodfellow, [REDACTED] and Philip George Day, [REDACTED] (Map 5 of 6)</p> <p>The proposed Potential Access Route (New) is approved in principle but may involve moving the Anglian Water monitoring Kiosk and also cross the manholes that give access to the balancing tank situated beneath the proposed access. We request a site meeting to agree the exact route as soon as possible.</p> <p>We assume that the alternative route couored purple on the plan across the meadows will no longer be required - can this be confirmed? Christopher Bond would be prepared to meet on site with Orsted representatives to address individual client concerns.</p>	N	Both routes shown will remain as options, with the more recently added southern option being the preferred point of entry. Hornsea Three has suggested that a meeting takes place on site once a construction contractor has been appointed and prior to work commencing in order to discuss and agree any specific details relating to this access. Should any amendments to the existing Anglian Water assets be required, Hornsea Three will liaise with them accordingly.
Savills - (Jane Kenny) on behalf of Church Farm (Booton)	<p>I am writing on behalf of our client, [REDACTED] who are landowners affected by the third consultation "Focused Statutory Consultation". There has been no discussion with our client or us as agents, with regards to access point across the holding from the road to the onshore cable route corridor. In addition the appropriate notification of this change via a S.42 has not been received by our client or us as agent. Our client notes the route that you have selected across Church Farm (Booton). This is not acceptable. Our clients preferred route is the original proposal with it extending further south before coming east so that it runs as close as possible to the boundaries to minimise the impact on the croppable area of the fields. I have attached a plan showing this route hatched red. The reasons for this are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It is likely the area of woodland the route would pass through will be felled by the time you commence works.</li> <li>2. it will affect less land drains.</li> <li>3. It will avoid the grain store, the associated infrastructure and underground cabling.</li> <li>4. There will be less disruption to farming as it will only affect two arable fields rather than four.</li> <li>5. It will avoid Moor Farm and the associated impact on the occupants.</li> </ol> <p>Th proposed access route is also not acceptable. Our client would like to propose the route that I have marked on the plan colored blue, subject to the proposed access to the north of Marriott's Way being acceptable to the Salle Estate. Please note the track you have selected as an access route is actually a permissive path provided by our client, for the villagers of Reephams to access Marriott's Way.</p>	N	<p>The notices issued to your respective clients, as consultation on the access and cable route amendments referred to, were done so via contact addresses on record and to which earlier correspondence has been sent with no issues raised. Should these contact addresses be incorrect, we would be grateful if these could be confirmed by providing completed LIQ forms. Copies of S42 notices issued for your clients have since been provided upon request.</p> <p>The objection to the two proposed routes across the landowner's land are noted, despite the eastern option being added to proposals following earlier feedback from the landowner to recent consultation. The new requested alternative route option to the west would run adjacent to residential receptors and listed buildings, in addition to Booton Common SSSI. The existing eastern route option would not have any direct impact on access to Moor Farm, whereas a western alternative route could impact the road to Moor Farm if the cables were installed here by direct burial. This route would also avoid the landowner's new barn development and would not impact the associated infrastructure.</p> <p>The suggested possible use of the landowner's new access road off Church Road is noted and appreciated. The temporary compound mentioned would be required for the temporary storage of materials and equipment to assist with the cable route construction and also the two proposed adjacent Horizontal Directional Drills (HDDs).</p>

	<p>It is also not clear that the road between our clients land to the north and the woodland to the south will be directionally drilled however, this is a requirement and mitigate the disturbance to the area. I have shown yellow on the attached plan.</p> <p>Our client would consider the use of their new access road from Booton by the contractors, if deemed helpful, and on the appropriate terms. I have marked this in brown on the attached plan. It is also proposed a compound has been designated on our clients land. Again this has been down with no consultation / discussions with our client or us as the agent. Our client is not against the compound however before making any commitments needs to understand what it is required for, the visual impact and the length of time required.</p> <p>A meeting to discuss these changes has been requested but we have heard no further. I trust you find this self - explanatory but should you have any queries please do not hesitate to contact me otherwise we look forward to having the opportunity to meet and discuss these changes at your earliest convenience. In the meantime please can you acknowledge safe receipt of this email.</p>		
<b>Section 47: Duty to consult local community</b>			
John Hurst (copied in Lady Ann Prince-Smith - Landowner on route)	<p>For the reasons above it is in my opinion (having lived here for over thirty years) a very unsuitable site and the storage compound would be better suited on the other side of the A1067 on land off the Street as this can be accessed from the old A1067 which can be accessed from both directions from the new A1067. If this is not possible for any reason, you are already showing two construction and storage compounds to the south and west of Ringland Lane at Weston Longville and it would be better to rely on these two areas which are situated on dry land and which will be much easier to reinstate. I have photographs of the winter's flooded road which I can send to you if you wish.</p>	N	<p>The other proposed storage areas mentioned (towards Weston Longville) will still be required, and have been identified mainly due to additional areas potentially required for soil and material storage, due to the height restrictions under the existing overhead electricity tower line. There is also a proposed storage area to the north of The Street which has been identified mainly to support the proposed HDD under the River Wensum and adjacent meadows.</p>
<b>Section 48: Duty to publicise</b>			
No comments were received in response to the Public Notice relating to the Site Selection Process under Phase 2.C..			

### 3.3 Policy

Table 3.6: Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.A) relating to Policy.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>5</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 42: Prescribed consultees (The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009: Schedule 1)</b>			
Norfolk Vanguard	<p>We note that Hornsea 3 has chosen to voluntarily comply with The Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 ("the 2017 Regulations"), where "this is possible". We would like to understand any limitations imposed by the 2017 Regulations and any areas (if any) where it has not been possible to comply with them.</p>	N	<p>Within the Policy and Legislation Chapter (Environmental Statement, volume 1 chapter 2) information is provided stipulating how the 2017 regulations have been considered.</p>
Holt County Division	<p>One resident has raised a concern with me relating to potential security implications with so much energy being brought ashore in one location.</p>	N	<p>The infrastructure of Hornsea Three will be secured in accordance with established standards, with specific measures developed during the detailed design phase.</p>

<sup>5</sup> Y = Yes change made; N = No change made; I = Incorporated into or considered when producing the assessment or landowner voluntary agreement offer; N/A = Not applicable.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>5</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
<p>River Glaven Conservation Group (RGCG) and CPRE Norfolk</p>	<p>The 2008 Core Strategy of North Norfolk District Council refers to the importance of the North Norfolk Chalk rivers at Policy EN 9 on Biodiversity, and has a six page appendix B devoted to the ecological network, thanks to the good acceptance of the input of the Norfolk Wildlife Trust. In our view however the importance of this is still underplayed in the national planning system, in which there is a lack of connectivity. The planning system compartmentalises landscape and wildlife; and in wildlife there is a separation between habitats and species. There is a lack in consideration of the overall importance of the ecological network and how it embraces the component parts.</p> <p>Clearly Dong Energy has to evaluate impacts and mitigation options arising from their development within the existing planning framework. However we would hope that Dong might be 'ahead of the game', and provide an overlay on the importance of the ecological network, and this might influence how they assess the effects and impacts' significance in the range from negligible to minor, and moderate adverse to major adverse. If that is a step too far in the present Environment Impact Assessment framework, then still apply in practice to what is considered to be appropriate mitigation measures to be taken, and do all possible to apply the best possible.</p> <p>We could add further in support of this that the compartmentalisation extends to considering each impact event and fails to assess the cumulative impact across the whole length of the project. To put it crudely but illustrate the point, there is a need to completely avoid the potential territory of death by a thousand cuts and backfill. So we urge a 'generous' approach to mitigation measures all along the cabling route, especially where it is within an important ecological corridor.</p> <p>The most important mitigation technique is the use of horizontal direct drilling, but at present the Glaven headwaters are only in the 'second league' of sites. We fully realise that Hornsea Project Three is a complex, massive and expensive project; and that open trench will be the norm, and that there is no transmission loss by cabling up a hill rather than going through by direct drill. We are of course aware also that the cabling route is designed to avoid sites of the highest nature conservation (and identified farmland ponds). We ask however that the use of HDD is given careful consideration in aquatic based an ecological network; and where there are important features such as hedgerows, woodland strips and meadows of wildlife value, In the context we add that it may be up to a decade between start and finish of the whole project and all cut and backfill work is completed.</p>	<p>I</p>	<p>Potential impacts which remain on ecological receptors are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation. This assessment considers the interactions between the project and ecological receptors, and is informed by the relationship between hydrogeology, hydrology and water-dependant habitats which are described in the Hydrological Characterisation Note which forms Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 2.4. This approach was discussed and agreed with the onshore ecology expert working group which comprised Natural England, the Wildlife Trust, Environment Agency and the RSPB amongst others.</p> <p>Impacts from Hornsea Three on ecological and hydrological features, including hedgerows, trees (including woodlands) and sensitive watercourses has been avoided where possible through commitments to use trenchless technologies such as Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD). Further details are provided in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation as well as the Outline Ecological Management Plan which form part of the DCO application.</p>
<p>River Glaven Conservation Group (RGCG) and CPRE Norfolk</p>	<p>COMMENTS ON ECOLOGY AND NATURE CONSERVATION:</p> <p>3.2.15: We note that the PEIR assessment is based on the wider 200 m wide onshore cable corridor search area which includes the proposed locations for the onshore HVAV booster station and onshore HVDC converter/HVAC substation. The final 80 m wide cable corridor construction area (60 m wide permanent cable corridor) will continue to be refined before being confirmed in the final DCO. It is anticipated that a number of potential impacts identified through this assignment will be mitigated or removed, through the refinement of the onshore cable corridor, particularly where the onshore cable corridor search area currently crosses designated sites. We comment: This 'wriggle room' might be particularly useful for avoiding impact on the restored (and those yet to be restored) farmland ponds in the upper Glaven, proving to be important as a key link in the ecological network.</p> <p>3.3.1.4, Table 3.1, Field surveys undertaken and associated survey area: We note in this list in particular the comments on hedgerows, white-clawed crayfish, great crested newt, bats, otters and water voles. All present in the upper Glaven, see attached Ecological Network document.</p> <p>3.9.1.3 and Table 3.11; and 3.9.2.2 and Table 3.12: We note the impact assessment criteria and definition of terms relating to the sensitivity of the receptor, and the magnitude of the impact. We comment: we agree with the hierarchy order of importance and sensitivity of an international designation (very high), national designation (high), county or regional level (medium), district level (low) and local level (negligible). We comment: BUT this is part of the compartmentalisation issue as all on a wider basis might be part of an ecological corridor, have in that sense a greater importance than when done in isolation. In the refinement and mitigation stage of the cabling route this needs to be taken into account.</p> <p>3.10.1.3 and Table 3.14: We welcome the design measures adopted in selecting a cabling route. In particular as a Valued Ecological Receptor (VER) features such as ponds and Local Wildlife Sites (LWSs); these have been avoided where possible; likewise standard trees. Also as a pre-construction measure the surveys of ponds; where a trenchless installation across a water course will be undertaken where water voles,</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Impacts on protected species as well as associated habitats are included within Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation. This assessment considers the interactions between the project and ecological receptors, and is informed by the relationship between hydrogeology, hydrology and water-dependant habitats which are described in the Hydrological Characterisation Note which forms Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 2.4. This approach was discussed and agreed with the onshore ecology expert working group which comprised Natural England, the Wildlife Trust, Environment Agency and the RSPB amongst others.</p> <p>Hornsea Three has committed to use HDD at all EA main rivers and a majority of tributaries. A full list of crossing, and the methodologies proposed are provided in Environmental Statement volume 4, annex 3.5: Crossing Schedule (onshore).</p> <p>It is noted that since the PEIR, refined route at landfall has been identified (western re-route around Kelling) and the area identified for landfall works has reduced. This was informed by a number of factors including community feedback in the area of Kelling and Weybourne, avoidance of the Kelling Heath SSSI/CWS and Holiday Park as well as engineering/technical considerations.</p> <p>Appropriate mitigation measures for visual disturbance are outlined in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources. This includes, for example, the restoration of habitats (including hedgerows) which cannot be avoided and landscape planting around the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.</p>



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>5</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>Desmoulin's whorl snail, white-clawed crayfish and/or otters have been recorded. On construction methods that the landfall cable installation may be by trenchless method beneath Weybourne Cliffs SSSI, we assume by HDD.</p> <p>Table 3.14 continued to page 38: There are two lists where measures to minimise the potential for pollution incidents, and options for trenchless installation. The first lists places where they are identified, seven in all and include the rivers Wensum, Tud and Bure, and associated water bodies. The second list of four locations are being considered and may be identified following the completion of species survey, and include Kelling Heath SSSI and River Glaven head waters and tributaries. We urge that these should be 'promoted'. The first because heather is difficult if not impossible to regenerate following an open cut and backfill; it forms part of an area where much effort has been taken to restore heathland also at nearby at Salthouse, Wiveton Downs and Holt Lowes. There is an impact on Landscape as well as species, and in addition to being much walked they are part of the North Norfolk tourism 'offer'. On the Glaven headwaters, and at the risk of repeating a mantra, we would argue for the central role in the ecological corridor, and that the numbers of protected species would out-compete the other three rivers, albeit not well recognised,</p> <p>3.11.1.3/3.11.1.4: Weybourne Cliffs are mentioned again, and notes that they are designated SSSI for its geological features, and about 1.8 ha of the land falls within the Ecology and nature conservation area. We comment: this is helpful reminder of in depth on one topic but segregation of others, including landscape and tourism interests. On a specific point, the sand martin colony does need checking ahead of construction. After many years of being located under the Coastguard Cottage, some 3-4 years ago they moved to about 1 km to the east.</p> <p>3.11.1.5: Kelling Heath returns with a statement that 5.2 ha of heathland habitat falls inside the onshore cable corridor, which is 5.2% of the SSSI. Then we have: Although restoration would be put in place, restoration of heathland is not guaranteed and can take many years to succeed. In addition the maximum design scenario would involve three separate trenching operations over an 11 year period, and it is considered that heathland restoration would not succeed except potentially in the very long term given the repeat disturbance that would result in this scenario. We comment, and make some general points here: Much effort has been put in to extend precious habitat, such as heathland, and we should not be reversing his by knocking lumps off in some places. Further the EIA 'system' rightly takes a view as a safety net that the impact of a maximum dimension should be considered as a scenario. However an 11 year vacuum in many situations would be ruinous, not least by some pernicious weeds (as defined by Defra) such as thistles; but also invasive plant species such as Himalayan Balsam, which on the Glaven the RGCG spend much time seeking to eradicate. There is also a major issue on many and various individual sites of sediment run-off. Should you wish to visit and area already badly affected by Himalayan Balsam, then visit the Wensum or Bure; the same applies there for arable run-off, and near extinction of the white-clawed crayfish. The EU Habitat Regulations state that a development for a river such as the SAC Wensum should not make matters worse than the already are. The same principle should apply to our other Chalk Rivers. The Water Directive Framework seeks to improve the ecology status of all our rivers, those affected by the development are described as moderate condition, except the Bure classified as poor.</p> <p>There are other paragraphs that we have 'marked up', but to comment would become repetitive and unnecessary as regards ecology and nature conservation; and some have appeared in the N-TS section. For this and the Landscape Chapter we will respond again at the next consultation step, and in addition likely to submit further information on the Glaven for species and habitats in the context of the ecological network.</p>		
<b>Section 42: Local Authorities (prescribed under section 43 of the Act)</b>			
<i>No comments were received from the local authorities relating to Policy under Phase 2.A.</i>			
<b>Section 42: Persons with an interest in the land (prescribed under section 44 of the Act)</b>			
<i>No comments were received from persons with an interest in land relating to Policy under Phase 2.A.</i>			
<b>Section 47: Duty to consult local community</b>			

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>5</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
David and Julie Brooks	What is the total cost of Hornsea Project 3 and how is this being paid for – presumably in extra tariffs on fuel bills. What subsidy rate will be paid to DONG Energy for this project?	N	<p>Hornsea Project Three is being developed by Ørsted (formerly DONG Energy). Headquartered in Denmark, Ørsted is the global leader in offshore wind power, with over 25 years of experience developing, constructing and operating offshore wind farms.</p> <p>The subsidy regime in which Hornsea Three would be brought forward is not currently known as this has yet to be confirmed by the government, this would be determined post-consent.</p>
Ray & Diane Pearce	<p>Cumulative Effects Assessment: There will be a cumulative effect from the Hornsea Three cables crossing the Vanguard and Boreas cables. The cumulative effects of co-locating up to 54 high voltage cables, carrying up to 6 GW of electrical energy, should not be underestimated and the PEIR does not address the environmental issues. Notwithstanding the potential cumulative EMF, the PEIR Volume 4 Annex 5.1, only acknowledges that there are other projects in 'Planning Application'; this is despite acknowledgement from Dong Energy that there have been specific discussions with Vattenfall regarding their projects. These discussions have purposefully not been included in the PEIR.</p> <p>By its own admission, the PEIR should discuss the cumulative impact of projects, plans and activities with which Hornsea Three may interact. Regarding the crossing point, it is, once again, deficient. We contest that Dong Energy does not have a design proposal for the crossing of the Hornsea three cables with those of Vanguard and Boreas. The PEIR makes it clear that the minimum depth of the cables will be 1.2m and the maximum 2.0m. The significant number of cables and limited depth to which high voltage cables can be buried, before they are unable to efficiently dissipate heat, will have a significant and potentially detrimental impact on the local environment for soils, principle and secondary aquifers, substrates and groundwater, especially regarding thermal effects. Considering the depth and comprehension of the cumulative effects assessment for the off-shore environment, why has the on-shore environment not been afforded the same level of detail in the PEIR? Accordingly, there is a requirement for there to be a coordinated plan which will affect the relative depth of either Dong's cable trench or Vattenfall's, which will have a consequence for the environment.</p> <p>We draw your attention to the Planning Inspectorates directive, as follows: "... the Overarching NPS [National Policy Statement] for Energy (EN-1) paragraph 4.2.5 states that: 'When considering cumulative effects, the ES [Energy Supplier] should provide information on how the effects of the applicant's proposal would combine and interact with the effects of others already in existence'."</p> <p>We contest that the crossing of the Hornsea three cables with the Vanguard and Boreas cables, will have detrimental effects on the environment, the ecology, the population and potentially human health (see EMFs). However, most importantly, there will be a cumulative effect. Astonishingly, the PEIR states that the overall effect will be solely be from the Hornsea Three cables, and, have graded the environmental impact of the cables as "minor adverse".</p>	I	<p>The potential for impacts arising as a result of Hornsea Project Three to combine with other planned developments (including the Vattenfall projects) is assessed in each respective topic chapter, under the heading 'Cumulative Effect Assessment'. In relation to geology and ground conditions, the cumulative effect assessment is therefore included in Environmental Statement Volume 3, Chapter 1: Geology and Ground Conditions, section 1.13.</p> <p>This assessment concludes that there are no significant cumulative effects associated with Hornsea Three in combination with other cumulative developments.</p>
Ray & Diane Pearce	<p>Environmental Impact Assessment: The following quote is at PEIR Volume 3, Chapter 11, Paragraph 2.1.6 : "The EIA Directive states that Environmental Statements should include a description of "interrelationships" between environmental aspects likely to be significantly affected by a proposed development. The Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (Paragraph 5) states that "the EIA must identify, describe and assess in an appropriate manner, in light of each individual case, the direct and indirect significant impacts of the proposed development on the following factors: a) population and human health; b) biodiversity.....; c) land, soil, water, air and climate; d) material assets, cultural heritage and the landscape; e) the interaction between the factors referred to in sub-paragraphs a) to d)."</p> <p>By omitting the interrelationship of routing the Hornsea Three transmission cables across those of Vanguard and Boreas the conditions of EIA Directive have not been met by the PEIR. We ask that the Planning Inspectorate seriously considers why the crossing point was omitted from the PEIR. Also, why are the discussions between Dong Energy, Vattenfall and National Grid plc regarding nationally significant UK infrastructure projects are not divulged for public scrutiny.</p>	I	<p>As noted in previous comments relating to cumulative effects vs. inter-related effects, Volume 3, Chapter 11: Inter-related effects of the Environmental Statement provides an assessment of the likely effects should the same type of impact affect the same receptor group during each of the three key project phases (i.e. construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning), and therefore have the potential to combine and result in an overall effect of greater significance. It also provides an assessment of the likely effects should multiple impact types occur on the same receptor group (e.g. noise and landscape and visual impacts may affect the same residential properties); impacts may individually be considered insignificant, but when considered together, could amount to a significant cumulative effect. The potential for impacts arising as a result of Hornsea Project Three to combine with other planned developments (including the Vattenfall projects) is assessed in each respective topic chapter, under the heading 'Cumulative Effect Assessment'.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>5</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Elaine Parkinson	<b>Proposal</b> - Understand the need for renewable energy	I	Noted. The need for renewable energy is detailed in government policy which is summarised in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 2: Policy and Legislation.
<b>Section 48: Duty to publicise</b>			
<i>No comments were received in response to the Public Notice relating to Policy under Phase 2.A.</i>			

Table 3.7: Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Further Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.B) relating to Policy.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>6</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 42: Prescribed consultees (The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009: Schedule 1)</b>			
<i>No comments were received from the prescribed consultees relating to Policy under Phase 2.B.</i>			
<b>Section 42: Local Authorities (prescribed under section 43 of the Act)</b>			
<i>No comments were received from the local authorities relating to Policy under Phase 2.B.</i>			
<b>Section 42: Persons with an interest in the land (prescribed under section 44 of the Act)</b>			
<i>No comments were received from persons with an interest in land relating to Policy under Phase 2.B.</i>			
<b>Section 47: Duty to consult local community</b>			
Dale Heaton	3 We need more so called green energy production although there is already a cost to the environment in terms of the manufacture and installations of the turbines and accompanying infrastructure.	N	Noted
<b>Section 48: Duty to publicise</b>			
<i>No comments were received in response to the Public Notice relating to Policy under Phase 2.B.</i>			

<sup>6</sup> Y = Yes change made; N = No change made; I = Incorporated into or considered when producing the assessment or landowner voluntary agreement offer; N/A = Not applicable

### 3.4 Project Description

Table 3.8: Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.A) relating to the Project Description.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>7</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 42: Prescribed consultees (The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009: Schedule 1)</b>			
Weston Longville Parish Council	One of our Parish Councillors, Ruth Goodall, has received the latest communication concerning the consultation for the Hornsea 3 wind farm (dated 25/7/17). On map 7, for the parishes of Morton on the Hill and Weston Longville, the route is marked but also marked is a construction compound. Please can you provide details of what this will consist of, how it will operate, and the numbers of vehicle movement and types of vehicles that will use it. The location on the map is within an existing 7.5t weight restriction order which encapsulates the main village of Weston Longville and the surrounding narrow lanes and we would like to evaluate the impact associated with this when responding to the consultation.	I	The Main construction compound proposed near Weston Longville has not been taken forward to the application. The main construction compound for the project will be located at Oulton Airfield, accessed off the B1149, as detailed in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description
Health & Safety Executive	HSE's land planning advice. Will the proposed development fall within any of HSE's consultation distances? The 3 fixed sites within Hornsea 3 Export Cable Route (ECR) search are: #0649 Bernard Matthews, Weston Green, #3374 Bernard Matthews, Great Witchingham, #3374 Bernard Matthews, North Sire, Great Witchingham. The search area is also crossed by 8 pipelines operated by National Grid. They are: NGG 1720 No 4 Feeder Bacton to Great Ryburgh, NGG 2739 No 27 Feeder Bacton to Kings Lynn, Comp., NGG 1709 No 3 Feeder Bacton to Roudham Heath, NGG1686 Bowthorpe to Drayton, NGG1684 Bowthorpe Supply, NGG1644 Yelverton to East Carleton, NGG1640 Silfield Tee to East Carleton. HSE recommends that the applicant contacts National Grid to discuss up to date information on pipeline location, as the applicant is advised not to rely solely on the information in this response in establishing where encroachment on pipelines could occur.	I	Response noted. Hornsea Three has engaged with relevant asset owners to confirm existence of assets within the onshore cable corridor (as appropriate). Onshore crossings are identified, along with the crossing methodologies proposed, in the Onshore Crossing Schedule which forms part of the DCO application.
Plumstead Parish Council	There is concern as to the working hours of the project in practical terms and how long is it proposed that the overall scheme will take?	I	Proposed working hours are set out in the outline CoCP which forms part of the DCO application. The outline CoCP is a 'living' document that will be updated as required post submission of the DCO application, during the Examination Period following more detailed engagement with stakeholders and post examination by way of instruction of the Examining Authority and Secretary of State.  In terms of the duration of the construction phase for the whole scheme, Hornsea Project Three could be built out in up to two phases. There are various possible reasons for phasing including constraints in the supply chain or requirements of the government's Contract for Difference subsidy regime which offshore wind farms currently rely on to secure a price for the electricity produced by a project. It is currently anticipated that the total duration of onshore construction works could be up to eight years, which has reduced from eleven years previously proposed.
Plumstead Parish Council	The working width of the scheme passes close to the occupants of Heath Farm and Range Farm – nuisance and disturbance should be kept to a minimum.	I	Where sensitive receptors are in close proximity to onshore works, the Project will ensure that sensitive construction management measures, such as noise, dust and traffic control are considered. These are documented in an outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), which accompanies the DCO application. Impacts on residential receptors are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement.
Little Melton Parish Council	2.) The PC notes that the magnetic field strength is inversely proportional to the distance from the conductor by a factor of $2\pi$ (circumference of a circle) and that reference fields are measured 1m above ground. Someone working in a field or playing rugby may well have their head closer to the ground than 1m. The PC would like to see the cable buried at least 2m deep where it passes under recreational land (including the Parochial Charity land, which potentially may be used for allotments and the growing of fruit trees).	I	Noted. Further information on EMF can be found in Environmental Statement, volume 4, annex 3.3: EMF Compliance Statement.

<sup>7</sup> Y = Yes change made; N = No change made; I = Incorporated into or considered when producing the assessment or landowner voluntary agreement offer; N/A = Not applicable



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>7</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
River Glaven Conservation Group	We welcome the decision to choose the Barningham site as the preferred site for a booster station. We welcome the decision to set aside the Hempstead and Pond Hills sites for Booster stations having chosen the least damaging one at Barningham, but would still strongly prefer an HVDC option with no booster station all. Is there a feasibility study to be produced on the HVDC options?	I	As noted in previous comments, there is a certain level of confidence in the UK wind industry that HVDC technology will become more mature before Hornsea Project Three will connect, but there is currently no certainty. Therefore, committing to solely HVDC now could restrict or even prevent the development of the project in the future if we do not see the necessary developments in the market. We may well eventually choose to opt for HVDC transmission technology; however, it is considered that to only seek a consent (planning permission) for such a technology (and excluding HVAC) at this time could make the eventual Project unbuildable and/or unprofitable.  Due to current uncertainty, a decision on which transmission system to adopt will not be made until post consent after extensive engagement with potential systems suppliers has taken place. This will be informed by a feasibility study.
River Glaven Conservation Group	The PIER describes screening assessments for a booster station, but I think doesn't comment on any need for tree planting to screen it from nearby visual impact. Again background noise assessment is made. At what point can it be possible to judge the incremental effect of a booster station on noise and indeed light pollution? This information may be hidden within the depths of the PIER- or be produced later. We will attend the consultation dates and be able to ask more but answers to the above would be appreciated.	I	During design refinement, visual screening has been proposed for the HVAC booster station to minimise impacts. Indicative proposals are shown within the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.  An assessment of both construction and operational noise impacts associated with the onshore infrastructure (including the HVAC booster station) is provided within Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 8: Noise and Vibration. Details of the baseline noise surveys which have been undertaken to inform the noise assessment are presented within Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 8.1: Baseline Noise Survey.  During construction noise and light pollution would be controlled through appropriate design and construction management measures documented in the outline Code of Construction Practice which forms part of the DCO application. In respect to lighting, site lighting at the HVAC booster station will only operate when required and will be directional to avoid unnecessary illumination.
Maritime & Coastguard Agency	Construction scenarios MCA would like to see continuous construction which is progressive across the wind farm with no opportunity for two separate areas to be constructed with a gap in the middle.	I	Comment noted. The project has assessed a phased approach within all chapters of the Environmental Statement including volume 2, chapter 7: Shipping and Navigation, with the assessment allowing for build out in one or two phases.
Trinity House	I can confirm that Trinity House is satisfied with the PEIR, the contents of which have been noted.	N	Noted
Trinity House	However, our concerns remain over the structural design of the substations, as well as their locations and also the proposed layout of the array of wind turbines. We would of course welcome the earliest of consultation on these matters once further details become available.	I	A post PEIR meeting was held between Hornsea Project Three and Trinity House where details as the worst case layout taken into the assessment and intended location of substation and search area for HVAC booster stations was presented

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>7</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Whale & Dolphin Conservation	<p>Potential impacts</p> <p>Volume 1 Chapter 3 of the PEIR 'Project Description' describes the various foundation types being considered for Hornsea 3. We are pleased to see that a number of options are open for consideration. However, we are concerned to see that foundations requiring piling are included, in particular monopiles. Pile driving, even with the use of pin piles, has the potential to cause physical harm, as well as displacement.</p> <p>Reactions to the pile driving process for wind development have been recorded at distances up to 15 km from the piling site (Carstensen et al., 2006). Thomsen et al. (2006) found that the noise generated by the construction of offshore wind farms was loud enough to be audible by harbour porpoises beyond 80 km from the source and could mask communication at 30 – 40 km. Bottlenose dolphins could exhibit behavioural responses at distances of up to 40 km from pile driving locations (Bailey et al., 2010).</p> <p>A paper analysing foraging rates in harbour porpoise found that they feed almost continuously to meet energy needs and are therefore highly sensitive to disturbance (Wisniewska et al., 2016). Given the importance of the Hornsea 3 area and the cSAC for harbour porpoise, most likely as prime foraging areas, displacement from the area could be very significant.</p> <p>Due to the sensitivity of harbour porpoises to noise disturbance, the location of Hornsea 3 to the Southern North Sea cSAC and that alternative foundations are available that have significantly less noise impact, we strongly recommend that foundations requiring piling are removed as an option for Hornsea 3.</p>	I	<p>The Applicant notes the WDC position on use of monopile foundations, and recognises that it is a position they adopt industry wide and therefore, not unique to Hornsea Three. As WDC are aware there is a balance that needs to be struck between adopting a restricted design envelope and retaining technical and commercial flexibility. Based on the outcomes of this assessment the Applicant does not consider such stringent envelope refinement (which could fundamentally affect the project's viability) is merited. The Applicant points the WDC to those embedded measures that it has committed to (as presented in Section 4.10 of Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 4: Marine Mammals) to reduce the potential underwater noise effects on marine mammals.</p>
Norfolk County Council	<p>Electricity Supply Issues</p> <p>2.12 It is felt that DONG Energy should:</p> <p>(a) pursue a HVDC solution where economically viable in order to minimise the onshore environmental impacts arising from the proposal;</p> <p>(b) Work with National Grid and UK Power Networks to consider options regarding the potential to feed electricity into the local transmission networks to assist, for example, with the electricity needs along the A 11 (T) corridor; and</p> <p>(c) Continue to work closely with other offshore windfarm developers to minimise any onshore impacts arising from their development</p>	I	<p>We address each of your points in turn:</p> <p>As noted in previous comments, there is a certain level of confidence in the UK wind industry that HVDC technology will become more mature before Hornsea Project Three will connect, but there is currently no certainty. Therefore, committing to solely HVDC now could restrict or even prevent the development of the project in the future if we do not see the necessary developments in the market. We may well eventually choose to opt for HVDC transmission technology; however, it is considered that to only seek a consent (planning permission) for such a technology (and excluding HVAC) at this time could make the eventual Project unbuildable and/or unprofitable. Due to current uncertainty, a decision on which transmission system to adopt will not be made until post consent after extensive engagement with potential systems suppliers has taken place. This will be informed by a feasibility study. It should also be noted that HVAC does not always result in the maximum design scenario, for example an HVDC converter station is expected to be a greater height than the HVAC substation.</p> <p>The transfer from the National Grid to the local network, or the capacity of the local transmission network is beyond the projects control. Orsted understands UK power networks has demand feeder connections at Norwich Main which already supply the local area with power. Therefore any power produced by Hornsea Three and injected into Norwich Main 400kV substation, will feed into both local demand (through these feeders) and the National transmission system, as this is the nature of electrical interconnection.</p> <p>Cumulative effects which may arise from Hornsea Three in combination with other planned developments are assessed in individual topic chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3). Hornsea Three has and will continue to work with Vattenfall in relation to potential interactions</p>
Norfolk County Council	<p>Socio-Economic Issues</p> <p>2.16 The County Council strongly encourage, on economic development grounds and supporting the Norfolk economy, DONG Energy to use the Port facilities at Great Yarmouth for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction; assembly and manufacture of windfarm components; and</li> <li>• operations and maintenance.</li> </ul>	N	<p>We will certainly explore the ability to use port facilities along the East Coast. We are likely to use more than one port during construction, and cannot yet ascertain where we would site an operations and maintenance base. A decision on which port to use will not be made until detailed discussions have taken place with potential suppliers, at a stage where we have a greater understanding of where the various components will come from and port capabilities. This will likely be post consent.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>7</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Norfolk County Council	<p>Local Member Views</p> <p>2.39 The Local County Councillor for Melton Constable has made the following comments:</p> <p>2.40 There is generally little opposition to these proposals in absolute terms and local residents appreciate the importance of national infrastructure and securing future energy supply;</p> <p>2.41 There are concerns about the lack of mitigating measures planned in respect of the onshore HVAC Booster Station; and</p> <p>2.42 The Local Member strongly urges the County Council to insist that the developers provide detailed mitigating measures as part of their submission in respect of: height, visibility and noise – relating to the HVAC booster station at Little Barningham.</p>	I	<p>Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts to local residential receptors, either through site selection/route refinement (see Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives) or through the identification of suitable mitigation measures. Where there are impacts to residential receptors, these are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3).</p> <p>Appropriate mitigation measures relating to the onshore HVAC booster station are also identified in the relevant topic specific chapters. For example, visual disturbance impacts and associated mitigation are outlined in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources. This includes, for example, the restoration of habitats (including hedgerows) which cannot be avoided and landscape planting around the HVAC booster station to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.</p>
Norfolk Vanguard	<p>We note that the approach being taken on the assessment is to take forward alternative options for both HVAC and HVDC solutions. We would welcome further discussions with the Hornsea 3 team on this matter to allow a co-ordinated approach.</p>	N	<p>Discussion between Hornsea Project Three and Vattenfall Vanguard have occurred on a regular basis throughout the pre-application phase.</p>
Planning, South Norfolk Council	<p>4) How will the impact of installing the cables be minimised?</p>	I	<p>Through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive ecological receptors. For example, Weybourne Cliffs and Kelling Heath SSSI have been avoided through alternative routes and no direct impacts are predicted on these designated sites from Hornsea Three. Additional mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project are outlined in topic specific chapters, and include the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts on local road networks, ecological receptors (e.g. hedgerows) and hydrological features (e.g. main rivers). These measures are identified in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3).</p>
Royal Mail/BNP Paribas Real Estate UK	<p>1. More information should be provided in the ES that is submitted in support of the DCO application on the locations of all the onshore infrastructure elements, details of how and when these infrastructure elements will be constructed, the resultant traffic impact during the construction phase and the mitigation measures that are required. This information should be supported by a TA with an appropriate traffic model.</p>	I	<p>Information relating to the location of onshore infrastructure, construction programme and construction methodology is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description.</p> <p>Impacts relating to access are addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport, with mitigation measures identified where relevant. A transport assessment accompanies the assessment, presented in Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 7.1: Transport Assessment.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>7</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Eastern Inshore Fisheries and Conservation Authority	<p>Policy CAB 1</p> <p>The East Marine Plans Policy states that 'preference should be given to proposals for cable installation where the method of installation is burial'. The PEIR documentation (Volume 1, Chapter 3.6.9.) states that the cable will typically be buried between 1-2m depth and where the cable cannot be buried cables will be secured using armoring, such as rock, mattress or proprietary separation layer, to maintain integrity. This is not in keeping with the East Marine Plans policy and efforts should be made to minimise the length of cable that will require armoring. Additionally, previous requests to use armoring in The Wash and North Norfolk Coast SAC have not been consented by Natural England and the MMO. Armoring cable instead of cable burial can have increased adverse effects on the environment but also on fishing activity. For example, the presence of the export cable if not buried can result in snagging of fishing gears, a significant safety implication particularly for the small vessels operating in this area, and thus could permanently exclude fishing activities from the area. Until the cable route has been decided and the proportion and location that require armoring have been determined, the potential impacts cannot be accurately assessed. In general the need for armoring occurs when cable crossings are required or in the presence of harder sediments, further supporting the requirement for the cable route to avoid the rock and chalk features within the offshore cable corridor.</p> <p>The PEIR documentation (Volume 2, Chapter 2.11.2.19) describes that whilst the creation of hard substrate from cable protection will have long-term adverse effects on existing local biological communities, it is also associated with increases in biodiversity and provision of habitat resulting from the formation of 'artificial reefs'. Although to some extent EIFCA agree with this, communities associated with hard substrates tend to include long-lived, and slow growing species, taking many years to colonise and become established. Any benefits that they may provide will be highly localized and need to be considered against the loss of existing habitat. Consideration also needs to be made to the disturbance and removal of any subsequently established communities during the decommissioning phase of the development.</p>	I	<p>The East Marine Plans Policy does indeed allude to a preference for cable burial but Hornsea Three note that this is a preference rather than a necessity. It will not always be possible to bury cables depending on the nature of the sediment (albeit it is possible to bury cables in chalk) and hence other methods are considered and form part of the Project envelope. Further refinements have been made to the project envelope in relation to cable protection, as detailed in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description.</p> <p>Comments relating to the removal of epifaunal communities associated with hard substrate during decommissioning are noted and assessed in paragraph 2.11.3.28 et seq. of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology in the Environmental Statement.</p>
Great Yarmouth Borough Council	<p>Policy CS6 of the adopted Great Yarmouth Core Strategy states that port related development proposals will be supported by encouraging a greater presence of higher value technology and energy-based industries in the Borough. It is, therefore, welcomed that Great Yarmouth is acknowledged as having the greatest potential to benefit from the proposed development given our supply chain capacity and capability. Great Yarmouth is the centre for the offshore energy industry in England, with a 50 year history of supporting the offshore oil and gas industry and the burgeoning offshore wind sector. The port of Great Yarmouth is currently involved in the construction of two new windfarms, Galloper and East Anglia 1 and is the operations and maintenance base for the original offshore windfarm at Scroby Sands and Statoil's new Dudgeon Windfarm. Great Yarmouth has developed a wide ranging supply chain of local companies to support the oil, gas and offshore wind sectors.</p>	N	Acknowledged.



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>7</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Broadland District Council	The District Council requests that further detailed investigations and assessments are undertaken in respect of: - The alternative underground cable route to the west of Salle Park as shown in the 'Phase 2 Statutory Consultation Plan' if this becomes part of the proposed route, plan attached. - The additional temporary construction compound identified at Oulton Streen as shown in the 'Phase 2 Statutory Consultation Plan' if this becomes part of the proposed route, plan attached.	I	The Hornsea Three onshore cable corridor has been subject to rerouting since the production of the PEIR and now passes 110 m from Salle Park at its nearest point, thus avoiding any effect on the relationship between the church and Salle Park. An assessment of impacts on heritage assets is provided in Environmental Statement, volume 3, chapter 5: Historic Environment.  In respect to the main construction compound at Oulton, Hornsea Three recognises the sensitivity of this location and since its identification as the main construction compound, Hornsea Three has sought to identify measures to minimise any impacts on Oulton village, local residents and the local road network. In this regard, where properties are located in close proximity to the Oulton Airfield, the Project will ensure that sensitive construction management measures, such as noise, dust and traffic control are considered. These are documented in an outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), which accompanies the DCO application, as well as the topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3). Furthermore, it is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this also forms part of the DCO application.  Both the alternative route to the west of Salle Park and the construction compound at Oulton are now considered throughout the Environmental Statement (volume 3)
Broadland District Council	It is understood that the length of the build programme is still to be finalised and in respect of the construction programme for the onshore export cables this could be up to 6 years in total, if more than a single phase build out programme is utilised. In the District Council's opinion a 6 year build programme would have very serious implications for the local tourism and agricultural economies. Further details in this respect, together with how the impacts will be mitigated are requested and the applicant is asked to liaise with relevant landowners to minimise the impact of the extended construction programme.	Y	During the design refinement Hornsea Three has sought to minimise the duration of any disruption, and has reduced the total duration of the construction phase onshore to eight years. Within this, the maximum duration for construction of the onshore cable corridor is approximately 2.5 years, this therefore means that the maximum duration over which construction could occur would be 5.5 years incorporating two phases (assuming a three-year gap between the two phases). The work associated with each phase is expected to progress along the Hornsea Three onshore cable corridor with a typical active construction works duration of three months at any particular location.  Impacts on agricultural farm holdings, socio-economics and tourism are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapters 6: Land Use and Recreation and chapter 10: Socio-Economic respectively. Where appropriate, mitigation measures have also been identified within these chapters to minimise potential impacts.
The Wildlife Trust (joint response from Norfolk WT and TWT)	3.2. Report to Inform the Appropriate Assessment (RIAA): Southern North Sea cSAC Table 3.2 indicates that floating turbines are being considered as part of the design envelope. An assessment against entanglement should be undertaken for the Southern North Sea cSAC and also be included in the EIA marine mammals chapter. It is stated in 3.4.4.26 that if floating turbines are used, anchors to secure mooring lines could be secured by piles. Please could figures be provided on the potential hammer energy required for installing anchor piles for floating turbines.	Y	Floating turbines are no longer within the design envelope and therefore, this comment is no longer relevant.
Holt County Division	Construction Three phases The potential that this project could be built out over three phases raises serious concerns, many of which have been addressed above. Whilst it is understood this is out of the hands of DONG and a result of government processes, it must surely be in the interests of DONG as much as the residents along the construction path for this to be consolidated into a single plan. Economically and environmentally this makes so much more sense.	Y	During the design refinement Hornsea Three has sought to minimise the duration of any disruption, and has reduced the total number of phases to two and the duration of the maximum timeframe over which construction could occur onshore to eight years (noting that this would not be 8 years of continuous construction in any one area). An indicative construction schedule for the project as a whole is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>7</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Holt County Division	Whilst accepting that HVDC is an emerging technology, we understand that HVDC has already proven more effective in underwater transmission systems over long distances; particularly in distances over 50km. From associated background research, it would also appear to offer other substantial financial and environmental advantages – fewer cables are required, and lower power amounts are lost over transmission distances; not to mention the savings by not building the booster stations. This being the case why are DONG still asking for both options to be considered? This is a landmark project due to its size, all the more reason for DONG to build on its green credentials and invest in technology that protects the environment and communities they work in, as well as providing clean energy.	I	As noted in previous comments, there is a certain level of confidence in the UK wind industry that HVDC technology will become more mature before Hornsea Project Three will connect, but there is currently no certainty. Therefore, committing to solely HVDC now could restrict or even prevent the development of the project in the future if we do not see the necessary developments in the market. We may well eventually choose to opt for HVDC transmission technology; however, it is considered that to only seek a consent (planning permission) for such a technology (and excluding HVAC) at this time could make the eventual Project unbuildable and/or unprofitable.  Due to this uncertainty, a decision on which transmission system (HVDC or HVAC) to adopt will not be made until post consent after extensive engagement with potential systems suppliers has taken place. As a result of this, we have conducted our assessments based on a realistic worst-case scenario, which could be either HVDC or HVDC technology depending on the receptor.
Holt County Division	The size of the project and current government processes, dictate construction is likely to take place in phases over several years, thus potentially causing multiple periods of disruption, which is of great concern to residents. It is essential householders receive binding commitments that the total construction period will be kept to an absolute minimum. (I believe this also endorses the views of High Kelling Parish Council).	I	During the design refinement Hornsea Three has sought to minimise the duration of any disruption, and has reduced the total duration of the construction phase onshore to eight years. A breakdown of the maximum construction durations is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Project Description.
Historic England	Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project Description Section 3.6.4 - a number of options have been presented for the foundations of the turbines, such as monopiles, piled jacket, gravity base etc. Each of these options has different implications for any archaeology present in the area, such as the ground preparation requirements and the need for scour protection. The impact that they may have on the archaeology needs to be considered, in terms of the worst case scenario or reassessed once the foundation types have been selected, so that an appropriate mitigation strategy can be developed.	I	In assessing the effects of Hornsea Three on marine archaeology, the assessment has been undertaken on the basis of i) the greatest area of near-surface sediments disturbed and ii) the greatest penetration depth of foundations (see Environmental Statement section 9.7 of volume 2, chapter 9: Marine Archaeology). These two assessments are undertaken as they have very different effects on the marine historic environment, making it difficult to identify which option can best be said to represent the greatest effect. The assessment therefore considers both the maximum design scenario on seabed features (i.e. maximum seabed footprint), and the maximum design scenario in terms of buried remains (i.e. maximum volume of material disturbed); see Environmental Statement Table 9.8 in Volume 2, chapter 9: Marine Archaeology.
Historic England	Section 3.6.5.2 - We are aware that it has not been decided if the cable system would use HVAC or HVDC technology. This has implications for the number of cables required and how they are arranged. The maximum design scenario for cable diameter, length of cable and voltage carried has been presented in Table 3.21. It is also not yet known how the cable trenches would be excavated as this would be defined post-consent (Section 3.6.5.5). The worst case scenario has been presented in Table 3.25. In our view the historic environment would need to be taken into account when the cable system and installation approaches have been decided so that an appropriate mitigation strategy is developed. This would need to be reflected in a suitably worded WSI, and no pre-commencement works should be undertaken until the WSI is in place and has been agreed. This is similar for the offshore accommodation platforms (Section 3.6.6), Offshore substations (Section 3.6.8), Offshore export cables (Section 3.6.9).	I	The marine archaeology assessment (Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 9: Marine Archaeology) considers the maximum design scenario for cables and foundation (including substation installation). An outline WSI (Environmental Statement volume 5, annex 9.2: Outline Written Scheme of Investigation) has also been prepared and submitted as part of the application. The procedures set out in the Outline WSI are intended to i) identify archaeologically sensitive remains encountered during the development, ii) to avoid them wherever possible and iii) to enable recording of any remains that are directly affected.  The WSI will be monitored and updated throughout the post-consent process to ensure that the scheme of investigation is appropriate to the final project design.
Historic England	The Landfall section (Section 3.6.11) discusses the use of HDD or Thrust Boring in order to bring the cables onshore. It should be noted that internationally significant deposits referred to as the Cromer Forest bed Formation (CF-bF) have been recorded along the Norfolk coast that preserve a range of remains, from large mammal remains such as elephants/mammoths, palaeoenvironmental remains, flint tools and even footprints of early hominids (Homo antecessor). The potential of these deposits and the value of the information that they may hold requires careful considerations to be made about how the archaeology at the landfall site can be evaluated and assessed in order to maximise any opportunities. Likewise there are known to be significant Holocene deposits recorded along the Weybourne cliffs, and these need to be identified and taken mitigated if and where necessary.	I	Environmental Statement Volume 5, annex 9.1: Marine Archaeology Technical Report, provides a baseline review of the known and potential archaeology within the Hornsea Three intertidal area. The impacts from Hornsea Three on known and potential archaeology within the Hornsea Three intertidal area is assessed in section 9.10 of volume 2, chapter 9: Marine Archaeology.
Historic England	In relation to Section 3.6.12 it should be noted that anchorage and jackup/spud legs can damage surface and near-surface archaeology, and that it may be necessary to identify safe areas where vessels can be anchored, and place exclusion zones for archaeology that may be at risk of damage.	I	The comment from Historic England is noted and Archaeological Exclusion Zones (AEZs) (see Environmental Statement volume 5, annex 9.2: Outline Written Scheme of Investigation) are proposed for all high and medium anomalies to avoid direct impacts on sites of identified archaeological significance.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>7</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Marine Management Organisation	2.2. DONG Energy have stated that “Up to four installation vessels may be used, with up to two piling and two drilling simultaneously (paragraph 3.6.4.10, Volume 1, Chapter 3 – Project Description). Clarity should be provided as to whether this is likely to be in one phase or across all three phases of the proposed Project.	I	Further information has been added to the Environmental Statement volume 1 chapter 3 Project Description.
Marine Management Organisation	2.3. The MMO recommends that a ‘Rochdale Envelope’ approach is adopted for the methods used to remove boulders and other seabed obstructions at foundation locations to enable assessment of this element of the project (paragraph 3.6.4.11, Volume 1, Chapter 3 – Project Description).	I	Further information has been added to the Environmental Statement volume 1 chapter 3 Project Description.
Marine Management Organisation	2.4. A disposal site characterisation report will be required to enable the disposal of dredging and drilling spoil adjacent to foundation locations (paragraph 3.6.4.14, Volume 1, Chapter 3 – Project Description). The MMO notes that site characterisation data has been provided as a technical annex to the Report (Volume 4, Annex 3.2 – Dredging and Disposal (Site Characterisation)).	I	A Site Characterisation document has been produced as part of the Environmental Statement at Volume 4 Annex 3.2
Marine Management Organisation	2.5. DONG Energy should review and adhere to the collaborative guidance document produced by the Health and Safety Executive and Maritime and Coastguard Agency entitled, “Regulatory expectations on moorings for floating wind and marine devices” (August 2017). In addition, the MMO requests further information on the proposed floating foundation moorings. Detail such as the maximum anchor size, total area of seabed expected to be covered by floating foundation anchors and the total areas of scour from anchor lines is requested (paragraphs 3.6.4.38 and 3.6.4.40, Volume 1, Chapter 3 – Project Description).	Y	Floating foundations are no longer part of the Project Envelope and therefore this comment is no long relevant.
Marine Management Organisation	2.6. The layout of inter-array cabling has not been described for turbines with floating foundations. The MMO recommends that this element is added to the project description, particularly if floating inter-array cables are being considered. Information is required to allow an assessment of their potential impacts on commercial fishery activities, shipping and navigation (Table 3.22, Volume 1, Chapter 3 – Project Description).	Y	Floating foundations are no longer part of the Project Envelope and therefore this comment is no long relevant.
Marine Management Organisation	2.7. The MMO requests further information on the range of foundation types proposed for the HVAC booster station, which has not been specified in the project description (paragraph 3.6.8.26 and Table 3.34, Volume 1, Chapter 3 – Project Description).	I	Further information has been added to the Environmental Statement Volume 1 Chapter 3 Project Description.
Marine Management Organisation	2.8. The MMO notes that Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD) has been omitted from the potential list of export cable installation techniques (paragraph 3.6.9.7, Volume 1, Chapter 3 – Project Description).	I	Information is included within Environmental Statement Volume 1 Chapter 3 Project Description in relation to the potential use of HDD at landfall. HDD would not be used elsewhere on the offshore export cable route.
Marine Management Organisation	2.9. Clarity is required in the ES as to whether pre-grapnel boulder and unexploded ordnance (UXO) removal have been included in the seabed disturbance figure in the maximum design scenario for offshore export cables installation (Table 3.37, Volume 1, Chapter 3 – Project Description).	I	Further information has been added to the Environmental Statement Volume 1 Chapter 3 Project Description.
Marine Management Organisation	2.10. The MMO requests that clarification is provided in the ES as to what the 50% figure refers to regarding “Sand wave clearance: Contingency - 50%” along the proposed export cable route (Table 3.40, Volume 1, Chapter 3 – Project Description).	I	Further information has been added to the Environmental Statement Volume 1 Chapter 3 Project Description with regards to the rational behind sandwave clearance estimates.
Marine Management Organisation	2.11. The legend in Figure 3.18 – Export Cable Route Corridor at Landfall indicates a temporary working area at Weybourne, however it is not clear from the map as to where the temporary working area is located (page 35, Volume 1, Chapter 3 – Project Description). The MMO also requests that further information is provided on the activities planned within the temporary working area in areas where this is situated seaward of the MHWS tide mark.	I	The temporary working area in the vicinity of the landfall has been refined and can be seen in the works plan (offshore) (Application document reference A.2.4.1). Further information has been added to the Environmental Statement Volume 1 Chapter 3 Project Description.
Marine Management Organisation	2.12. The MMO recommends that further information on the methodology for excavating the proposed HDD exit pits is included within the ES (paragraph 3.6.11.8, Volume 1, Chapter 3 – Project Description).	I	Further information has been added to the Environmental Statement Volume 1 Chapter 3 Project Description.
Marine Management Organisation	2.13. It is unclear from paragraph 3.6.11.11 whether the potential impacts from thrust boring on geology and groundwater features have been considered (Volume 1, Chapter 3 – Project Description).	I	The impacts of HDD operations (akin to thrust boring from an impact perspective) have been considered in the Environmental Statement, Volume 3, Chapter 1: Geology and Ground Conditions.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>7</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Marine Management Organisation	<p>2.14. DONG Energy has identified the potential for repowering of the Project "(i.e. reconstruct and replace turbines and/or foundations with those of a different specification or design)" at the end of its intended 25 year design life (section 3.10, Volume 1, Chapter 3 – Project Description). The MMO advises that such activities do not fall under the definition of "upkeep or reasonable improvement" under the 2009 Act and therefore constitute a construction activity. The MMO advises that Section 66 (1)(7) of the 2009 Act states that to alter or improve any works within the marine environment requires a marine licence as highlighted below;</p> <p>(1) For the purposes of this Part, it is a licensable marine activity to do any of the following;</p> <p>(7) To construct, alter or improve any works within the UK marine licensing area either</p> <p>(a) in or over the sea, or</p> <p>(b) on or under the sea bed.</p> <p>The MMO's interpretation of "maintain" is the upkeep, repair or reasonable improvement of the works and the MMO do not consider "reconstruct" and "replace" to fall within the definition of "maintain" in line with Article 19 of the Marine Licensing (Exempted Activities) Order 2011 (no. 409).</p> <p>The PEIR does not assess offshore construction throughout the entire operational period and any activities under the current definition which have not been assessed within the ES will require a separate marine licence. In addition, certain projects and plans may have been scoped out of the Cumulative Impact Assessment due to the lack of temporal overlap which would need to be considered in marine licence applications for activities within the Project's operational period.</p>	N	This comment is acknowledged. Should repowering be considered outside the current envelope, additional consents will be sought as required.
Marine Management Organisation	<p>2.15. DONG Energy is proposing to allow inter-array and export cables and associated cable protection to remain in-situ following decommissioning of the Project (paragraph 3.14.2.6, Volume 1, Chapter 3 – Project Description). The MMO understands that there is no legal requirement to remove such infrastructure from the seabed following expiry of the date of the DCO. The MMO's position remains, however that all infrastructure should be removed from the seabed so that no lasting legacy remains. It is presently unclear who would monitor and rectify any exposed or unburied cables following expiry of the DML(s).</p>	I	This comment is acknowledged. Orsted's position remains that cable protection will be left in-situ following decommissioning.
Marine Management Organisation	<p>1.3. The MMO notes the assumption in the maximum design scenario that up to 10% of the offshore cable corridor may require cable protection where burial is not an option, with protection methods including gravel, concrete mattresses and rock placement (paragraph 3.6.9.8, Volume 1, Chapter 3 – Project Description). The location of cable protection measures has not been specified in the PEIR. The proposed export cable route passes through a number of designated marine protection areas and therefore the significance of the impact of cable protection measures within these locations will be higher than in other areas of the proposed route. It is not currently possible for the MMO to comment on the potential impact of cable protection measures on a range of potential receptors without a clearer indication as to where along the proposed export cable corridor the protection measures are likely to be required.</p>	I	More detail has now been added to the Environmental Statement regarding cable protection and the required amount in designated sites has been revised (see Environmental Statement, Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project Description).
Marine Management Organisation	<p>1.4. The inshore section of the proposed cable corridor passes through the Cromer Shoals Chalk Reef Marine Conservation Zone (MCZ). The MMO notes that the current plan for trenching through subtidal chalk, peat and clay features would result in the permanent loss of a proportion of these features and a change of habitat type, with no potential for recovery (paragraph 2.11.1.16, Volume 2, Chapter 2 – Benthic Subtidal and Intertidal Ecology). The MMO recommends that DONG Energy further explores alternative cable corridor routes which avoid permanent impacts on designated features within the Cromer Shoals Chalk Reef MCZ.</p>	Y	On the basis of the Hornsea Three offshore cable corridor re-route presented in volume 2, chapter 2, Benthic Ecology, direct impacts to subtidal chalk habitats and peat and clay habitats, such as may arise from jack-up operations or cable burial, are no longer predicted to occur as these habitats are not present within the offshore cable corridor.
Marine Management Organisation	<p>2. Project Description</p> <p>2.1. The MMO notes the potential for DONG Energy to construct the proposed Project in three phases (paragraph 3.5.1.7, Volume 1, Chapter 3 – Project Description). DONG Energy should consider how data sources and impact assessments will remain relevant and appropriate over the timescale proposed for the development phases. Monitoring plans should also be designed to reflect the extended construction period in order to assess impacts through each of the Project phases.</p>	I	Following consultation on the PEIR, Orsted has reduced the number of phases to up to two. Phasing is considered throughout the Environmental Statement in forming views on the impacts.



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>7</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
RSPB	<p>Preliminary Environmental Information Report: Volume 1: Chapter 3: Project Description Para 3.6.11.5 – the use of HDD for landfall cable laying would be preferable. Para 3.7.1.6 – The RSPB note the maximum installation duration of 30 months and hope that this will allow for suitable scheduling of works to avoid the most sensitive areas at the points of the year when the relevant receptors are present. Para 3.7.1.8 – Please ensure that measures are put in place to manage any reptiles that may enter the trench whilst it is open. This may be a particular issue around Kelling Heath.</p>	I	<p>At the landfall area, Hornsea Three may use HDD or open trenching from Mean Low Water to the Norfolk Coast Path. A decision on which technique to use will be made during detailed design based on further technical information. The assessments presented in this chapter, and in related chapters assess the maximum design scenario for each particular receptor.</p> <p>Although the installation of the onshore cable is expected to take up to 30 months in total, work is expected to progress along the route with a typical works duration of three months at any particular location (see Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description). As such the duration of activities at the most sensitive areas would be significantly less than the maximum installation duration of 30 months, although the exact timing of impacts would be determined during detailed design. Notwithstanding this, mitigation measures for works in sensitive areas will be employed as appropriate (see Table 3.19)</p> <p>The Outline EMP that accompanies the DCO application contains measures to mitigate impacts on reptiles, including ensuring they are protected from risk of injury or death during cabling works that affect areas of reptile habitat.</p>
National Grid	<p>Gas Transmission National Grid Gas has high pressure gas transmission pipelines and above ground installations (AGI's) within or in close proximity to the onshore scoping area. The transmission pipelines and AGI's form an essential part of the gas transmission network in England, Wales and Scotland: Above Ground Installations: · Little Barning · Felthorpe Gas Transmission Pipelines: · Feeder Main 02 - Bacton to Brisley · Feeder Main 03 - Bacton to Roudham Heath · Feeder Main 04 - Bacton to Gt Ryburgh · Feeder Main 27 - Bacton to Kings Lynn Please find enclosed plans showing the location of National Grid's transmission infrastructure.</p>	NA	<p>Ørsted acknowledged the relevant locations of the gas infrastructure and has been in discussions with National Grid Gas regarding asset interactions.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>7</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
National Grid	<p>The following points should be taken into consideration:</p> <p>Electricity Infrastructure:</p> <p>§ 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</p> <p>§ 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) and also shown in the following National Grid Document: <a href="http://www2.nationalgrid.com/WorkArea/DownloadAsset.aspx?id=6169">http://www2.nationalgrid.com/WorkArea/DownloadAsset.aspx?id=6169</a></p> <p>§ 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.</p> <p>§ 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.</p> <p>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 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> <p>§ 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.</p> <p>§ 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</p> <p>§ 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.</p> <p>§ 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.</p>	NA	Ørsted acknowledged the relevant locations of the electrical infrastructure and has been in discussions with NGET regarding asset interactions.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>7</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
North Norfolk District Council	<p>In respect of point 4) whilst the District Council recognises that DONG Energy may need at this stage to assess the potential of both HVDC and HVAC transmission Council is aware from public comments made through the current public consultation processes in respect of the Hornsea Project Three and other major offshore wind proposals seeking landfall and connections into the National Grid in Norfolk that the public have a strong preference to see HVDC transmission systems adopted. The Council understands that this is because HVDC technology would remove the need for onshore and offshore booster stations to be provided along the route of the export cables between the turbine field and the connection into the National Grid infrastructure, thereby minimising the impact of these developments on communities in North Norfolk once the construction of any cable corridor works were complete. The District Council has therefore prepared its comments on the PIER report based upon the potential of an HVAC transmission system being deployed, but would ask that DONG Energy continue to appraise both options in the hope that the less intrusive HVDC option might be chosen in the final scheme design. Without prejudice to the comments made above, the District Council is carefully following the debate which is taking place over the use by offshore wind development companies of HVAC and HVDC systems and reserves its position in respect of publically lobbying the Government to better understand the difference between the two transmission systems so that the least environmentally damaging option might be taken forward on this and other schemes.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the position outlined above, the District Council values the relationship which has been established with the DONG Energy team in the development of the Hornsea Project Three project proposal over the past 18 months and looks forward to continued dialogue with you in the coming months as the project proposals are refined so as to achieve the best possible outcome for communities in North Norfolk if the proposal receives Development Consent approval through NSIP and the Secretary of State.</p>	I	Due to current uncertainty (see volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives), a decision on which transmission system (HVDC or HVAC) to adopt will not be made until post consent after extensive engagement with potential systems suppliers has taken place. As a result of this, we have conducted our assessments based on a realistic worst-case scenario, which could be either HVDC or HVAC technology depending on the receptor.
Edgefield, Bodham, Corpusty & Saxthorpe, Hemstead and Plusted Parish Councils and others.	<p>We wish to stress that we are not overall opposed to the development of Hornsea 3: only 36% of respondents said they felt it was very important to stop this type of development happening in Norfolk, and 78% said they were generally in favour of alternative energy developments.</p> <p>We have, however, strong concerns about the current proposals that we wish to have heard. Our voices as members of the local community are somewhat powerless in the face of infrastructure projects of this national significance.</p> <p>Responses to the question of whether local feedback would lead to the plans being adjusted were the most varied: only 47.4% felt they would, with a standard deviation of 1.43. We are therefore appealing directly to DONG Energy's company ethics as well as the initial statutory purpose of the Planning Inspectorate in identifying and acting on key issues resulting from this consultation.</p> <p>We believe that each of our concerns can be addressed through appropriate consideration and investment by the developers and we have avoided suggesting anything that is excessively prescriptive or clearly unachievable.</p> <p>We very much hope that our concerns will be taken seriously so that we can support this opportunity to make the UK's future energy supply more sustainable.</p>	N	Noted. Please see responses to particular points raised below.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>7</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Edgefield, Bodham, Corpusty & Saxthorpe, Hemstead and Plusted Parish Councils and others.	<p>2.Prioritising HVDC</p> <p>We understand the significant uncertainties surrounding the proposed development, although we believe the risks to be within the normal range for an engineering project of this scale and the potential profitability of the scheme overall to be within a normal risk threshold for energy generation construction.</p> <p>There is a degree of debate around the merits of DC or AC as the most appropriate transmission technology, about which we lack the specialist knowledge effectively to contribute. It is, however, abundantly clear that High Voltage DC transmission would significantly reduce the deleterious effects of the development overall, and in particular in connection to our local area. It is, we understand, an emergent technology at this industrial level in Europe (see <a href="https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_HVDC_projects#Europe_2">https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_HVDC_projects#Europe_2</a>), and as such could well develop further between the application and the final choice the developers make.</p> <p>We believe it is highly likely that the Secretary of State will grant an order permitting the option for either AC or DC, although we urge them to challenge the developers' claim that there are relatively few examples of HVDC being used for long-distance transmission between generation and the grid. Our research, including the above link, suggests otherwise. We firmly believe that this technology is viable and preferable – even if it has a higher cost and project management risk attached. In subjugating ourselves and the land of which we are custodians to the demands of the UK's energy consumption we would like to be a driver, not a passenger, in progressive technology development. The Hornsea 3 development could contribute significantly to the development of HVDC transmission in other schemes and have a lasting, positive impact on the manner in which energy developments are built with minimal damage to the countryside. We consider it to be DONG Energy's duty to us, and in its commercial interests to use -- and be seen to use -- the best technologies, not just the most tried-and-tested or cost-effective. We therefore urge the developers, and failing that the Secretary of State, to make it a condition that HVDC be explored as the preferred method even if it is more expensive. This could involve a condition being included that requires HVDC to be the transmission method in question so long as it adds no more than an agreed percentage to the onshore cable proportion of the project either in risk or known cost. This would go some way to potentially removing point three below, completely.</p>	I	Due to current uncertainty (see previous responses on this matter), a decision on which transmission system (HVDC or HVAC) to adopt will not be made until post consent after extensive engagement with potential systems suppliers has taken place. As a result of this, we have conducted our assessments based on a realistic worst-case scenario, which could be either HVDC or HVDC technology depending on the receptor.
Marlingford and Colton Parish Council	The Chairman of Marlingford and Colton Parish Council, David Wildon, is very appreciative of Dong Energy's efforts to inform all the relevant parties as to what is involved in the Hornsea Three project. The Parish Council, at its meeting held on September 12th, considered the 200m wide corridor for the cable run through Marlingford. The Council's one concern related to the properties on the Bawburgh Road, in particular, the easternmost dwelling. At the Phase 2 community consultation event that was held on September 12th, in Weston Longville Hall for All, the Chairman was pleased to learn that horizontal drilling was being considered to drill below both the Yare and the Bawburgh Road in one continuous operation. It was also indicated that the final corridor possibly could be somewhat to the east side of the 200m corridor.	Y	Noted. Following consultation on the PEIR, Hornsea Three has committed to a number of points at which HDD will be employed as a means to reduce impacts, particularly on roads and rivers.
Weybourne Parish Council	2. Members are concerned at the consideration DONG Energy is giving to possibly phasing construction works over a period of up to eleven years. This period would have a long term impact on the community and tourism. Any extension from a single phase would be hugely damaging.	Y	During the design refinement Hornsea Three has sought to minimise the duration of any disruption, and has reduced the total duration of the construction phase onshore to eight years. Impacts resulting from the construction phase on socio-economics and tourism are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 10: Socio-Economics.
Swainsthorpe Parish Council	Swainsthorpe Parish Council have the following comments to submit in respect of the statutory consultation: Councillors are concerned at the size of the proposed substation, especially the height.	I	The height of the HVDC converter/HVAC substation will be up to 25 m (as set out in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description). Appropriate mitigation measures for visual disturbance are outlined in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources. This includes, for example, landscape planting around the HVDC converter/HVAC substation to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>7</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Swannington with Alderford and Little Witchingham Parish Council	I am writing to provide input into the consultation process, regarding the proposed route for the cables. Alderford and Hall Road, Alderford The proposed route passes close to several residential properties in Alderford. You have explained through parish councillors' meetings the timescales and digging processes. Parishioners' concerns in particular relate to; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noise and dust/dirt attenuation</li> <li>• Disruption to Hall road and the Reepham Road</li> <li>• The possibility of significant extension of the construction timescales if the project has to be delivered in phases.</li> <li>• Dong identifying all utility cables and pipes, including live privately-owned water pipes</li> <li>• Accessing the construction area from compounds</li> <li>• Local compensation - benefit</li> </ul>	I	Where possible and practicable the cable corridor route selected seeks to avoid passing adjacent to properties. This is to reduce impacts associated with construction disturbance and to seek to minimise conflicts such as Heavy Goods Vehicle (HGV) traffic movements. However, it is not possible to avoid passing in close proximity to all properties on the route. Where properties are located in close proximity, the Project will ensure that sensitive construction management measures, such as noise, dust and traffic control are considered. These are documented in an outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), which accompanies the DCO application.  Potential impacts on residential receptors are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapter (as well as the inter-related effects chapter) contained within Environmental Statement volume 3.
Swannington with Alderford and Little Witchingham Parish Council	Hall Road and Reepham Road: Will the cables be taken under Hall Road and Reepham Road by tunnelling rather than open cutting?	Y	All public roads will be crossed by HDD to minimise impacts on the local road network. This is demonstrated in the plans accompanying the DCO application.
Swannington with Alderford and Little Witchingham Parish Council	Cables and pipes: although Dong should be able to easily identify public utility services, being a rural area there is a likelihood that there are privately-owned pipes near the construction area. How will Dong identify these so as to prevent rupturing these?	N	Hornsea Three review public records to identify existing utilities which may be affect by the project. In respect to those not on the public record, a more detailed utility search would be undertaken during the detailed phase to identify any local supplies.
Natural England	1.5 Natural England notes that the maximum piling duration used in the noise modelling is 4 hours (including the soft start). Natural England advises that on this basis, any piling which exceeds 4 hours would invalidate the noise modelling and would therefore seek confirmation from DONG Energy that this is a realistic worst case scenario. (Volume 1, chapter 3, paragraph 3.6.4.12)	I	The impact assessment has been updated and is presented within the Marine Mammal Chapter (volume 2, chapter 4: Marine Mammals) and Underwater Noise Technical Report.
Natural England	1.6 Natural England assumes that this table only considers construction phase and would like to see the information presented in relation to a phased build scenario. Vessel movements over a long construction window means that depending on the port transiting from there is the potential for interactions with Annex I interest features from designated sites. Therefore we advise that boat operators adopt best practice measures to minimise the potential impacts. This will also be the case for O&M activities. (Volume 1, chapter 3, table 3.7)	I	Best practice measure will be adopted by vessel operators during both construction and operation of the wind farm.
Natural England	1.7 Natural England advises that seabed levelling is minimised within designated sites and that the Deemed Marine Licences include a condition to provide a post consent seabed levelling plan for the array and export cable. (Volume 1, chapter 3, 3.6.4.27)	I	Quantification of the temporary habitat loss/disturbance associated with sandwave clearance within designated sites is provided in The Environmental Statement in Tables 2.19 (North Norfolk Sandbanks and Saturn Reef SAC), Table 2.22 (The Wash and North Norfolk Coast SAC), Table 2.23 Cromer Shoal MCZ) and Table 2.24 (Markham's Triangle rMCZ) and fully assessed in the accompanying text of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology.
Natural England	1.8 The description of seabed preparation for gravity base foundations is lacking any mention of new material introduction onto the seabed, such as gravel or rock dumping into the 'cleared' area to ensure foundation stability. (Volume 1, chapter 3, paragraph 3.6.4.36)	I	With respect to the benthic ecology assessment, all habitat directly within the footprint of the turbine and associated scour protection has been assessed as long term habitat loss in the Environmental Statement in paragraphs 2.11.2.3 et seq of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology.
Natural England	2.3.2 Vol. 1 Chapter 2 – Project Description Table 3.44 The Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD) exit pit dimensions are given at 30 x 50 x 4 m. The section does not explain whether any additional area of seabed would be disturbed or require clearance during preparation works for exit pit excavation. Impacts on both subtidal and intertidal should be considered.	I	HDD has been discussed as a potential construction activity within the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ in the benthic ecology chapter (see the Environmental Statement, volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology), although as discussed in Table 2.14 the maximum design scenario is for open cut trenching rather than HDD and, as such, numbers for temporary habitat loss associated with this activity are not presented within the chapter.  Impacts of HDD exit pits on features of the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ are considered in the Environmental Statement, section 5.1 of volume 5, annex 2.3: MCZ Assessment.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>7</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Natural England	1.9 The use of permanent rock placement around structures should be minimised as much as possible in soft sediment environments. (Volume 1, chapter 3, paragraph 3.6.4.56)	I	The maximum design scenario for scour protection and cable protection is presented in Table 2.14 of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology in the Environmental Statement. Cable protection requirements for Hornsea Three offshore cable corridor will be detailed in the Cable Specification and Installation Plan that will be agreed in consultation with statutory consultees. This document will detail the technical specification of the offshore electrical system, including a cable burial risk assessment or similar, cable protection specification and installation risk mitigation measures.
Natural England	1.10 Natural England would expect the Deemed Marine Licences to include a requirement to submit a finalised cable installation plan based on or as part of the Cable Burial Risk Assessment Plan prior to the commencement of offshore construction. The plan should also be linked to the Scour prevention/Cable protection plan(s). Natural England notes that the option of surface-laying the cable is not mentioned. If this method has been scoped out of the project envelope it would be helpful to provide this clarity within the document. (Volume 1, chapter 3, paragraph 3.6.5.5)	I	The requirement for a Cable Specification and Installation plan is included in the DMLs (application document reference A3.1). The potential for surface laying of cables has not been scoped out and is still included within the project envelope.
Natural England	1.11 Natural England supports sandwave clearance outside of designated sites, because this is preferential to cable burial remedial works involving additional rock placement. A requirement for a sandwave levelling plan should be included in the Deemed Marine Licences or included as part of the bed levelling plan. Full details should also be provided on the disposal of dredged material. (Volume 1, chapter 3, paragraph 3.6.5.9)	I	Details of sandwave clearance would be included in the Cable Specification and Installation Plan that is secured within the DMLs (Application document reference A3.1). Details of the disposal of this material are provided in the Environmental Statement Volume 4, Annex 3.2: Dredging and Disposal (Site Characterisation). It should be noted that it is important for this activity to also be conducted in designated sites as it will increase the chances of successful burial which is understood to be preferential to cable protection.
Natural England	1.12 The amount of rock protection for cable crossings within the array is estimated at 33 600 m2. Please clarify: - The rationale behind the assumption that 10% of the cable will require protection; - The likely parameters for each section of cable protection; - Whether the 25% replenishment during operations is part of or in addition to the construction total. (Volume 1, chapter 3, table 3.24)	I	The rationale behind the assumption of 10% cable protection was discussed during a Marine Processes, Benthic Ecology and Fish Ecology Expert Working Group Meetings in Q4 2017 and Q1 2018. Cable replenishment is in addition to cable protection totals during construction and is considered in Environmental Statement Volume 1: Chapter 3: Project Description.
Natural England	1.13 See comment in point 1.6 above in relation to potential impacts to Annex I interest features whilst transiting to and from installation location. (Volume 1, chapter 3, table 3.25, 3.27)	I	See response to comment 1.6 above.
Natural England	1.14 Information pertaining to the use of scour prevention and/or seabed levelling should be included in the text. (Volume 1, chapter 3, figure 3.16 )	I	Chapter 3 Project Description has been updated to include details relating to scour protection and seabed leveling.
Natural England	1.15 Further details should be provided as it is not clear how the figures included in this table have been derived. Natural England has particular interest in the scour prevention/cable protection as this could have significant environmental impacts depending on the amount and location. Natural England advises that an indicative scour prevention and cable protection plan/s is provided as part of the application. It is unclear whether the area for rock protection stated here includes cable crossings. It appears that cable crossings are assessed separately and the total maximum area of rock protection has not been considered in the report. SNCBs advised through the Evidence Plan process that cable protection/scour prevention would not be acceptable within offshore designated sites. We note that the PEIR gives the worst case scenario of 10% cable protection, and without further information on the locations of the cable crossings or areas where protection will be needed, currently our advice has to be based on that 10% being all within designated sites. Sandwave clearance volume is estimated at 182 086 m3 – it is our view that removal of material at such a large scale may have an impact on the Annex 1 sandbank, the NNSSR cSAC/SCI, sediment budget and dynamics. (Volume 1, chapter 3, table 3.37)	I	Scour and cable protection requirements (including for cable crossings) are detailed in Environmental Statement Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project Description. In addition, the requirement for a Cable Specification and Installation Plan is secured in the DMLs (application document reference A3.1). It is not appropriate to produce a scour prevention and cable protection plan at this point in time. Locations of cable protection cannot be specific until detailed pre-construction surveys have been conducted and in some cases, will change post installation where required burial depth has not been achieved. This was discussed with Natural England at Marine Processes, Benthic Ecology and Fish Ecology Expert Working Group Meetings in Q4 2017 and Q1 2018.  The envelope has been refined following PEIR such that it is clear that not all 10% of the export cable protection would occur within designated sites. This is detailed in Environmental Statement Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project Description.  The impacts of sandwave clearance on the North Norfolk Sandbanks and Saturn Reef SAC is considered in Environmental Statement, volume 2, Chapter 2: Benthic Ecology and the Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment (application document reference A5.2)
Natural England	1.16 As per comments to section 3.6.5.9 above. We note that there are proposals to clear sandwaves within designated sites along the export cable corridor. Please see our comments in Annex 2 Sections 1 and 2 in relation to benthic ecology and marine processes. (Volume 1, chapter 3, paragraph 3.6.9.12 and Table 3.42)	I	Noted. As explained above, it is considered that activities such as sandwave clearance will actually increase the likelihood of successful cable burial which is understood to be preferential to cable protection.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>7</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Natural England	1.17 The Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD) exit pit dimensions are given at 30 x 50 x 4 m. The section does not explain whether any additional area of seabed would be disturbed or require clearance during preparation works for exit pit excavation. Impacts on both subtidal and intertidal should be considered. (Volume 1, chapter 3, Table 3.44)	I	Further information has been added in relation to the potential HDD operations at landfall within Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description
Natural England	1.18 Again vessel movements over a long construction window means that depending on the port transiting from there is the potential for interactions with Annex I interest features from designated sites. Therefore we advise that boat operators adopt best practice measures to minimise the potential impacts. This will also be the case for O&M activities. (Volume 1, chapter 3, paragraph 3.6.12)	I	The updated design envelope has seen a revision to the number of projected vessels associated with the construction and operation of the project. The maximum figures are presented in Table 4.15 of Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 4: Marine Mammals and these have been used to inform the subsequent assessment.
Natural England	1.19 Once the onshore cable corridor has been finalised Natural England will provide further nature conservation advice. (Volume 1, chapter 3, paragraph 3.7.1.2)	N	Noted.
Natural England	1.20 The maximum number of joint bays along the onshore cable corridor is 330 which also requires 330 link boxes. Have implications on hydrology been assessed? (Volume 1, chapter 3, paragraph 3.7.1.2)	I	Impacts on hydrology area assessed within Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 2: Hydrology and Flood Risk, this includes the joint backs and link boxes. These features have also been taken into consideration within the flood risk assessments presented in Environmental Statement volume 6, chapter 2.1: Onshore Infrastructure Flood Risk Assessments.
Natural England	1.21 Construction compounds have been identified as 'temporary' structures. Natural England would like to understand the implication of a phased build and how this may impact on the length of time these structures will be in place. (Volume 1, chapter 3, paragraph 3.7.1.23)	I	It is envisaged that each secondary construction compound will be in place for periods of up to 3 months (per phase), as set out in the Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description.
Natural England	1.22 Natural England advises that the application should include O&M activities in relation to offshore cable replacement and reburial. This would be consistent with other OWF applications. (Volume 1, chapter 3, section 3.9)	I	Further detail on the potential for licensible offshore O&M activities has been added to Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description. These have then been assessed throughout the offshore Environmental Statement chapters where appropriate
Natural England	Annex 1 Key concerns Natural England has a particular interest in the 1 535 001 m2 included for scour prevention as this could have significant environmental impacts depending on the amount and location. Natural England would expect a Scour prevention/Cable protection plan(s) to be provided as part of the application. We would also expect the Deemed Marine Licences to include a requirement to submit a finalised cable installation plan based on or as part of the Cable Burial Risk Assessment Plan prior to the commencement of offshore construction, which should be linked to the Scour prevention/Cable protection plan(s).	I	Environmental Statement in Volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology has been updated with revised project description details for scour and cable protection; the full breakdown of these numbers is presented in the Table 2.14 for long term habitat loss during the operation and maintenance phase, and assessed in paragraphs 2.11.2.3 et seq.  A Scour Protection Management Plan (SPMP) detailing the need, type, sources, quantity, location and installation methods for scour protection will be produced and submitted to the MMO prior to construction.  Cable protection requirements will be detailed in the Cable Specification and Installation Plan which will be produced prior to construction and agreed in consultation with statutory consultees. This document will detail the technical specification of the offshore electrical system, including a cable burial risk assessment or similar, cable protection specification and installation risk mitigation measures.  A Cable Specification and Installation Plan (detailing the technical specification of the offshore electrical system, including a cable burial risk assessment, cable protection specification and installation risk mitigation measures) will be developed prior to construction.  A Scour Protection Management Plan detailing the need, type, sources, quantity, location and installation methods for scour protection and cable armoring will be developed prior to construction.
Natural England	Annex 1 Key concern Natural England advises that the application should include a thorough consideration of O&M activities, especially in relation to offshore cable replacement and reburial. This would be consistent with other OWF applications.	I	The maximum design scenario presented in Table 2.14 of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology has been updated with revised project description details regarding cable maintenance during the operation and maintenance phase. The updated assessment is presented in paragraphs 2.11.2.143 et seq of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>7</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Natural England	<p>1.39 Vol. 4 Annex 3.2 Fig. 1.1 The Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ is excluded from the proposed disposal site area, however, HDD pit excavation will involve placement of material on the seabed. Although this is described as a temporary measure, this could be in place for several years and as such should potentially be considered as disposal site. To minimise the loss of sediment from the offshore sandbank system it is important that disposal of dredged material occurs in the vicinity allowing it to be re-distributed throughout the local environment. Currently the proposed disposal site boundary follows that of the offshore cable corridor. Disposal of material restricted to that area may result in the net loss of material from the NNSSR cSAC/SCI as the sediment is brought outside site boundary by prevailing north-easterly sediment transport. The application should consider disposal of material further south outside the present cable corridor boundary to ensure the loss of sediment from the sandbank system is minimised.</p>	I	<p>In the Environmental Statement, paragraph 2.11.1.86 of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology outlines that material arising from sandwave clearance activities within the MCZ will be deposited within the boundary of the project and at a location that takes into account the net direction of sediment transport in the region to ensure that sediment will not be lost from the sandbank system. This will also be the case for all designated sites where With regards to Marine Processes, It is proposed to extend the disposal site to include the nearshore area and include material placed as part of HDD exit pit excavation. Hornsea Three appreciates the principal of maintaining sediment within the sandbank system. However, our understanding is that it would not be necessary to extend the disposal site in the way suggested in order to achieve this aim. Hornsea Three is happy to discuss with further with Natural England. Dredging and disposal is also considered within Environmental Statement volume 4, annex 3.2: Dredging and Disposal (Site Characterisation)</p>
Natural England	<p>1.40 Vol. 4 Annex 3.2 2.2.1.3 'a 5 m thick layer of top sediment with a diameter of 61 m may have to be excavated before installation of GBFs. However, based on initial site surveys, it is expected that the average thickness of the dredged layer will be up to approximately 2 m, depending on GBF design.' The above statement confirms that the worst case scenario of removal of 5 m of sediment as seabed preparation has not been assessed. We would like to see additional evidence to support the choice of 2 m as a realistic worst case scenario and the provision of examples of gravity base foundations (GBFs) already installed elsewhere (i.e. Blyth Offshore Demonstrator Project).</p>	I	<p>Additional information has been provided to support the justification of the worst case scenario for removal of sediment for seabed preparation at turbine locations. Please see the Environmental Statement, Volume 4, Annex 3.2 - Dredging and Disposal: Site Characterisation.</p>
Natural England	<p>1.41 Vol. 4 Annex 3.2 2.2.4.4 It is unclear why The Wash and North Norfolk SAC has not been included.</p>	I	<p>HOW03 acknowledge this and have ensured that this is now included.</p>
Natural England	<p>1.42 Vol. 4 Annex 3.2 Table 5.1 A number of impacts listed does not refer directly to the proposed activity of 'disposal of spoil'. The table needs to be re-written to make sure the impacts identified refer to this activity. For example, 'Marine Processes – Removal of sandwaves impacting sandbank systems within proximity to the Hornsea Three array area and offshore cable corridor.' The above impact would not result from disposal of spoil but from bed preparation activities. The potential impact from disposal could include: loss/input of sediment into a sandbank system as a result of disposal activities. 'Subtidal Benthic Ecology – Temporary habitat loss/disturbance due to cable laying operations (including anchor placements), spud-can leg impacts from jack-up operations and seabed preparation works for GBFs, may affect benthic ecology.' The above impact is unlikely to result from disposal activities, unless the hopper barge needs to anchor in the area of disposal.</p>	I	<p>As described in the Environmental Statement in volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology, due to the depth of sediment deposition associated with disposal activities (e.g. GBS seabed preparation and sandwave clearance) this has been considered temporary habitat loss as many benthic species will most likely suffer mortality beneath these areas.</p>
Natural England	<p>Annex 1 Key concerns We note that the maximum piling duration that is used in the noise modelling is 4 hours, including the soft start. Natural England would like to seek confirmation from DONG Energy that this is a realistic worst case scenario as any piling which exceeds 4 hours would invalidate the noise modelling.</p>	I	<p>The impact assessment has been updated and is presented within the Marine Mammal Chapter (Volume 2, Chapter 4; Marine Mammals) and Underwater Noise Technical Report</p>



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>7</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Natural England	1.3 It would be useful if the table explained how the numbers were derived, i.e. '342 turbines with gravity bases of X m2 area + Y m2 area of associated bed preparation'. Natural England has a particular interest in the 1 535 001 m2 included for scour prevention as this could have significant environmental impacts depending on the amount and location. Natural England advises that an indicative scour prevention and cable protection plan/s is provided as part of the application. (Volume 1, chapter 3, paragraph )	I	In the Environmental Statement, Table 2.14 of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology has been updated to include a breakdown of the habitat loss (temporary and long term) numbers. A Scour Protection Management Plan (SPMP) detailing the need, type, sources, quantity, location and installation methods for scour protection will be produced and submitted to the MMO prior to construction. Cable protection requirements will be detailed in the Cable Specification and Installation Plan which will be produced prior to construction and agreed in consultation with statutory consultees. This document will detail the technical specification of the offshore electrical system, including a cable burial risk assessment or similar, cable protection specification and installation risk mitigation measures.
Natural England	1.4 Natural England notes that monopole installation may take 30 months in total for turbines. Further information should be provided as to whether or not this is anticipated to be a 'consecutive 30 months' as well as the implications of a phased build scenario. (Volume 1, chapter 3, paragraph 3.6.4.10)	I	Further detail on the phased build scenario has been added to Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description.
Visned	<b>Export Cable</b> - As long as cables are and stay sufficiently buried and will not be exposed, VisNed has no further comments on the offshore export cable corridor.	I	Noted. See Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description for details of the cable burial methods proposed as well as details of operation and maintenance activities to ensure cables remain buried.
<b>Section 42: Local Authorities (prescribed under section 43 of the Act)</b>			
Norfolk County Council	Electricity Supply Issues 2.12 It is felt that DONG Energy should: (a) pursue a HVDC solution where economically viable in order to minimise the onshore environmental impacts arising from the proposal; (b) Work with National Grid and UK Power Networks to consider options regarding the potential to feed electricity into the local transmission networks to assist, for example, with the electricity needs along the A 11 (T) corridor; and (c) Continue to work closely with other offshore windfarm developers to minimise any onshore impacts arising from their development	I	We address each of your points in turn:  As noted in previous comments, there is a certain level of confidence in the UK wind industry that HVDC technology will become more mature before Hornsea Project Three will connect, but there is currently no certainty. Therefore, committing to solely HVDC now could restrict or even prevent the development of the project in the future if we do not see the necessary developments in the market. We may well eventually choose to opt for HVDC transmission technology; however, it is considered that to only seek a consent (planning permission) for such a technology (and excluding HVAC) at this time could make the eventual Project unbuildable and/or unprofitable. Due to current uncertainty, a decision on which transmission system to adopt will not be made until post consent after extensive engagement with potential systems suppliers has taken place. This will be informed by a feasibility study. It should also be noted that HVAC does not always result in the maximum design scenario, for example an HVDC converter station is expected to be a greater height than the HVAC substation.  The transfer from the National Grid to the local network, or the capacity of the local transmission network is beyond the projects control. Orsted understands UK power networks has demand feeder connections at Norwich Main which already supply the local area with power. Therefore any power produced by Hornsea Three and injected into Norwich Main 400kV substation, will feed into both local demand (through these feeders) and the National transmission system, as this is the nature of electrical interconnection.  Cumulative effects which may arise from Hornsea Three in combination with other planned developments are assessed in individual topic chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3). Hornsea Three has and will continue to work with Vattenfall in relation to potential interactions
Norfolk County Council	Socio-Economic Issues 2.16 The County Council strongly encourage, on economic development grounds and supporting the Norfolk economy, DONG Energy to use the Port facilities at Great Yarmouth for: • Construction; assembly and manufacture of windfarm components; and • operations and maintenance.	N	We will certainly explore the ability to use port facilities along the East Coast. We are likely to use more than one port during construction, and cannot yet ascertain where we would site an operations and maintenance base. A decision on which port to use will not be made until detailed discussions have taken place with potential suppliers, at a stage where we have a greater understanding of where the various components will come from and port capabilities. This will likely be post consent.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>7</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Norfolk County Council	<p>Local Member Views</p> <p>2.39 The Local County Councillor for Melton Constable has made the following comments:</p> <p>2.40 There is generally little opposition to these proposals in absolute terms and local residents appreciate the importance of national infrastructure and securing future energy supply;</p> <p>2.41 There are concerns about the lack of mitigating measures planned in respect of the onshore HVAC Booster Station; and</p> <p>2.42 The Local Member strongly urges the County Council to insist that the developers provide detailed mitigating measures as part of their submission in respect of: height, visibility and noise – relating to the HVAC booster station at Little Barningham.</p>	I	<p>Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts to local residential receptors, either through site selection/route refinement (see Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives) or through the identification of suitable mitigation measures. Where there are impacts to residential receptors, these are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3).</p> <p>Appropriate mitigation measures relating to the onshore HVAC booster station are also identified in the relevant topic specific chapters. For example, visual disturbance impacts and associated mitigation are outlined in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources. This includes, for example, the restoration of habitats (including hedgerows) which cannot be avoided and landscape planting around the HVAC booster station to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.</p>
Planning, South Norfolk Council	4) How will the impact of installing the cables be minimised?	I	<p>Through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive ecological receptors. For example, Weybourne Cliffs and Kelling Heath SSSI have been avoided through alternative routes and no direct impacts are predicted on these designated sites from Hornsea Three. Additional mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project are outlined in topic specific chapters, and include the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts on local road networks, ecological receptors (e.g. hedgerows) and hydrological features (e.g. main rivers). These measures are identified in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3).</p>
Great Yarmouth Borough Council	<p>Policy CS6 of the adopted Great Yarmouth Core Strategy states that port related development proposals will be supported by encouraging a greater presence of higher value technology and energy-based industries in the Borough. It is, therefore, welcomed that Great Yarmouth is acknowledged as having the greatest potential to benefit from the proposed development given our supply chain capacity and capability. Great Yarmouth is the centre for the offshore energy industry in England, with a 50 year history of supporting the offshore oil and gas industry and the burgeoning offshore wind sector. The port of Great Yarmouth is currently involved in the construction of two new windfarms, Galloper and East Anglia 1 and is the operations and maintenance base for the original offshore windfarm at Scroby Sands and Statoil's new Dudgeon Windfarm. Great Yarmouth has developed a wide ranging supply chain of local companies to support the oil, gas and offshore wind sectors.</p>	N	Acknowledged.
Broadland District Council	<p>The District Council requests that further detailed investigations and assessments are undertaken in respect of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The alternative underground cable route to the west of Salle Park as shown in the 'Phase 2 Statutory Consultation Plan' if this becomes part of the proposed route, plan attached.</li> <li>- The additional temporary construction compound identified at Oulton Streen as shown in the 'Phase 2 Statutory Consultation Plan' if this becomes part of the proposed route, plan attached.</li> </ul>	I	<p>The Hornsea Three onshore cable corridor has been subject to rerouting since the production of the PEIR and now passes 110 m from Salle Park at its nearest point, thus avoiding any effect on the relationship between the church and Salle Park. An assessment of impacts on heritage assets is provided in Environmental Statement, volume 3, chapter 5: Historic Environment.</p> <p>In respect to the main construction compound at Oulton, Hornsea Three recognises the sensitivity of this location and since its identification as the main construction compound, Hornsea Three has sought to identify measures to minimise any impacts on Oulton village, local residents and the local road network. In this regard, where properties are located in close proximity to the Oulton Airfield, the Project will ensure that sensitive construction management measures, such as noise, dust and traffic control are considered. These are documented in an outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), which accompanies the DCO application, as well as the topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3). Furthermore, it is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this also forms part of the DCO application.</p> <p>Both the alternative route to the west of Salle Park and the construction compound at Oulton are now considered throughout the Environmental Statment (volume 3)</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>7</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Broadland District Council	It is understood that the length of the build programme is still to be finalised and in respect of the construction programme for the onshore export cables this could be up to 6 years in total, if more than a single phase build out programme is utilised. In the District Council's opinion a 6 year build programme would have very serious implications for the local tourism and agricultural economies. Further details in this respect, together with how the impacts will be mitigated are requested and the applicant is asked to liaise with relevant landowners to minimise the impact of the extended construction programme.	Y	During the design refinement Hornsea Three has sought to minimise the duration of any disruption, and has reduced the total duration of the construction phase onshore to eight years. Within this, the maximum duration for construction of the onshore cable corridor is approximately 2.5 years, this therefore means that the maximum duration over which construction could occur would be 5.5 years incorporating two phases (assuming a three-year gap between the two phases). The work associated with each phase is expected to progress along the Hornsea Three onshore cable corridor with a typical active construction works duration of three months at any particular location.  Impacts on agricultural farm holdings, socio-economics and tourism are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapters 6: Land Use and Recreation and chapter 10: Socio-Economic respectively. Where appropriate, mitigation measures have also been identified within these chapters to minimise potential impacts.
North Norfolk District Council	In respect of point 4) whilst the District Council recognises that DONG Energy may need at this stage to assess the potential of both HVDC and HVAC transmission Council is aware from public comments made through the current public consultation processes in respect of the Hornsea Project Three and other major offshore wind proposals seeking landfall and connections into the National Grid in Norfolk that the public have a strong preference to see HVDC transmission systems adopted. The Council understands that this is because HVDC technology would remove the need for onshore and offshore booster stations to be provided along the route of the export cables between the turbine field and the connection into the National Grid infrastructure, thereby minimising the impact of these developments on communities in North Norfolk once the construction of any cable corridor works were complete. The District Council has therefore prepared its comments on the PIER report based upon the potential of an HVAC transmission system being deployed, but would ask that DONG Energy continue to appraise both options in the hope that the less intrusive HVDC option might be chosen in the final scheme design. Without prejudice to the comments made above, the District Council is carefully following the debate which is taking place over the use by offshore wind development companies of HVAC and HVDC systems and reserves its position in respect of publically lobbying the Government to better understand the difference between the two transmission systems so that the least environmentally damaging option might be taken forward on this and other schemes.  Notwithstanding the position outlined above, the District Council values the relationship which has been established with the DONG Energy team in the development of the Hornsea Project Three project proposal over the past 18 months and looks forward to continued dialogue with you in the coming months as the project proposals are refined so as to achieve the best possible outcome for communities in North Norfolk if the proposal receives Development Consent approval through NSIP and the Secretary of State.	I	Due to current uncertainty (see volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives), a decision on which transmission system (HVDC or HVAC) to adopt will not be made until post consent after extensive engagement with potential systems suppliers has taken place. As a result of this, we have conducted our assessments based on a realistic worst-case scenario, which could be either HVDC or HVDC technology depending on the receptor.
<b>Section 42: Persons with an interest in the land (prescribed under section 44 of the Act)</b>			
Kate Willcox	Yes, we are directly affected by your current proposed route which means our property is within the defined boundary of this cable corridor.	Y	Revised cable route does not affect the property
Kate Willcox	We object and will be writing separately on your proposed route as far as it affects our property Half Acre at Heydon and wish you to consider your alternative route to the west for the cable corridor for this section	Y	Revised cable route does not affect the property

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>7</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Kate Willcox	As previously outlined, the current proposed route runs absolutely on our boundary putting our property and access to our property at risk and meaning that our property sits within the working zone of the cable corridor. We believe the disruption that this will cause us is unacceptable when there is an alternative route to the west of our property outlined within the current plans that does not affect properties in such a significant manner. We have had not direct enquiry from any consultant as to who is the owner of our property, and found by chance a stake pushed into the verge on our property with some documents badly attached, which then fell off. There is a distinct lack direct consultation with property owners in our opinion. We would like a direct response to our concerns.	Y	Revised cable route does not affect the property
Ray Pearce	<b>Area identified for construction</b> - Yes. You would not need them if you used a marine cable through the Wash to Walpole.	I	This comment is acknowledged. The reason for the connection to the Norwich Main National Grid substation as well as the routing of the offshore cable are detailed in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives
Ray Pearce	<b>Opinion on baseline information</b> - It is misleading, lacks clarity and your intention is to drive your project forward at all costs to Public Health, the environment, the residents of North Norfolk and anybody else who may stand in your way. You are a greedy, corporate and lack any regard for the human beings who have to contend with your reckless disregard.	I	Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts to sensitive receptors, either through site selection/route refinement or through the identification of suitable mitigation measures. Where there are impacts to receptors, (including environmental and social) these are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3). The Environmental Statement has been significantly updated following the PEIR and is considered to provide a thorough and transparent assessment of the potential impacts of the project.
Ray Pearce	<b>Mitigation methods</b> - YES! Look at an alternative connection point at Walpole with a marine cable and stop this nonsense. You and Vattenfall are forcing us to live within 80 metres of a 6 GW power supply; that is 5 times greater than the output from Sizwell B. Why? Corporate greed! It is not green! It is using more CO2 to produce the turbines and associated equipment than could ever be recovered by renewable energy.	I	Environmental Statement, volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives sets out the process of identifying a grid connection location and associated cable routes.  The aim of the grid connection option appraisal was to identify the most economic and efficient design option for the connection of a project. Although both National Grid and Orsted input into the appraisal process (in respect to economic and strategic factors), the eventual grid connection offer is determined by National Grid. In July 2016, Hornsea Three was formally offered a grid connection at Norwich Main Substation as a result of this appraisal process.
Ray Pearce	<b>Any local matters to landfall zone</b> - Yes! Human beings who have to live there!	I	Where possible and practicable the cable corridor route selected seeks to avoid passing adjacent to properties. This is to reduce impacts associated with construction disturbance and to seek to minimise conflicts such as Heavy Goods Vehicle (HGV) traffic movements. However, it is not possible to avoid passing in close proximity to all properties on the route. Where properties are located in close proximity, the Project will ensure that sensitive construction management measures, such as noise, dust and traffic control are considered. These are documented in an outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), which accompanies the DCO application.  Impacts on residential receptors, as well as mitigation identified to minimise them, are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters within Environmental Assessment volume 3.
Ray Pearce	<b>To consider in refining the 80m corridor</b> - Yes, you are planning to cross Vattenfall's cables. You have not considered the cumulative effects and will endanger our lives ... we live 80 meters from the crossing point. You have neither consulted with us nor given us the courtesy of your time. You have railroaded the PEIR and did not notify the UK Public of the timing of the PEIR in your June 2017 newsletter.	I	Cumulative effects are assessed within the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 2 and 3). Details of the consultation process that the project has conducted can be found within the Consultation Report that accompanies the application for Development Consent, including how the project has had regard to consultation responses, including where possible, through amendments to the project proposals.
Ray Pearce	<b>Comments on HVAC</b> - Keep your cablers offshore to enter at Walpole and you would not need to ask this question!	I	Environmental Statement, volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives sets out the process of identifying a grid connection location.  The aim of the grid connection option appraisal was to identify the most economic and efficient design option for the connection of a project. Although both National Grid and Orsted input into the appraisal process (in respect to economic and strategic factors), the eventual grid connection offer is determined by National Grid. In May 2016, Hornsea Three was formally offered a grid connection at Norwich Main Substation as a result of this appraisal process.



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>7</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Ray Pearce	<b>Substation</b> - It is ridiculous that you have accepted this connection point when Walpole would be better for the environment as a whole, closer, cheaper and you would not have to endanger our lives and blight our property.	I	Environmental Statement, volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives sets out the process of identifying a grid connection location.  The aim of the grid connection option appraisal was to identify the most economic and efficient design option for the connection of a project. Although both National Grid and Orsted input into the appraisal process (in respect to economic and strategic factors), the eventual grid connection offer is determined by National Grid. In July 2016, Hornsea Three was formally offered a grid connection at Norwich Main Substation as a result of this appraisal process.
Ray Pearce	55kms of trenching in one of the most beautiful counties in England is a travesty. You are not allowed to do this in Denmark so don't do it in the UK!	N	Hornsea Three has, through site selection and route refinement sought to minimise impacts on environmental and social receptors. Where there are impacts associated with Hornsea Three, these are assessed within the Environmental Statement, along with mitigation identified to minimise them.
Natasha/Steven Hall	<b>HVAC</b> - Yes, this is too close to my house. The construction village is nearly in my garden - not enough information or warning. Once approached - after several calls, indications were that the substation was only viable from back of back garden. This is not the case and was misleading	I	Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts to local residential receptors, either through site selection/route refinement or through the identification of suitable mitigation measures. Where there are impacts to residential receptors, these are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3).  Impacts relating to landscape and visual resources are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual resources. Photographic panels along the cable corridor, as well as indicative visualisations from public viewpoints have been prepared to inform the assessment of impacts and are provided in Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 4.5: Photographic Panels, Wireframes and Photomontages.
<b>Section 47: Duty to consult local community</b>			
Ray & Diane Pearce	We contest that the crossing of your cables with Vattenfall's will have an effect on the environment, the ecology, the population and human health, and most importantly, there will be a cumulative effect. The PEIR makes it clear that the minimum depth of the cables will be 1.2 metres and the maximum 2 metres. Therefore, how are you planning to engineer the crossing without effecting the local environment? The maximum depth of the proposed transmission cables is governed and limited by the cable's ability to dissipate heat. Accordingly, there is a requirement for you to coordinate a plan which will effect the relative depth of either your cable trench or Vattenfall's, with a consequence on the environment.	I	The depths of 1.2 m and maximum of 2 m are those associated where cables are installed via open cut method. Where our proposed cables cross over other infrastructure, other installation methods, such as trenchless installation techniques (e.g. horizontal directional drilling, HDD) can be deployed. Paragraphs 3.6.11.8 and 3.7.1.14 of Environmental Statement Chapter 3: Project Description notes the methodology for HDD crossings. The exact depth and length of each HDD will be dependent on the nature of the obstruction being crossed – in this instance the proposed works by Vattenfall. Therefore, at the crossing point with the proposed Vanguard cables either set of cable will be installed at a greater depth to ensure that no permanent above ground works are required.
Ann Abbott	1. Will you be considering the floating turbines which operate in Scotland which are tethered to the seabed, or be installing foundations on the sea bed for the turbines?	N	The project has removed the potential for floating turbines from the project description and these will not be taken forward for Hornsea Project Three.
Ann Abbott	10. Closure of roads affect the livelihood of residents and visitors. This didn't occur with SCIRA can we have an assurance that road closures will not happen with DONG?	I	To minimise disruption on the local highway network, in general the application provides for cables to be installed under roads by way of trenchless installation. In doing so the road can remain open whilst the works are being carried out. Roads in the Weybourne area which will be crossed by way of trenchless installation include the A148 and A149. Further details are documented in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7, Traffic and Transport.
Ann Abbott	11. Where will your offices be to administer the Wind Farm and how many staff be involved? SCIRA at one point had 650 specialists employed off and on shore with Sheringham Shoal SCIRA at one point had 650 specialists employed off and on shore with Sheringham Shoal with 88 turbines.	I	The locations of operations and maintainace staff has not be confirmed at this time. Further details are documented in Environmental Statement, volume 3, chapter 10, Socio Economics.
Ann Abbott	12. Is your company involved in any other renewable sources e.g. one is a lagoon of tidal currents to produce electricity as critics argue these wind turbines are not very efficient as they have to be turned off with very high winds which occur in Weybourne from time to time - the latest being 48 miles an hour high winds.	N	Ørsted develops, constructs and operates offshore wind farms, bioenergy plants and innovative waste-to-energy solutions and provides smart energy products to its customers. For more information on Ørsted, visit <a href="http://orsted.co.uk">orsted.co.uk</a> .
Ann Abbott	2. How many miles out will the Hornsey Project 3 Shoal be and will the 342 windmills be in rows or set up hazardly. Which is the best layout?	N	Hornsea Three has committed to developing a wind farm layout with a single line of orientation menaing the turbines will be in development rows. Hornsea Project Three is approximatley 120 km offshore.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>7</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Ann Abbott	3. Will the 19 Offshore platforms be temporary or permanent and where will they be sited?	N	The design for the project is not yet finalised and the envelope assessed is the maximum possible. There is potential that the project will build out less infrastructure, however, what is built will be there for the duration of the project until decommissioning, at which point it will be decommissioned in line with best practice at the time.
Ann Abbott	6.How many On Shore Sites will there be and where will they be sited?	N	The onshore components of Hornsea Three are set out in Chapter 3: Project Description of the Environmental Statement.
Ann Abbott	7. Are you still wanting to site an On Shore Site on the village car park which regularly floods never mind the sea surges? If so such a site would be detrimental to the tourist trade as visiting walkers, divers, tourists, residents and fishermen regularly visit the beach and need the car park for their vehicles.	Y	The proposed application does not seek to make use of the Weybourne beach car park. Community and Local Authority feedback advised of the localised constraints on the site such as flooding. The applicant is also aware of the potential added constraints and disruption such works would generate on the wider general public and accessibility along Beach Lane.
Ann Abbott	9. Depending on the route followed where will the Haul Road for machinery be sited and which village roads will they travel onto the site? Bearing in mind both Holt Road and Station Road are both designated 'C' roads, very narrow and unsuitable for heavy traffic. Holt Road has 2 tight bends and Station Road has an old narrow bridge over the railway line with trains carrying passengers which I understand could not support heavy loads. Health & Safety concerns apply. You will not be able to use the A149 coast road as the railway bridge over the road is not high enough for your loads. Would it be feasible for cables and machinery to be brought to the Shoal by sea?	I	Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport identifies the proposed construction traffic routing in the landfall area.
Laura Philpott	1. Please provide cable specifications for each of the potential cables you may use, accepting that you have some options to select from you should provide data for each option. The data should include as a bare minimum; the cable type (AC or DC), size and the proven and tested EMF exposures levels demonstrated from 0-100metres, in 10 metre increments	I	Magnetic field levels for both Alternating Current (AC) and Direct Current (DC) cables, with both a 'trefoil' (bundled) or flat layout in the trench, at 10 m increments, have been provided in Volume 4, Annex 3.3: Electro-Magnetic Fields (EMF) Compliance Statement of the Environmental Statement. The maximum levels are shown to be well below the guideline public exposure limits set to protect health. These data are provided from calculations, which is the approach specified in the government guidance referenced in Annex 3.3.  It is not possible to measure EMFs from a particular cable before it has been manufactured, installed, and connected to the power generation source (the cables are designed to carry the power produced by an entire wind farm or power station). However, conservative parameters (i.e. those leading to a higher field strength) have been used in the calculations in Annex 3.3. These are based on the potential cable specifications that are given in the Project Description of the Environmental Statement. However, it should be noted that at this stage of the project development a specific supplier for the cables has not been selected. Importantly, the final designs and cables purchased will remain within the 'design envelope' parameters that have been assessed and upon which the development consent, if granted, is based. Please note that underground cables do not emit an electric field that is experienced above ground level.
Laura Philpott	2. Please supply data relating to the change in exposure levels where cables are joined, I understand this can be significantly higher. Therefore this data should be given in relation to each of the cable types being considered.	I	Where cables are joined - cable joint bays - the individual conductors can be more spread out, and the magnetic field strength can be higher because the cancellation effect between the field from each conductor is reduced. The Hornsea Project Three design is not yet at the stage where specific cable joint bay designs have been produced. However, these will be designed such that the guideline public exposure limits set to protect health are not exceeded. Indeed, the Project contends, as documented in Environmental Statement volume 4, annex 3.3: Electro-Magnetic Fields (EMF) Compliance Statement that we will be well below the standard. Ensuring that cable joints are within the standards is readily achievable.
Laura Philpott	3. In terms of your response to Q.3 how will you logistically manage the location of cable joints and their placement in relation to homes and community buildings? Will there be a minimum distance applied to the location of said joints?	I	Joint bays, as with all sections of the cable, will be designed and installed such that the guideline public exposure limits set to protect health are not exceeded, even immediately above them (i.e. in the closest proximity). As shown in Environmental Statement volume 4, Annex 3.3: EMF Compliance Statement, the magnetic field strength drops very rapidly with distance from the source, and there is no electric field above ground level. The location of the cable joints will largely be driven by the length of cable on a drum and the need to maintain roughly equal sections.
Laura Philpott	4. Please advised if there are any other circumstances that could cause the cabling or any other equipment to expose the public to levels over and above those stated in either Q.1 or Q.3	I	Air cored reactors in the onshore substation (used in filter and statcom compounds) have the potential to exceed ICNIRP 1998 guideline levels in close proximity, and we will seek to site these away from the fence line to ensure that EMF levels outside our compound are within the 1998 levels.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>7</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Laura Philpott	5. What testing and evidence will you produce before and after project completion to demonstrate that the cabling effects are as stated?	I	Environmental Statement, volume 4, annex 3.3: EMF Compliance Statement comprises an assessment of the static and extremely low frequency (ELF) EMFs that will be generated by the Hornsea Project Three onshore transmission infrastructure (cabling), giving maximum predicted field strengths to assess compliance with health protection guidelines for public exposure to EMFs. The assessment concludes that based on the maximum field strengths, using worst-case assumptions where required, the proposals are well below established levels and the Project is compliant. The cables eventually selected for the project will be required to fall within the envelope assessed and meet the prescribed standards and hence will not generate greater EMF.  In demonstrating that the cables installed for Hornsea Project Three will be compliant with health protection guidelines for public exposure, any subsequent need to monitor is not required or planned to occur, although we note that broader quality control checks are undertaken during the manufacturing and installation process.
Rob Hannan	Thanks for circulating your recent newsletter. I have one suggestion to bring significant benefits to the North Norfolk communities. One problem facing the area (and many rural areas) is the lack of high-speed broadband. One of the barriers to providing this is the cost of putting fibre-optic cable into the ground. Whilst you are installing your underground cable, would it not make sense for a broadband infrastructure company to be putting fibre optic cable into the same hole? This could then be linked to existing fibre routes or left for future connections. I have made a similar suggestion to Vattenfall regarding their Norfolk Vanguard project. Simply putting two or more cables into a single trench does seem a sensible way of getting maximum benefit from the necessary disruption to the countryside and its residents.	N	Response is noted, however there are a number of complexities which would be associated with co-locating other cables or assets with the Hornsea Three cables, these are summarised below: - The Offshore Transmission Operator (OFTO) owner (to whom we must eventually divest the elements of the project associated with electricity transmission) is unlikely to be comfortable with the activity of laying an additional cable or asset within such close proximity to the Hornsea Three cables due to the extremely high insurance caps which could make the transmission asset unsaleable or jeopardise the business case and increase project risk; - The consent for the installation and operation of any other assets e.g. broadband cables, would need to be obtained by another party (it cannot be obtained as part of the Hornsea Three infrastructure as it has not been stated, consulted on, or incorporated into the Environmental Statement); and - Finally, the owner/operator of any other assets would be required to source its own agreements with all landowners linearly along the onshore cable corridor route.  On the basis of the above, no such infrastructure is proposed as part of Hornsea Three.
David Edwards	Hi, I live quite near the proposed HVDC Converter/HVAC Substation in Swardeston and would be interested in what it looks like, Do you have any plan/ drawing I could view.	NA	Ørsted advised the consultee to attend one of the community consultation events if possible or to view the exhibitions banners available on the Hornsea Three website.
Beverley Wigg	This disruption would be greatly minimised if HVDC technology is adopted (narrower cable corridors and no booster station) and this is, in my view, the only acceptable solution, if the current route succeeds through planning. A narrower cable route would also presumably mean less impact in terms of traffic serving the site and the length of time needed in development.	I	Due to current uncertainty (see Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives), a decision on which transmission system (HVDC or HVAC) to adopt will not be made until post consent after extensive engagement with potential systems suppliers has taken place. As a result of this, we have conducted our assessments based on a realistic worst-case scenario, which could be either HVDC or HVDC technology depending on the receptor.
Beverley Wigg	The disruption caused by both the cable route and the booster station are unacceptable in this rural landscape, which is also happens to be an important area for tourism especially self catering cottages and B&B style accommodation.	I	Potential impacts associated with Hornsea Three, particularly the onshore cable corridor and the HVAC booster station are addressed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement.  The potential for impacts to interact and impact tourism is addressed in Environmental Statement Volume 3, Chapter 10: Socio-economics, whilst impacts on recreational resources are addressed in volume 6: Land Use and Recreation. The former concludes that there would be no significant effects on tourism as a result of Hornsea Three.
Beverley Wigg	However, I am even more concerned at the lack of joined-up thinking of this and other projects being proposed. Having a cross over of cables near Salle is completely unacceptable in terms of impact on local residents and businesses and I join the growing groundswell of support for a more strategic solution, i.e. The Walpole option.	I	We are in close contact with Vattenfall at all levels of the project in relation to their proposed Norfolk Vanguard and Norfolk Boreas projects; we liaise on environmental consents, communications, stakeholder engagement, technical aspects etc. We are of course considering where the proposed projects may cross in terms of the underground cables, as we recognise that, if both projects are built simultaneously, coordinating construction works will minimise disruption. Additionally, we are in close consultation regarding any areas where there could be potential for cumulative impacts to arise as a result of both developments to ensure we progress the projects appropriately and sensitively. Notwithstanding the above, it is important to note that Norfolk Vanguard is a project with its own technical and environmental characteristics and constraints, and is subject to a separate DCO process.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>7</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Beverley Wigg	Of particular concern is the booster station which is a major industrial installation in a totally rural setting. The images provided so far at the drop-ins (Reepham 8th September) are not sufficiently detailed to allow members of the public, or stakeholders to get a real sense of how it will look – and it is difficult for people to begin to understand what the noise implications are.	I	<p>Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 4.5: Photograph Panels, Wirelines and Photomontages presents indicative visualisations which show a potential appearance of the proposed HVAC booster station. In short, the equipment for the onshore substation could be up to 25 metres in height and could be housed within a single or multiple buildings, in an open yard or a combination of these. The maximum design scenario is detailed more fully in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description.</p> <p>It is noted that the assessment contained within Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual resources, which is informed by annex 4.5, considers a worst-case scenario, so in this instance the maximum dimensions of the proposed HVAC booster station. Based on the findings of the impact assessment, mitigation measure have been identified to reduce any significant landscape and visual effects to an acceptable level. Measures include strategic landscape planting .</p> <p>It is important to note that although annex 4.5 includes visualisations which show an indicative design, the final design will be subject to change. However, this final design will need to be within the confines of what has been assessed, i.e. it couldn't be any larger than the maximum dimensions presented.</p> <p>In respect to noise, a full assessment of potential impacts associated with the HVAC booster station is provided in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 8: Noise and Vibration. It concludes that with mitigation, no significant effects are anticipated.</p>
Beverley Wigg	In summary, companies and government need to strongly consider better strategic solutions for North Norfolk and in the meantime HVDC is the only acceptable option to minimise onshore impact.	N	Due to current uncertainty (see Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and alternatives), a decision on which transmission system (HVDC or HVAC) to adopt will not be made until post consent after extensive engagement with potential systems suppliers has taken place. As a result of this, the Hornsea Three EIA has conducted the assessments based on a realistic worst-case scenario, which could be either HVDC or HVDC technology depending on the receptor.
Paul Craske	As a resident of Weybourne, I attended your Community Consultation Event on the 7th September. I am writing to strongly oppose your decision to come ashore at Weybourne. Why Weybourne again , we have just recovered from Dudgeon?	Y	Through the design development process, the proposed route now limits the area of landfall to an area in and around Muckleberry Miliarty Collection (approximately 350m west of the beach car park). Works then head south west, to the east of Kelling , avoiding Kelling Heath SSSI. Further information on the justification for the chosen landfall is provided Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives.
Godfrey Sayers on Behalf of the Friends of North Norfolk	The true significance of your Hornsea Three project is only now beginning to sink into the public consciousness of north Norfolk, (should you chose to use the HVAC option) the effect of the proposed booster stations and cabling on the lives, businesses and landscape are unacceptable, and it would seem unnecessary. As DONG will benefit greatly from enormous subsidies using tax payers money it seems only right that they should pay close attention to their wishes and acknowledge their concerns. It is very worrying that DONG are not required to make a decision as to which option to take until after the Inspectorate has granted permission, which keeps the major concerns we all have out of the democratic process. But I am sure that DONG would wish to make every effort to avoid unnecessary disruption to people's lives and using the HVDC option would go a very long way to ensuring that this aim is achieved.	I	Due to current uncertainty, a decision on which transmission system (HVDC or HVAC) to adopt will not be made until post consent after extensive engagement with potential systems suppliers has taken place. As a result of this, our assessments are conducted based on a maximum design scenario, which could be either HVDC or HVDC technology depending on the receptor. Please refer to assessments presented in the Environmental Statement
Susan Allen	You will be aware that the only acceptable solution to many people on this route is the use of HVDC technology and the claims that this technology is not yet proven provide you with a very important opportunity to ensure that it can work and be leaders in the field. The narrower cable route associated with the DC choice would be far less disruptive than that of the HVAC and would mean no cable relay/booster station mid route in the open	I	Due to current uncertainty, a decision on which transmission system (HVDC or HVAC) to adopt will not be made until post consent after extensive engagement with potential systems suppliers has taken place. As a result of this, our assessments are conducted based on a maximum design scenario, which could be either HVDC or HVDC technology depending on the receptor. Please refer to assessments presented in the Environmental Statement



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>7</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Susan Allen	<p>What is becoming clear also is that there is an astonishing lack of joined-up thinking for his and other projects being proposed. Given that wind energy is a future solution for the country's energy needs and the east coast is going to have a number of wind farms in the next decade or so it would seem imperative to form a better option and solution for the onshore cabling. With the Dong and Vattenfall projects having a cross over of cables near Salle is completely unacceptable in terms of impact on local residents and businesses and you will be aware of the growing numbers of people supporting a more strategic solution, i.e. The Walpole option.</p>	I	<p>Hornsea Project Three are in close contact with Vattenfall at all levels of the project in relation to their proposed Norfolk Vanguard and Norfolk Boreas projects; we liaise on environmental consents, communications, stakeholder engagement, technical aspects etc., so it's not just one point of contact for both businesses.</p> <p>Hornsea Project Three are of course considering where the proposed projects may cross in terms of the underground cables, as we recognise that, if both projects are built simultaneously, coordinating construction works will minimise disruption. Additionally, we are in close consultation regarding any areas where there could be potential for cumulative impacts to arise as a result of both developments to ensure we progress the projects appropriately and sensitively. Cumulative impacts of Hornsea Three with other projects (including Vanguard projects) are assessed in each topic chapter within the Environmental Statement</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, it is important to note that Norfolk Vanguard is a project with its own technical and environmental characteristics and constraints, and is subject to a separate DCO process.</p>
Susan Allen	<p>The Booster Station. Of particular concern is the booster station which is a major industrial installation in a totally rural setting. The images provided so far at the drop-ins (Reepham 8th September) are not sufficiently detailed to allow members of the public, or stakeholders to get a real sense of how it will look – and it is difficult for people to begin to understand what the noise implications are. These are a very real and very important consideration along with the impact on the landscape.</p>	I	<p>Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 4.5: Photograph Panels, Wirelines and Photomontages presents indicative visualisations which show a potential appearance of the proposed HVAC booster station. In short, the equipment for the onshore substation could be up to 25 metres in height and could be housed within a single or multiple buildings, in an open yard or a combination of these. The maximum design scenario is detailed more fully in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description.</p> <p>It is noted that the assessment contained within Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual resources, which is informed by annex 4.5, considers a worst-case scenario, so in this instance the maximum dimensions of the proposed HVAC booster station. Based on the findings of the impact assessment, mitigation measures have been identified to reduce any significant landscape and visual effects to an acceptable level. Measures include strategic landscape planting.</p> <p>It is important to note that although annex 4.5 includes visualisations which show an indicative design, the final design will be subject to change. However, this final design will need to be within the confines of what has been assessed, i.e. it couldn't be any larger than the maximum dimensions presented.</p> <p>In respect to noise, a full assessment of potential impacts associated with the HVAC booster station is provided in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 8: Noise and Vibration. It concludes that with mitigation, no significant effects are anticipated.</p>
Susan Allen	<p>In summary, companies and government need to strongly consider better strategic solutions for North Norfolk and in the meantime HVDC is the only acceptable option to minimise onshore impact. You may wish to make money out of Norfolk and as a Norfolk based business I understand that and effectively do the same but you have a corporate responsibility to carry it out in a way that causes the minimum impact and disruption. If this costs you money in the short term, in the long term this will pay dividends as communities will appreciate that the necessary work to make provision for our energy needs, carried out by foreign energy companies, is being done in such a way as to cause the minimum disruption to our countryside, communities and cherished landscape. I await your confirmation that this response has been received and formally included in your feedback system.</p>	I	<p>General response noted.</p> <p>In respect to the comment on HVDC technology, it is noted that cost is not the main reason for not committing to HVDC technology, as it is not clear which technology will represent the lowest cost until quotations are received from potential suppliers. System reliability, market availability and lead times are also major considerations when selecting a final transmission technology.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>7</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
David Ramsbotham	You may recall our correspondence when I was the Norfolk County Councillor for the Melton Constable Division. I confirm that the various issues raised are still of concern to me as a resident of the area. In particular I feel that the onshore HVAC booster station should be avoided at all costs. This would create an unacceptable industrial blot on the landscape affecting the environment for local residents and tourism which is the life blood of the area.	N	<p>Potential impacts associated with Hornsea Three, particularly the onshore cable corridor and the HVAC booster station are addressed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement.</p> <p>The potential for impacts to interact and impact tourism is addressed in Environmental Statement Volume 3, Chapter 10: Socio-economics, whilst impacts on recreational resources are addressed in volume 6: Land Use and Recreation. The former concludes that there would be no significant effects on tourism as a result of Hornsea Three.</p> <p>The need for the HVAC booster station is set out in the Environment Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives.</p>
David Gurney	<p>Having looked at the project information online and at one of the events I would like to comment on and object to the proposed location of the construction compound (Compound 1) on part of the former airfield south of the village of Weston Longville.</p> <p>The main reasons why this is a highly unsuitable location for a compound relate to highways issues, namely:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) the number and speed of vehicles using the road by the site – Honingham Road. This road is also subject to a width restriction.</li> <li>2) the configuration of the junction of Honingham Road and Weston Road to the north, and Honingham Road and Weston Green Road leading to Breck Lane to the south. Both junctions are highly unsuitable for large vehicles both in terms of safe negotiation and visibility.</li> <li>3) Breck Lane is very narrow and has high volumes of traffic with no passing places.</li> <li>4) Traffic use of all these local roads is likely to increase as a result of the Norwich Northern Distributor Road in progress and works planned by Highways England on the A47. They are already “rat runs”. I would urge you to consider alternative sites for this compound for the reasons outlined above.</li> </ol>	Y	<p>The Main construction compound proposed near Weston Longville has not been taken forward to the application. The main construction compound for the project will be located at Oulton Airfield, accessed off the B1149. Justification for this decision is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives.</p>
Cllr Graham Everett (District Councillor for Reepham) - Broadland District Council	<p>The points I would like to raise are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The previous issue about the depth of the cables has been addressed as I understand they will now be laid at a depth at 1.2 mts rather than the originally proposed 0.7 mts which will address the concerns raised.</li> </ol>	Y	<p>The onshore cables will be buried at a minimum depth of 1.2 m, further details on the cable installation is provided in Environmental Statement, volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description.</p>
Cllr Graham Everett (District Councillor for Reepham) - Broadland District Council	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2) I would wish to see serious consideration given to the cable route around the Salle area as this is an area of great sensitivity and has been raised to myself by many people. I firmly believe the alternative route, shown in purple, should be fully investigated and explored in detail before a final decision is made, and I ask that local residents, landowners and relevant local authorities are duly consulted and updated.</li> </ol>	Y	<p>Following on from the design refinement process, which took into consideration consultation responses, the onshore cable corridor is now located within the area previously marked as 'alternatives under consideration' during the Phase 2 consultation. It therefore is located to the west of Salle. Further details on route refinement is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives.</p>
Cllr Graham Everett (District Councillor for Reepham) - Broadland District Council	Having studied both HVAC and HVDC cabling methods I can see benefits and disadvantages with both systems and again I am confident that DONG energy will use whichever system is best suited at the appropriate time, bearing in mind the constant technology changes and advances.	N	Noted
Friends of North Norfolk	10. The flexibility allowed by use of the Rochdale Envelope should only be available to provide a choice of which design/ configuration of HVDC Transmission System is eventually utilised. It should not be allowed to provide the Developer with the option of the far more ecologically and environmentally harmful HVAC Transmission System purely on grounds of finance.	N	<p>The Hornsea Three EIA has employed a maximum design scenario approach, which reflects the Rochdale Envelope approach. By identifying, and assessing based on the maximum design scenario, it can therefore be concluded that the all issues have been addressed and any impacts will be no greater for any other design scenario.</p> <p>The full details of the EIA methodology are set out in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 5: EIA Methodology. Further information on HVDC compared to HVAC transmission system is provided in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Project Description.</p>
Friends of North Norfolk	11. The consequences of allowing such an accommodation would be perverse since in the quest and overall desire for clean energy, great harm to ecology and environment of the highest value would result.	I	<p>Hornsea Three has, through site selection and route refinement sought to minimise impacts on environmental and social receptors. Where there are impacts associated with Hornsea Three, these are assessed within the Environmental Statement, along with mitigation identified to minimise them.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>7</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Friends of North Norfolk	24. Most importantly we would challenge the use of HVAC Transmission when HVDC Transmission would achieve a win, win, outcome for North Norfolk, the Environment and the Nation's energy supply in a viable and sustainable way.	I	<p>At present, all UK offshore wind farms use HVAC technology and the technology, its capabilities and limitations are well understood. To date, HVDC has more commonly been used to transmit electricity from one grid to another in the form of an interconnector and has yet to be applied to any UK offshore wind farms. Although there is some experience in Germany, the structure of this market is quite different to the UK (in that offshore transmission connections are centrally planned and delivered by the onshore utility) and the use of DC technology for the offshore wind farms is still maturing. For an interconnector from one country to another, there is no marine infrastructure other than the cabling itself and therefore interfaces with other systems/marine platforms etc is absent (both ends of the interconnector are on dry land. However, use of DC for wind farms add additional complexity in terms of greater infrastructure interfaces offshore and in some instances technical issues, cost overruns and delays have been experienced. Furthermore, due to the increased complexity of offshore HVDC systems and limited experience, transmission reliability is lower meaning that over time, less offshore wind energy can be transmitted to the grid.</p> <p>Aside from the technology maturity, there are very few suppliers in the world with the capability of producing and supplying HVDC transmission technology (for the cables and convertor stations) that would be needed for a wind farm of this size, and delivery lead times can be considerably longer than for equivalent HVAC systems. In light of the above, there are risks associated with only taking the DC option forward at this time and as the developer, we are responsible for ensuring the proposed development is feasible and can be realised within a reasonable timeframe.</p> <p>There is a certain level of confidence in the UK wind industry that HVDC technology will become more mature before Hornsea Project Three will connect, but there is currently no certainty. Therefore, committing to solely HVDC now could restrict or even prevent the development of the project in the future if we do not see the necessary developments in the market. We may well eventually choose to opt for HVDC transmission technology; however, it is considered that to only seek a consent (planning permission) for such a technology (and excluding HVAC) at this time could make the eventual Project unbuildable and/or unprofitable.</p> <p>Due to current uncertainty, a decision on which transmission system to adopt will not be made until post consent after extensive engagement with potential systems suppliers has taken place.</p>
Friends of North Norfolk	25. We understand that in order to make their final decision as to which system to adopt, DONG have promised to undertake a full technical/feasibility appraisal of HVAC and HVDC. So as to fulfill that promise completely we request that the conclusions of this appraisal are made know to all consultees and within a time frame for them to respond	N	The ultimate decision on which technology the project will take forwards will take on board a number of considerations, as detailed in previous responses. Many of these considerations will be commercially sensitive and hence could not be shared with consultees.
Friends of North Norfolk	26. In conclusion, we request that all the foregoing are adequately and properly addressed before DONG submit their proposals to the Planning Inspectorate.	I	Noted. Please see previous responses. Comments have been considered in preparing the final application materials, particularly the Environmental Statement
Friends of North Norfolk	3.Dong Energy have applied what is known as 'The Rochdale Envelope Approach' and reserve the option to choose between High Voltage Direct Current, (HVDC) or High Voltage Alternating Current (HVAC) Transmission schemes if they receive approval for both within the one application. The Rochdale Envelope Approach enables a Developer to avoid repeated applications for approval to changes in the design of a project and consequential delays in implementation. It should be used to encourage better designs and allowance for rapid advances in technology, which can reduce environmental impacts. In short, it is to allow for a project to evolve over a number of years but within clearly defined parameters. However, we strongly argue that the Rochdale Envelope Approach should not be allowed in cases such as this when changes in the features/ specifications of the design options are so fundamental, and where it allows for a Developer to manipulate a consent for purely profit motives rather than to gain a superior solution from an environmental perspective.	N	<p>The Hornsea Three EIA has employed a maximum design scenario approach, in accordance with the Rochdale Envelope approach. By identifying, and assessing based on the maximum design scenario, it can therefore be concluded that the all issues have been addressed and any impacts will be no greater for any other design scenario.</p> <p>The full details of the EIA methodology are set out in Volume 1, chapter 5: EIA Methodology.</p>
Friends of North Norfolk	4.Guidelines regarding the use of the Rochdale Envelope Approach were issued by the former Infrastructure Planning Commission (IPC) in IPC Note 9 (February 2011). They still remain relevant to the assessment process.	N	Noted.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>7</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Friends of North Norfolk	5. The PEIR and Consultation by Dong Energy fail to meet these guidelines.	I	The Environmental Statement prepared for Hornsea Three follows the relevant guidelines of the PINS advice notes as did the PEIR so far as was practicable at that early stage of development. A full list of guidance which has been considered is listed in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 5: Environmental Impact Assessment Methodology.
Friends of North Norfolk	6. Further, they do not satisfy the underlying principles applicable to public consultation over new development requiring Environmental Impact Assessment. Unless they are adequately addressed this current process will be legally flawed.	I	<p>The Planning Act 2008 encourages a consultation driven application process where comments regarding proposal are documented and addressed where possible. Hornsea Three</p> <p>As part of our public consultation, we have held three rounds of community consultation events through 2016 and 2017. These events were an opportunity for members of the local community to view the latest plans, to speak directly with members of the project team where individuals required further clarity, and to comment on our proposal at that stage. Attendees were encouraged to capture their thoughts and any concerns by completing one of our feedback forms or by writing to us directly.</p> <p>All the feedback received at and after the events has been carefully considered by the Project and has been incorporated where possible into the final design. A Consultation Report summarising all the comments received and how we have had regard to these forms part of the DCO application. This includes details of a number of design changes that were made to the project as a result of consultation feedback.</p>
Friends of North Norfolk	7. The details provided in the PEIR and Non-technical Summary do not describe the Proposal as clearly and simply as possible. There are no proper accurate and detailed photo montages/ wireframe images, particularly for the very large offshore or onshore HVAC Compensator/ Booster Station Installations to enable a ready visualisation/ appreciation of their visual impact. No proper description of the equipment e.g. lightning protection equipment which might be up to 17.5 metres in height which is 5 metres higher than buildings/ equipment.	I	A full description of Hornsea Three is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description. Indicative visualisations, including both wireframes and photomontages, are provided in Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 4.5: Photographic Panels, Wireframes and Photomontages.
Friends of North Norfolk	8. It is noteworthy that Dong Energy changed the original consent for Hornsea Project One to add the option to use HVAC Transmission and have subsequently chosen the HVAC Transmission option albeit in a less sensitive landfall and cabling area. In the case of Race Bank, Dong Energy have changed the position of offshore substations so that where originally they were to be out of sight over the horizon they have been moved to within the turbine array area and will now be visible from many highly sensitive viewpoints within the Norfolk Coast AONB and the Norfolk Coast National Trail.	N	Whilst the original proposals for Hornsea Project One did not include HVAC transmission technology, this was added in the pre-application phase and was granted in the original consent for the project. This was therefore not a change to the original consent for Hornsea Project One as suggested by the comment. This does, however, reflect the position of Hornsea Three in including both transmission options at the point of application. Impacts on the AONB and PRoW are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapters 4: Landscape and Visual Resources and 6: Land Use and Recreation respectively.
Friends of North Norfolk	9. There are clear and significant advantages of HVDC Transmission over HVAC Transmission. HVDC is used in long distance sub-sea and underground transmission systems linked to offshore and on-land power generation operations. Indeed it has cost advantages in terms of fewer cables and lower power losses for transmission distances over 50km. Hornsea Project Three Transmission will be over 170km in total length from offshore substations to the proposed grid connection at Norwich Main Substation. Most importantly in this case HVDC would clearly have a much less harmful environmental impact since it will not require massive offshore or onshore Reactive Compensation Booster Stations sited and visible in extremely sensitive locations.	I	<p>As noted in previous comments, there is a certain level of confidence in the UK wind industry that HVDC technology will become more mature before Hornsea Project Three will connect, but there is currently no certainty. Therefore, committing to solely HVDC now could restrict or even prevent the development of the project in the future if we do not see the necessary developments in the market. Hornsea Three may well eventually choose to opt for HVDC transmission technology; however, it is considered that to only seek a consent (planning permission) for such a technology (and excluding HVAC) at this time could make the eventual Project unbuildable and/or unprofitable.</p> <p>Due to current uncertainty, a decision on which transmission system to adopt will not be made until post consent after extensive engagement with potential systems suppliers has taken place. This will be informed by a feasibility study. However, at this time, both options are retained to ensure both can be considered post-consent.</p>
John Hurst	It may be possible to reduce the final easement width of 80m by laying the proposed pipeline in two trefoil patterns, or the cables could be laid at a much deeper depth where it is considered that the cable route will interfere with any of the proposed alternative routes. Alternatively the Applicant can of course undertake to relocate the cables at a later date to accommodate any future Western Link, but whatever is the proposed solution at each of the crossing points could they be incorporated into the final designs to be submitted to the Planning Inspectorate in 2018 to facilitate the examination of the Applicant's proposals and ensure this matter is given the consideration it deserves?	N	Hornsea Three has consulted with Norfolk County Council in respect to the Western Link; however, this proposal is not sufficiently advanced such that it has been possible to incorporate this into the design or routing of Hornsea Three.



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>7</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
David and Julie Brooks	In conclusion our impression is that this is the wrong area and landfall site to bring in offshore cables from Hornsea 3 and expect an 80 metre cable corridor construction to be implemented without major excessive disruption to local people/traffic/tourist trade/wildlife. This is on an altogether different scale to the Sheringham Shoal project which had a single trench of 2 metres width! Like many other older people we have recently retired to Weybourne to get away from the stresses of urban living and enjoy, in our later years, the peaceful environment of a small village on the coast, with accessible countryside on our doorstep. This would all be shattered if this massive landfall project goes ahead at Weybourne, especially if the eastern route(which is very close to residential areas of Weybourne) were to be used. For all the above reasons it could have a serious impact on our daily lives, and therefore on our health and wellbeing.	Y	Further information pertaining to the landfall location and route selection is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives. Where possible, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts to local residential receptors, either through site selection/route refinement (including taking forwards the alternative route further to the west of Weybourne) or through the identification of suitable mitigation measures. Where there are impacts to residential receptors, these are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3).
David and Julie Brooks	Why has Weybourne beach been chosen as the landfall site for the offshore cables? This will mean 3 offshore cable routes coming into Weybourne and all the associated disruption. Also security of supply could be jeopardised with a concentration of cables being a potential target for terrorist attacks. (re: PEIR 2.1.1.4).	I	Information pertaining to the site selection and route refinement process is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Alternatives, whilst consideration of security at the onshore infrastructure is discussed in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description.
David and Julie Brooks	There are major concerns over Magnetic Field effects on local wild life and people where they cross or are close to the 80 metre cable corridors. Will there be metal shielding of the cables to minimise EMF effects as is carried out in other European countries such as Italy? The detailed cross section of trenches/cable installation for Hornsea 1 does not show any metal shielding. Is Hornsea 3 going to be the same construction?	I	Environmental Statement, volume 3, annex 3.3: EMF Compliance Statement comprises an assessment of the static and extremely low frequency (ELF) EMFs that will be generated by the Hornsea Project Three onshore transmission infrastructure (cabling), giving maximum predicted field strengths to assess compliance with health protection guidelines for public exposure to EMFs.  Annex 3.3 concludes that the maximum magnetic field strength directly above a cable, using worst-case assumptions where required, is also well below the guideline public exposure limits set to protect health. The cables eventually selected for the project will be required to fall within the envelope assessed and meet the prescribed standards and hence will not generate greater EMF.  Relevant to this, it is noted that the view of health protection bodies, based on a wide-ranging health evidence base (including studies of reproductive and developmental effects, cardiovascular disease, neurodegenerative disorders, the immune system, and genotoxic effects), is that low-frequency EMF is not a cause of health risks and that the guideline exposure standards in place (based on well-established effects on the body) are appropriate to protect health.
David and Julie Brooks	At the recent community consultation events there was a vague response to questions about the 3 route options around Weybourne and the proposed timescales for work being carried out. Comments were made that the 3rd cable route had been introduced due to technical problems with the other routes. Can you clarify this and give more detail?	I	Information pertaining to the site selection and route refinement process is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Alternatives, whilst a more detailed description of the chosen route is discussed in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description.
William J Horabin	The PEIR and Non-technical Summary do not describe the Proposal as clearly and simply as possible and do not meet laid down standards for Public Consultations.	N	Noted. The non-technical summary forms part of the Environmental Statement and seeks to provide a non-technical summary of the approach to, and conclusions of the Environmental Statement to enhance comprehension. We have sought to simplify these details further through our community consultation through, for example, project newsletters or the materials produced to support consultation events.
William J Horabin	There is no proper appraisal of the two transmission systems - HVAC or HVDC It is clear that HVDC Transmission will be the superior solution re the Environment, Ecology and the supply of clean offshore wind generated energy to meet the Nation's energy needs.	I	Due to current uncertainty (see previous responses), a decision on which transmission system (HVDC or HVAC) to adopt will not be made until post consent after extensive engagement with potential systems suppliers has taken place. As a result of this, we have conducted our assessments based on a maximum design scenario approach, which could be either HVDC or HVDC technology depending on the receptor. This is in accordance with industry practice and guidance.
Rt Hon Norman Lamb MP	I urge DONG to give serious consideration to the use of High Voltage DC transmission. Local residents feel very strongly that it would be wholly wrong for old, out of date technology to be used when the technology is available to avoid the need for industrial installations in open countryside. My understanding also is that less energy is lost along the route of the cable if DC is used rather than AC – so, on the face of it, it is a more environmentally friendly option.	I	HVAC technology should not be considered as either old or out of date as this technology also continues to develop. Due to current uncertainty (as detailed in previous responses), a decision on which transmission system (HVDC or HVAC) to adopt will not be made until post consent after extensive engagement with potential systems suppliers has taken place. As a result of this, we have conducted our assessments based on a maximum design scenario, which could be either HVDC or HVDC technology depending on the receptor.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>7</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Rt Hon Norman Lamb MP	They also have misgivings, which I share, about the plans for a phased delivery of the project that could last for nearly a decade. Were that to happen it would have a major adverse effect on residents' lives, livelihoods- especially fishing and tourism- and environment and a lasting impact on transport infrastructure, wider tourism, flora and fauna.	Y	During the design refinement Hornsea Three has sought to minimise the duration of any disruption, and has reduced the total number of phases from three to two, and reduced the duration of the construction phase onshore from eleven to eight years.  Potential impacts from Hornsea Three on socio-economic and tourism are identified and assessed in Environmental Statement Volume 3, Chapter 10: Socio-Economics. Taking into consideration the mitigation designed into Hornsea Three, no significant adverse effects are predicted.  Impacts from Hornsea Three on transport and ecological receptors are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapters 7: Traffic and Transport and chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation. Inter-related effects on local residents, as a result of impact interactions, are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 11: Inter-related Effects.
Strutt & Parker LLP	Confirmation of whether the route will be HVAC or HVDC prior to submission of the Development Consent Order The variation in scheme requirements depending on whether an AC or DC scheme is installed vary widely. To have a Consent Order which encompasses both may result in a very general consent which allows the project to change drastically with minimum consultation going forward.	N	The Project will continue to apply for a DCO with the option for both HVAC & HVDC technology, with the route corridor and land take currently being shown on a worst case scenario, being HVAC.
Strutt & Parker LLP	How will soil storage and reinstatement be carried out, and will there be active weed control Our clients have worked hard to ensure that their soils are in the best condition possible in order to allow them to farm productively. It is there for essential that top and subsoil are stored separately and reinstated in the correct manner. A detail specification should be provided detailing how the soil will be moved, stored and replaced.	I	This detail will be included within the DCO application, and will be refined once a construction contractor has been appointed by Orsted.
Strutt & Parker LLP	As you will probably be aware, harmful, noxious and non-native plants must be managed in a proactive way, and the movement of soils which may be contaminated can assist in spreading them. Land owners and occupiers are expected to ensure that these plants do not spread. It would be beneficial to have sight of the management plan the developer will have in place in order to carry out this management on the stored soil.	I	This detail will be included within the DCO application, and will be refined once a construction contractor has been appointed by Orsted. Any specific harmful, noxious or non-native plants on land intersected by the route corridor should be highlighted to the Project in advance to allow this to be taken into consideration when tendering for a construction contractor.
Strutt & Parker LLP	Our clients are long term land owners and cropping and grazing rotations are planned many years in advance. A project of this scale can be incorporated within this management schedule provided that the information required from the developers is provided as early as viably possible with as much details as is available. This will ensure that their businesses can continue to function well and would strengthen the relationship between the developers and occupiers, creating a better working relationship.	N/A	Indicative timescales of the earliest work could commence have been provided. Following an award of a DCO and CfD subsidies, more accurate timescales will be available and provided to landowners and agents accordingly.
Strutt & Parker LLP	Explanation on the specified easement width Vattenfall Norfolk Vanguard is a 3.6 giga watt project and is requesting a 36 metre easement, whereas Dong Hornsea Project Three is a 2.4 giga watt project requiring a 60m easement. An explanation as to why such a wide easement corridor is required would enable us to better inform our clients of how the project will work in to the future.	N/A	The two projects are completely separate and being developed by separate companies. Orsted have completed sufficient investigation into the electrical and protective requirements for the cables, resulting in a 60m easement being the area considered suitable and appropriate.
Strutt & Parker LLP	Details of the link box locations and their distance from the junction bays The maximum size specification of each of these has been provided in the PEIR documents, however, there is no reference to their locality to each other. These are permanent fixtures and although there is stated intention of installing them in field boundaries, there is the possibility that cable lengths will not accommodate this. More information on this would be greatly appreciated by the land occupying community to enable us to best plan how to work with the permanent infrastructure left on the surface.	I	The location of the joint bays and link boxes will only be able to be confirmed once a DCO has been granted, cable design confirmed and order, and a construction contractor appointed. Link boxes will be located on field boundaries, where possible, and in line with landowner discussions in order to minimise the impact to ongoing agricultural operations.
Strutt & Parker LLP	How will the project installation be phased A provisional indication on how many stages the project will be installed in, how long it is intended for trenches to remain open and how the commissioning work will be undertaken would enable us to better advise our clients on land management during the works.	Y	The Project could now be constructed in a maximum of two phases as opposed to three. Trenches themselves are likely to only remain open for a number of days whilst the cables, or ducting, is installed with these then being backfilled. The joint bays will be open for longer periods of time to allow jointing and commissioning work to be completed.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>7</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Strutt & Parker LLP	How will the haul road being installed and how will the reinstatement following its removal be carried out The composition of the haul road will greatly affect the reinstatement required and the future condition of the land which it runs over. An indication of what the haul road will be constructed with, at what stage of the project the works will be carried out along the route, and when it is anticipated it will be removed would assist us in advising our clients accordingly.	I	The actual method will be confirmed once a construction contractor has been appointed. Works could be carried out at any stage of the construction along certain sections of the route, more detail on this will only again be available once a construction contractor has been appointed. The haul road will be removed on completion of the construction work, however if there is likely to be an overlap of phased works, or a short time period between phases, this may, by landowner agreement, be left in situ during this period.
Strutt & Parker LLP	How will the corridor be fenced, when will this be constructed, what access will be required to the corridor and how will occupiers cross the corridor No information regarding this is easily identifiable within the PEIR document, but this will be the first part of the construction project to directly affect the land owners and occupiers. Information relating to how early in the construction phase the fencing will be installed and how long it will remain in place would be gratefully received by the occupiers. This will assist in the ongoing land management plans, and enable our clients to alter cropping and grazing rotations to accommodate the project rather than be disrupted by it. It would be beneficial for there to be access points across the cable corridor which can be used whilst an area is not under construction. This will enable the impact of the development to be minimised.	I	Fencing requirements and specification will be determined once construction methods and contractor appointment are further developed. (NOTE: some sections of working corridor may not be fenced for access, egress or for other engineering reasons). Crossing points may be possible along the working corridor by request where these are feasible and suitable.
Strutt & Parker LLP	When and how will the aspects of the PEIR document which are currently marked as “lack of data” and “not fully evaluated” be updated These terms are used extensively throughout the documents and leave a number of gaps in the information. Proceeding without having collected sufficient data and fully evaluated the aspects which require it will surely lead to issues further down the project timeline which could have been avoided.	N/A	These will be updated and included within the DCO application.
Strutt & Parker LLP	The specific concerns of the clients we are representing are as follows: Will the cables will be ducted or not A number of our clients are concerned about the possibility that unducted cables may cause localised ground warming which would affect soil health and plant growth. Because of this, clarity on whether or not the cables which will be installed by the developer are going to be ducted would be appreciated.	I	The possibility of ducting should have minimal impact on any possible localised heat released from the cables. Confirmation on whether the cables will be ducted or not will be confirmed following granting of the DCO.
National Farmers Union	Soils Details of how soils will be treated and where stored during construction must be provided. Along with how sub and top soils will be kept separate and kept clean during the construction period. Due to the damage to soils during construction works must only take place when conditions are acceptable. During very wet conditions and if soils are waterlogged construction should be stopped. Further it is important for Dong Energy to set out after soil has been reinstated what measures will be put in place to bring the soil back to its condition and quality before the works took place. An after care plan should be included in a code of construction.	I	Comments noted. Greater detail on soil management will be presented in the DCO application.
National Farmers Union	AC v DC Cables: It is our understanding that the cables will come inland at Weybourne on the north Norfolk Coast and the cable corridor will run to the National Grid substation at Norwich Main (just south of Norwich).It has been highlighted that the cables could be either HVDC, HVAC or a combination of both. This will involve building a booster station and converter substation. The NFU would like to receive further information as to why the cables cannot be HVDC as it is understood that less land will be required to lay the cables, the easement width required will be less and so have less impact on agricultural businesses and no link boxes are required with HVDC. This further reduces the disturbance and impact on agricultural operations. It is being said that the only reason for not laying HVDC cables is the cost. The NFU would like for this to be qualified. It is not acceptable for a greater easement with restrictions to be taken for HVAC cables due to the cost of the cables and laying the cables	N	The project is presenting both options, an AC and/or DC cable solution, and is showing the worst case scenario width of cable easement accordingly - a decision has not yet been made on technology. The construction corridor will be up to 80m in width.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>7</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
National Farmers Union	<p>Construction</p> <p>The project involves laying 6 large cable ducts over a width of 60 metres along some of the most productive Grade 1, 2 and 3a land classification farmland in Norfolk. The ducts will be buried so most farming operations can take place on top of them, but as set out below, farmers are extremely concerned about the depth that cables will be buried. Further clarification and detail is requested on the depth of the cables?</p> <p>There is concern over how the cables will be laid, the actual construction technique used. Details are requested on open cut and directional drilling? Will the cables be ducted and if not why not?</p>	I	These decisions will not be made until a later date, however the DCO application will set out the worst-case project proposals for each technique, so that landowners will be fully informed.
National Farmers Union	<p>Jointing bays</p> <p>It is understood from other projects that 'Jointing Bays' should be all underground and will not interfere with agricultural operations. Confirmation of this would be gratefully received.</p>	N/A	Jointing bays will all be located underground.
National Farmers Union	<p>Link boxes.</p> <p>It is understood that link boxes will be needed if the cables are HVAC cables and they are normally placed at least every 600 to 800 metres on a cable run. Clarification is needed on how many link boxes will be needed at the end of every run? Link boxes do stand proud above ground level and so greatly interfere with agricultural operations and are a hazard to farm machinery. It is requested that link boxes where possible are located in field boundaries or field corners to reduce the interference on farming operations. However, we suspect that they will be placed where the cable runs out, i.e. literally every 600 to 800 metres along the route. This will inevitably mean that most of the link boxes will be in fields and subject to damage and extra costs for farmers in avoiding them and not cropping areas of land around the obstruction. It is extremely important to have further design information on link boxes and the siting of them. This includes will any link boxes be located in a cluster and how will they be marked/identified/fenced.</p>	I	The location of the joint bays and link boxes will only be able to be confirmed once a DCO has been granted, cable design confirmed and order, and a construction contractor appointed. Link boxes will be located on field boundaries, where possible, and in line with landowner discussions in order to minimise the impact to ongoing agricultural operations.
National Farmers Union	<p>Land (Field) Drainage and Soils</p> <p>The major potential lasting damage is to land drainage systems and soils structure. One of the main reasons for the productive land the cable duct route is going through is that the farms are very well drained by a network of clay or plastic land drains laid in parallel every 20 metres or so across the field at depths of up to 1.8 metres draining into a field edge ditch or dyke. These drainage systems prevent water pooling in fields and increase the productive capacity of the agriculture in the area. Good land drainage increases farm productivity by keeping waterlogging to a minimum, increasing soil strength by reducing water content, gives higher soil temperatures and leads to more efficient use of applied fertilisers. According to the Agricultural Notebook the yield advantage for most crops when comparing drained and undrained treatments is typically 10 to 25 per cent.</p> <p>Assuming land drains are laid every 20 metres in farmland (they are laid more closely in some cases) and assuming the whole route is farmland, which it is not, but it mainly is, the cable ducts/trenches will cut thousands of land drains in six places for each land drain.</p> <p>Major pipeline constructors will cut a trench and the land drains then place the pipeline in the trench and re-connect the land drains above the pipe. It is a drainage rule of thumb that with a major pipeline one in every six land drains does not work after the soil is replaced around the pipe. This will not just affect the 60 metre working width but could potentially affect the whole field where the cable duct goes through and therefore every arable field along the route.</p>	I	An independant land drainage consultant will be appointed in order to consider and design pre and post drainage sollutions where required.
National Farmers Union	<p>Clarification is needed as to whether Dong Energy will lay the cable duct below or above field drainage systems. In some cases this implies laying the cable duct at a depth of 2 metres or more.</p> <p>The NFU would like to agree standard terms of how field drainage will be treated in principle on every farm and for this wording to be taken forward and included in the Development Consent Order. The wording normally covers before, during and after construction. It will be important in places for field drainage to take place outside of the order limits and this will need to be agreed along with a local drainage consultant being taken on by Dong Energy.</p>	I	An independant land drainage consultant will be appointed in order to consider and design pre and post drainage sollutions where required.



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>7</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Ray & Diane Pearce	<p>Cumulative Effects Assessment: There will be a cumulative effect from the Hornsea Three cables crossing the Vanguard and Boreas cables. The cumulative effects of co-locating up to 54 high voltage cables, carrying up to 6 GW of electrical energy, should not be underestimated and the PEIR does not address the environmental issues. Notwithstanding the potential cumulative EMF, the PEIR Volume 4 Annex 5.1, only acknowledges that there are other projects in 'Planning Application'; this is despite acknowledgement from Dong Energy that there have been specific discussions with Vattenfall regarding their projects. These discussions have purposefully not been included in the PEIR.</p> <p>By its own admission, the PEIR should discuss the cumulative impact of projects, plans and activities with which Hornsea Three may interact. Regarding the crossing point, it is, once again, deficient. We contest that Dong Energy does not have a design proposal for the crossing of the Hornsea three cables with those of Vanguard and Boreas. The PEIR makes it clear that the minimum depth of the cables will be 1.2m and the maximum 2.0m. The significant number of cables and limited depth to which high voltage cables can be buried, before they are unable to efficiently dissipate heat, will have a significant and potentially detrimental impact on the local environment for soils, principle and secondary aquifers, substrates and groundwater, especially regarding thermal effects. Considering the depth and comprehension of the cumulative effects assessment for the off-shore environment, why has the on-shore environment not been afforded the same level of detail in the PEIR? Accordingly, there is a requirement for there to be a coordinated plan which will affect the relative depth of either Dong's cable trench or Vattenfall's, which will have a consequence for the environment.</p> <p>We draw your attention to the Planning Inspectorates directive, as follows: "... the Overarching NPS [National Policy Statement] for Energy (EN-1) paragraph 4.2.5 states that: 'When considering cumulative effects, the ES [Energy Supplier] should provide information on how the effects of the applicant's proposal would combine and interact with the effects of others already in existence'."</p> <p>We contest that the crossing of the Hornsea three cables with the Vanguard and Boreas cables, will have detrimental effects on the environment, the ecology, the population and potentially human health (see EMFs). However, most importantly, there will be a cumulative effect. Astonishingly, the PEIR states that the overall effect will be solely be from the Hornsea Three cables, and, have graded the environmental impact of the cables as "minor adverse".</p>	I	<p>The potential for impacts arising as a result of Hornsea Project Three to combine with other planned developments (including the Vattenfall projects) is assessed in each respective topic chapter, under the heading 'Cumulative Effect Assessment'. In relation to geology and ground conditions, the cumulative effect assessment is therefore included in Environmental Statement Volume 3, Chapter 1: Geology and Ground Conditions, section 1.13.</p> <p>This assessment concludes that there are no significant cumulative effects associated with Hornsea Three in combination with other cumulative developments.</p>
Ray & Diane Pearce	<p>Non-Disclosure Agreement: We are aware that Dong Energy and Vattenfall have agreed a commercial NDA which will undoubtedly restrict what can be placed in the public domain. However, this will not be in the best interest of the environment or the residents of Norfolk.</p> <p>We contest that the imposition of a NDA is limiting Dong Energy from providing information on the design engineering of how the cables will cross and interact. Dong's representatives have claimed that they have had: "regular and detailed discussions" with Vattenfall on the crossing issue. Without the imposition of an NDA, these discussions could have, and should have, been made public within the PEIR, as exemplified by Dong's discussions with other inter-related bodies in the Marine Environment report. Therefore, for the on-shore environment, the PEIR is an incomplete and elusive document and we contest that Dong Energy has failed in its duty of care to the Public.</p> <p>We also question why the location and construction of cable bonding pits and their interaction with the environment is not evident in the PEIR.</p>	I	<p>NDA's are standard agreements entered into when two commercial parties initiate discussions on a wide range of issues. The cumulative assessments in the EIA process rely on data which is publicly available and hence the PEIR relied on publicly available information for the Vattenfall Vanguard project which, at that time was limited. More up to date information on the Vanguard project has been incorporated into the final cumulative assessments presented throughout the Environmental Statement.</p> <p>Information regarding proposed crossing methodologies is provided in the Environmental Statement to inform the assessment of potential cumulative effects which is reported in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3).</p> <p>Cable jointing pits will be required along the onshore cable corridor and information is provided in the Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description about the approximate length of cable that would be expected and hence how frequently jointing pits might be required. It is not possible at this point in time to confirm the final locations of these as this will be determined by the eventual cable design and the length of cable that can therefore be transported on each cable drum. Where appropriate, these pits are considered in the Environmental Statement.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>7</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
F J Crossley	<p>I understand that you are planning the construction of the Hornsea 3 wind farm. It is reported that you intend to dopt the alternating current transmission system to supply power from the windfarm to a site inland and that this will involve building booster stations on sites in extremely sensitive areas of the East Anglian countryside. This operation would undoubtedly involve Dong in a number of costly and bitter clashes with local environmental protection organisation and with local authorities whose duty is to protect the rural environment. I believe it is perfectly possible to transmit this powr by direct current, eliminating the need for booster stations and thus avoiding the cost, delays and frustration involved in disputes and legal action.</p> <p>As someone who believes in offshore wind power and in protecting the countryside I strongly urge you to adopt the DC option. If you do not do so I and many, many other concerned individuals will be forced to oppose your plans thus delaying your project and involving Dong in bad publicity and substantial extra cost.</p>	I	Due to current uncertainty (see previous responses on this matter), a decision on which transmission system (HVDC or HVAC) to adopt will not be made until post consent after extensive engagement with potential systems suppliers has taken place. As a result of this, we have conducted our assessments based on a realistic worst-case scenario, which could be either HVDC or HVDC technology depending on the receptor.
Matthew Martin	My view about all this is that I cannot work out why the proposed corridor for the southern end of the onshore route cannot be made to run next to the Norwich Southern by-pass. The environmental damage has already been done by the road and by the overhead cables next to the road	I	Information relating to cable corridor routing is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives. Cable corridor routing was informed by a number of factors including technical and environmental constraints, as well as the availability of a suitably wide easement without disturbing wider highway network.
Joanna and Anshuman Mondal	<p>We are concerned about the alternative route that is being considered, which is purple on your map. This route would be closer to our property than the original, yellow route, and would have considerable impact on our property and our neighbours. Could you please let us know why this alternative and more disruptive route is being considered?</p> <p>Also, can you please tell us how long the excavations will be in place? That is, from the commencement of the work around Church Farm Barns, to the restoration of the terrain.</p>	I	Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts to local residential receptors, either through site selection/route refinement or through the identification of suitable mitigation measures. Where there are impacts to residential receptors, these are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3). Justification for the route refinement changes during the pre-application phase are set out in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>7</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Derek Barber	<p>Why can't the substation go in the quarry beside the A140? Access to the substation site should be directly from the A47 (or the A140-A47 westbound slip road) at least for HGVs and abnormal loads and preferably for ALL traffic. Whatever planting is used around the substation perimeter should be native species atop an earth bank in order to achieve maximum effect as quickly as possible and provide a beneficial wildlife habitat. Much of the substation itself looks to be bordered by "ancient hedgerows". It is imperative that these suffer minimal disturbance with zero tree felling and complete restoration upon project completion. This will aid the planned perimeter screening mentioned above. Any Community Fund set up to compensate the local communities affected by this development MUST be heavily biased in favour of Swardeston and its close neighbours as they will suffer some 80% of the permanent blight of this project via the onshore substation. More so if the booster station is relocated or not needed. Having walked the whole site it would seem relatively simple to sink the substation into the ground by several metres and use the spoil so produced to bund the whole site thus reducing visual impact. More so if the bund embankment is planted with trees.</p>	I	<p>We address each of your points in turn:</p> <p>The positioning of complex infrastructure in a quarry or similar, encompasses a range of technical constraints not least the footprint area which is required, accessibility and health and safety considerations. Furthermore, the quarry remains operational, with plans to extend (as assessed in the cumulative assessments in the relevant topic chapters of the Environmental Statement volume 3) and therefore was discounted as a site alternative for the HVDC converter/HVAC substation.</p> <p>Information relating to construction traffic routing is provided in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport, which confirms that access to the HVDC converter/HVAC substation would be from the B1113.</p> <p>Appropriate mitigation measures for visual disturbance are outlined in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources. This includes, for example, the restoration of habitats (including hedgerows) which cannot be avoided and landscape planting around the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.</p> <p>We recognise that protection and sensitive restoration of hedgerows is important to minimise any negative impact on biodiversity or landscape. Impacts from Hornsea Three on ecological features, including hedgerows and trees (including woodlands) has been avoided where possible through commitments to use trenchless technologies such as Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD). The replacement of hedgerows at the end of the construction phase to be undertaken will ensure there is no net loss of hedgerow habitat as a result of Hornsea Three. Furthermore, restoration of hedgerows, currently in poor condition, provides an opportunity to achieve long term benefits for the biodiversity associated with this habitat type. Further details on hedgerow removal, retention and replacement can be found in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation as well as the Outline Ecological Management Plan and the Outline Landscape Management Plan which form part of the DCO application.</p> <p>We have established voluntary Community Benefit Funds (CBFs) for a number of our projects, which are currently under construction. These funds can make a valuable contribution to the local area, by supporting projects such as community building improvements and recreation facilities, conservation and wildlife projects etc. Hornsea Project Three will review the interactions of the project, as the proposal is refined and consider an appropriate way to feed benefits back into the local community. However, any decision to establish a community benefit fund for Hornsea Three would be made post financial investment decision (FID).</p>
Derek Barber	<p>Onshore Cable Corridor: It is critical that the final route avoids as far as possible the falling of mature trees and damage to ancient hedgerows.</p>	Y	<p>Impacts from Hornsea Three on ecological and landscape features, including hedgerows and trees (including woodlands) has been avoided where possible through commitments to use trenchless technologies such as Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD). The replacement of hedgerows at the end of the construction phase to be undertaken will ensure there is no net loss of hedgerow habitat as a result of Hornsea Project Three.</p> <p>Furthermore, restoration of hedgerows, currently in poor condition, provides an opportunity to achieve long term benefits for the biodiversity associated with this habitat type. The impacts of Hornsea Three on hedgerows and trees is presented in Environmental Statement Volume 3, Chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation, whilst further details on hedgerow removal, retention and replacement are also set out in the Outline Ecological Management Plan and the Outline Landscape Management Plan which form part of the DCO application.</p>
Derek Barber	<p>Onshore HVAC Booster Station: Is there a possibility that, if needed, this booster station can be relocated offshore?</p>	N	<p>The project envelope for Hornsea Three currently allows for one onshore HVAC booster station and up to 4 surface of 6 subsea offshore HVAC booster stations, as set out in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description. The Environmental Statement (volumes 2 and 3) assess potential impacts associated with this maximum design scenario.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>7</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Derek Barber	Your assessment of the impact of the onshore substation appear to be optimistic in the extreme.	I	Impacts associated with the onshore HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation are assessed within topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3). The EIA has taken a Rochdale Envelope approach and therefore the assessments are based on a maximum design scenario.
Derek Barber	There seems to be little mitigation with regard to the onshore substation. More detail is needed.	I	Mitigation measures relevant to the onshore HVDC converter/HVAC substation have been identified in each topic chapter of the Environmental Statement (see volume 3). A key measure for during the operational phase include strategic landscaping around the HVDC converter/HVAC substation to provide visual mitigation, as described in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources and the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.
Marguerite Russel	<b>Comments on PEIR</b> - No - This is not an area I have knowledge of and nothing to compare it with. If the recent experiences with construction of the NDR and the total chaos this has caused is repeated then North Norfolk will come to a halt again, business's will suffer and tourists will avoid us. This would be a disaster.	I	Impacts on socio-economic and tourism are addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 10: Socio-Economics.
Marguerite Russel	<b>Landfall zone</b> - This is an AONB and a very important part of the tourist area that helps the coast line's business' survive. Does this have to be the proposed landfall zone? Why was Weybourne Picked?	I	Noted. Impacts relating to landscape and visual resources are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual resources. Particular consideration has been given to the AONB as a sensitive receptor, and it is noted that Hornsea Three has consulted with the Norfolk Coast Partnership to agree viewpoints to inform the assessment of impacts on the AONB.  Justification for the chosen landfall is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives.
Marguerite Russel	<b>Area for temporary construction</b> - Essential, but I would expect you to make sure that the areas were 'put back' to how they were as soon as possible. Is there some kind of retention that can be charged in order to make sure this is done?	I	Temporary construction compounds, storage areas and accesses will be cleared as work progresses and when they are no longer required. On completion of construction work all plant, temporary buildings or vehicles will be removed. If works are delivered in phases, temporary construction compounds and accesses will be removed on completion of construction work associated with that phase unless otherwise approved by the Local Planning Authority. Following completion of the onshore cable installation, the working area will be reinstated to a state commensurate with condition prior to the commencement of works. Further details are provided in the outline CoCP which forms part of the DCO application.
Marguerite Russel	Unless more sympathetic consideration is made to the site of this station at Swardeston I cannot support the proposal. In principle I do support windfarms as an answer to our energy problems and usage but I do not feel that there has been adequate thought and consideration for the siting of the station. There is another option - the gravel pit.	I	Noted. Information pertaining to the site selection for the onshore HVDC converter/HVAC substation is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives.
Marguerite Russel	<b>Local matters landfall zone</b> - Local birds and wildlife must not suffer. Is it an important migratory route? How about the seals?	I	The final assessment for offshore birds is presented in Environmental Statement Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore Ornithology and the final assessment for Marine Mammals presented in Environmental Statement Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine Mammals with no impacts of major significance identified for either receptors.
Marguerite Russel	<b>Cable corridor</b> - The area is so vast and covers such a landscape that this is too broad a question to answer. I would want to be satisfied that the local residents along the route have had a chance to comment when they have fully understood the proposal.	I	As part of our public consultation, we have held three rounds of community consultation events through 2016 and 2017. These events were an opportunity for members of the local community to view the latest plans, to speak directly with members of the project team where individuals required further clarity, and to comment on our proposal at that stage. All the feedback received at and after the events has been carefully considered by the Project and will be incorporated where possible into the final design. A summary of the feedback is provided within the Consultation Report which forms part of the DCO application.
Marguerite Russel	<b>Refining 80m corridor</b> - 80 metres is still a substantial measurement and will have just as much impact as 200 metres.	I	Hornsea Three has sought to minimise direct impacts on sensitive receptors by reducing the onshore cable corridor from 200 m to approximately 80 m. A number of factors have fed into this refinement process, including technical and environmental. The Environmental Impact Assessment applies a Rochdale Envelope approach, and as such assesses impacts based on a maximum design scenario (i.e. a worst case), and has identified mitigation on the basis of the findings. (see Environmental Statement volume 3).



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>7</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Marguerite Russel	<b>HVAC</b> - I appreciate there must be a need for this station to be built but I feel for the local residents as they must be feeling the same anxiety and concern I do. Is the booster station as large as the HVDC converter/HVAC substation? I did not take this from the presentation. Norfolk has a lot of small 'B' and minor roads. Your construction lorries will cause havoc. The station location is in a rural area already hindered by an increase in traffic. Construction will need careful planning with highways England. Can you handle this?	I	Impacts relating to access are addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport. It is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this forms part of the DCO application.  The maximum heights and footprints of the onshore infrastructure are provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description. This identifies that the HVAC booster station has a maximum height of 12.5 m, whilst the HVDC converter/HVAC substation has a maximum height of 25 m.
Marguerite Russel	<b>Onshore cable corridor</b> - The area is so vast and covers such a landscape that this is too broad a question to answer. I would want to be satisfied that the local residents along the route have had a chance to comment when they have fully understood the proposal.	I	As part of our public consultation, we have held three rounds of community consultation events through 2016 and 2017. These events were an opportunity for members of the local community to view the latest plans, to speak directly with members of the project team where individuals required further clarity, and to comment on our proposal at that stage. All the feedback received at and after the events has been carefully considered by the Project and will be incorporated where possible into the final design. A summary of the feedback is provided within the Consultation Report which forms part of the DCO application.
Marguerite Russel	<b>80m refinement</b> - 80 metres is still a substantial measurement and will have just as much impact as 200 metres.	I	Hornsea Three has sought to minimise direct impacts on sensitive receptors by reducing the onshore cable corridor from 200 m to approximately 80 m. A number of factors have fed into this refinement process, including technical and environmental. The Environmental Impact Assessment applies a Rochdale Envelope approach, and as such assesses impacts based on a maximum design scenario (i.e. a worst case), and has identified mitigation on the basis of the findings. (see Environmental Statement volume 3).
Marguerite Russel	<b>HVAC</b> - I appreciate there must be a need for this station to be built but I feel for the local residents as they must be feeling the same anxiety and concern I do. Is the booster station as large as the HVDC converter/HVAC substation? I did not take this from the presentation. Norfolk has a lot of small 'B' and minor roads. Your construction lorries will cause havoc. The station location is in a rural area already hindered by an increase in traffic. Construction will need careful planning with highways England. Can you handle this?	I	Impacts relating to access are addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport. It is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this forms part of the DCO application.  The maximum heights and footprints of the onshore infrastructure are provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description. This identifies that the HVAC booster station has a maximum height of 12.5 m, whilst the HVDC converter/HVAC substation has a maximum height of 25 m.
Marguerite Russel	<b>Converter station</b> - Why can't the HVDC converter/HVAC substation be built in the gravel pit off the A140? This has already made a great slash in the countryside. We do not need another. Why can't the substation be totally submerged underground? Considering the overall cost of the project this would be a very small price. The roads around the proposed site will not sustain heavy lorries. Access must be from the A47. I am concerned about the light pollution. Also, will access to the station be 24/7? What will be the average flow of traffic to the substation?	I	The positioning of complex infrastructure in a quarry or similar, encompasses a range of technical constraints not least the footprint area which is required, accessibility and health and safety considerations. Furthermore, the quarry remains operational, with plans to extend (as assessed in the cumulative assessments in the relevant topic chapters of the Environmental Statement volume 3) and therefore was discounted as a site alternative for the HVDC converter/HVAC substation. Further information relating to the site selection process for the HVDC converter/HVAC substation is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives.  Information on construction access routing and traffic flows generated by Hornsea Three is provided in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport. It is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this forms part of the DCO application.
Martin Davies	<b>Refined 80m corridor</b> - The route cuts off both roads that give Swardeston access to Cringleford via Intwood. Construction needs to be staggered, so both roads are never both closed at the same time.	I	Impacts relating to access are addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport. It is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this forms part of the DCO application. The project has also committed to a large number of HDD locations including under a number of roads to avoid main road closures.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>7</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Martin Davies	<b>Substation</b> - Dig into the ground for 2 metres to reduce skyline impact. Trees to shield the site/protect the view. Perhaps the trees on the bank from the spoil from the 2 metre dig?	I	Appropriate mitigation measures for visual disturbance are outlined in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources. This includes, for example, the restoration of habitats (including hedgerows) which cannot be avoided and landscape planting around the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.
Martin Davies	<b>Baseline information</b> - Too much of the main converter/substation is 'indicative' at present. Also the view shown from north east Swardeston appears to show the new station on the brow of the hill - this is incorrect	I	Additional detail regarding the HVDC converter/HVAC substation is provided within Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description. An indication of the visual appearance of the HVDC converter/HVAC substation is provided in Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 4.7: Photographic Panels, wireframes and photomontages, within maximum design scenario wireframes and indicative photomontages.
Martin Davies	I am unconvinced by wind power as a green alternative as it is unpredictable. Predictable green sources - e.g. South Wales tidal barrage should be explored first.	N	Orsted is an offshore wind farm developer.
Martin Davies	<b>Further Comments</b> - New station could be next door to the existing main station - National Grid could input a small number of pylons to permit this.	I	A number of alternative locations were considered for the HVDC converter/HVAC substation, as described in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives. The location proposed was chosen based on a range of factors including technical and environments, and is shown in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description.
Jill Wright	<b>Landfall zone</b> - View from or any impact on the Muckleburgh Collection	I	Impacts to receptors close to the landfall, including the Muckleburgh Collection (where appropriate), are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3). Visual impacts of Hornsea Three area assessed in the Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources, the specific viewpoints included within the assessment were agreed with NCC and local authorities as set out in Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 4.1: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment Methodology.
Jill Wright	<b>Cable corridor</b> - Seems far too wide - could it not be narrower or deeper.	Y	Up to six trenches will be required to accommodate up to six circuits, each containing individual cables and fibre optics to enable communication between the wind farm and the control system. Each trench could be up to 5 metres wide at the surface reducing to 1.5 metres at the bottom. The circuits must be spaced out to minimise the mutual heating effect. This spacing enables the cables to effectively carry the large power volumes required without overheating and damaging the cable. The final width and location of each specific trench will be determined closer to the construction phase. As such, the minimum width of the onshore cable corridor is approximately 80 m.  This has been refined down from the 200 m corridor presented at PEIR. A number of factors have fed into this refinement process, including technical and environmental.
Jill Wright	<b>Refine 80m corridor</b> - It should be as narrow as possible and when filled should be returned to its former state as much as possible.	I	Up to six trenches will be required to accommodate up to six circuits, each containing individual cables and fibre optics to enable communication between the wind farm and the control system. Each trench could be up to 5 metres wide at the surface reducing to 1.5 metres at the bottom. The circuits must be spaced out to minimise the mutual heating effect. This spacing enables the cables to effectively carry the large power volumes required without overheating and damaging the cable. The final width and location of each specific trench will be determined closer to the construction phase. As such, the width of the onshore cable corridor is approximately 80 m.  This has been refined down from the 200 m corridor presented at PEIR. A number of factors have fed into this refinement process, including technical and environmental.  Prior to construction commencing a Schedule of Condition of the land will be taken and we have an obligation to return the land in the same state. Once the cables are installed, we will reinstate the land and to ensure it is in no worse a condition than prior to construction.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>7</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Jill Wright	<b>Onshore substation</b> - This is my main concern - its impact on the landscape beside the B1113 and impact of construction/maintenance on B1113 (especially at the junction of B1113/A140 which is currently a real blockage and inadequate for current usage, especially where long vehicles are concerned. Looking at the construction timescale, I think you should put the substation closer to Norwich Main and hide it inside the current gravel pits which will probably be worked out by them. This would mitigate noise, visibility and conveniently fill an unsightly hole and use a brownfield site rather than greenfield.	I	The positioning of complex infrastructure in a quarry or similar, encompasses a range of technical constraints not least the footprint area which is required, accessibility and health and safety considerations. Furthermore, the quarry remains operational, with plans to extend (as assessed in the cumulative assessments in the relevant topic chapters of the Environmental Statement volume 3) and therefore was discounted as a site alternative for the HVDC converter/HVAC substation. Further information relating to the site selection process for the HVDC converter/HVAC substation is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives.  Appropriate mitigation measures for landscape impacts and visual disturbance at the HVDC converter/HVAC substation site are outlined in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources. This includes, for example, the restoration of habitats (including hedgerows) which cannot be avoided and landscape planting around the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.
Jill Wright	<b>PEIR</b> - I just hope you can keep to your proposals to 'burrow under' roads, services such as gas pipeline etc, to cause minimum disruption to road users. No last minute cost-cutting on this, please. Some areas are well covered but not sure they all are. It is the scenic impact that seems less than adequately addressed. The buildings - especially the one nearest Norwich - are very big and will have a high visual impact. Returning again to the final building proposed for a field by the B1113 near Swardston - this field is on rising land so unless you are going to make your own quarry, some areas will make a huge impact as people come over the fill from Swardston.	Y	Impacts from Hornsea Three on sensitive receptors has been avoided where possible through commitments to use trenchless technologies such as Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD) (which have been formalised following PEIR). By using HDD under major roads, we avoid major road closures and can minimise the potential impact on local road networks. A full list of crossings, along with the methodology proposed, is provided in Environmental Statement volume 4, annex 3.6: Onshore Crossing Schedule.  Appropriate mitigation measures for visual disturbance are outlined in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources. This includes, for example, the restoration of habitats (including hedgerows) which cannot be avoided and landscape planting around the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.
Jill Wright	<b>General Comments</b> - I support because I think we must increase the amount of renewable energy. But this proposal involves too great a length/amount of land-based infrastructure. More should be coast-based (preferably on the Lincolnshire coast which is less attractive than North Norfolk) with far less in the way of power cables and substations on land. I can see that you are working within too many constraints which are not your fault. To me this shows all the faults of putting energy provision into private hands when this should be far more overall Government strategy about things like coastal sites and need for fewer long cable trails. But maybe that's too political. <b>Response Form</b> - This response form is very long and complicated	I	Information pertaining to site selection and route refinement, particularly in respect to landfall, is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives.
David Young (NNDC Councillor)	<b>Cable corridor</b> - The roads between A148 and Weybourne/Kelling are narrow, winding, with no pavements. Previous experience of lorries has been bad, especially danger to pedestrians in Kelling. Parking in Kelling during the school run, events at Beck House Barn and bird sightings turn the street into a single carriageway. Kelling is also a 'hot spot' for mobile phones.	I	Impacts relating to access are addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport. It is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this forms part of the DCO application.
David Young (NNDC Councillor)	<b>Landfall Zone</b> - Weybourne has already played host to Sheringham shoal and to Dudgeon. Yet another landfall needs to keep disruption to residents and tourists to an absolute minimum.	I	Information pertaining to site selection and route refinement, particularly in respect to landfall, is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives.  Where possible and practicable the cable corridor route selected seeks to avoid passing adjacent to properties and tourism receptors. This is to reduce impacts associated with construction disturbance and to seek to minimise conflicts such as Heavy Goods Vehicle (HGV) traffic movements. However, it is not possible to avoid passing in close proximity to all properties on the route. Where properties or sensitive receptors are located in close proximity, the Project will ensure that sensitive construction management measures, such as noise, dust and traffic control are considered. These are documented in an outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), which accompanies the DCO application. Impacts on residential receptors are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of Environmental Statement volume 3, whilst impacts on tourism specifically are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 10: Socio-Economics.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>7</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
David Young (NNDC Councillor)	<b>General Comment</b> - The lack of information on 3rd landfall route via Kelling, and the fact that there are alternative methods yet to be chosen, inevitably meant that responses from representatives at consultation meetings were not satisfying, albeit that they were friendly and helpful.	I	Information pertaining to site selection and route refinement, particularly in respect to landfall, is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives.
David Young (NNDC Councillor)	<b>Local matters landfall</b> - 3rd alternative route passes the near the Quag and Kelling Water Meadow which is much used by birdwatchers as the area has frequent sightings of unusual birds. Most of Kelling area has no mobile signal.	I	Environmental Statement volume 6, annexes 3.1 - 3.14 report on the full suite of ecological baseline surveys undertaken to inform the assessment of impacts on ecology and nature conservation as reported in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation. Environmental Statement volume 6, annexes 3.9 and 3.10 provide a description of the currently baseline in respect to ornithology (wintering, migratory and breeding birds).
David Young (NNDC Councillor)	<b>Booster station</b> - Best avoided if at all possible. Either by use of DC or by positioning offshore.	I	Noted, further information regarding HVAC compared to HVDC and the need for the booster station is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, Chapter 3: Project Description and chapter 4: Site Selection and Considerations of Alternatives.
David Young (NNDC Councillor)	<b>Temporary construction</b> - See 8 regarding traffic - need to use A149 only. Landfall compound should not prevent access along the beach and coastal views east and west. Norfolk coastal path is a major tourist amenity. If 3rd route via Kelling is used, location of compound further west would be possible (theoretically) which would distance compound and works from housing. Effect on Muckleburgh tourism likely to be less than for 'eco' tourists.	I	Impacts relating to access are addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport. It is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this forms part of the DCO application.
David Young (NNDC Councillor)	<b>PEIR</b> - HDD required for crossing obstacles and to reduce impact on wildlife in sensitive areas.	Y	Impacts from Hornsea Three on ecological features, including hedgerows and trees (including woodlands) has been avoided where possible through commitments to use trenchless technologies such as Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD).
Janet Curtis	<b>Temporary Construction</b> - Weybourne car park is unsuitable due to restricted access, use by the tourists and local residents	Y	The beach road car park is not under consideration as a construction compound. Furthermore it is noted that, since the PEIR, a refined landfall location has been identified (western re-route around Kelling) and the area identified for landfall works has reduced. This was informed by a number of factors including community feedback in the area of Kelling and Weybourne, avoidance of the Kelling Heath SSSI/CWS and Holiday Park as well as engineering/technical considerations.
Janet Curtis	<b>Cable Corridor</b> - It should avoid Weybourne village completely.	Y	Since the PEIR, a refined landfall location has been identified (western re-route around Kelling) and the area identified for landfall works has reduced. This was informed by a number of factors including community feedback in the area of Kelling and Weybourne, avoidance of the Kelling Heath SSSI/CWS and Holiday Park as well as engineering/technical considerations. Impacts associated with works at the landfall are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3).
Ian/Celia Howe	<b>Landfall Zone</b> - my main concern is where you intend to place the depot for materials, cables etc and the route you choose to deliver them to the site. The local road Beach Lane cannot take the very large lorries that are needed to deliver the cable drums.	I	Following design refinement, the area identified for landfall works has reduced and the beach lane car park is not under consideration as a construction compound. A landfall construction compound has been identified and is shown within Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description. The main construction compound, located at Oulton Airfield will also be used for the storage of materials including cables.  In respect to access, access routes will be required from the nearby road network at various places along the onshore cable corridor route, including at landfall, to access the construction works. The route and design of these access roads will be agreed with the relevant landowners in advance of construction and where possible we will seek to use existing roads and tracks. Further details on access routes and the proposed management of traffic and transport are set out in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport as well as the outline Construction Traffic Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.
R. Richards, (G E Carman, Timber Merchant)	<b>Proposal</b> - I support the efforts to use sources of sustainable energy as long as the installation effects of land routes for cabling are thought through carefully and the cheapest options not always followed if appropriate	I	Environmental Statement Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives sets out the process undertaken during the pre-application phase of Hornsea Three to optimise the project in respect to site selection and route refinement, taking into consideration technical and environmental considerations.
Dawn Moore	<b>Offshore export cable</b> - The booster station will heavily impact the residents of the Reephram area.	I	Impacts of the onshore HVAC booster station are assessed within the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3).



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>7</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Dawn Moore	<b>HVAC</b> - We were informed that the platform in that village would be quite high in structure, any eye sore needs to be away from immediate view	I	Environmental Statement Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives sets out the process undertaken during the pre-application phase of Hornsea Three to optimise the project in respect to site selection and route refinement, taking into consideration technical and environmental considerations.
Stephen Huntley	<b>HVAC</b> - There is an existing quarry site close to your proposed location for the substation which would be much more suitable. It has existing access off the A140 (close to the A47 southern bypass) designed to take heavy vehicle access. It also provides an existing hole in the ground where the 25m high buildings could be well disguised immediately without the need for new screening measures to develop over many years. I am concerned about the potential noise from the site you are considering. Existing information is very hazy and needs to be fleshed out in much more detail before any meaningful observation can be made. My property is relatively close in a straight line across the fields and could be affected.	I	Information pertaining to the site selection for the HVDC converter/HVAC substation is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives, whilst maximum dimensions are provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description.  Through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive ecological receptors. Additional mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project are outlined in topic specific chapters, and include the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts on local road networks, ecological receptors (e.g. hedgerows) and hydrological features (e.g. main rivers); and landscape planting around the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.
John Walker, (SHOOT)	<b>Cable Corridor</b> - Yes, you have been on the land without proper access	N	Response noted, this matter has been communicated to Hornsea Three land agents who manage access arrangements for surveys. As a matter principle Hornsea Three has sought to secure land owner permission for all access to land.
John Walker, (SHOOT)	<b>80m Refinement</b> - Yes, we need proper notice of access	N	Noted
John Walker, (SHOOT)	<b>PEIR Construction Methods</b> - No, so long as the methods work, the cable laid has had to be modified/rejoined months after the completion date.	I	Information relating to the reinstatement of temporary land take is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description. To summarise, prior to construction commencing a Schedule of Condition of the land will be taken and we have an obligation to return the land in the same state. Thus, following the completion of the construction works all areas of temporarily impacted land, including recreational resources, PRoWs and other linear routes affected by the onshore works would be re-instated
John Walker, (SHOOT)	<b>PEIR surveys</b> - Yes - no notice given	N	Response noted, this matter has been communicated to Hornsea Three land agents who manage access arrangements for surveys. As a matter principle Hornsea Three has sought to secure land owner permission for all access to land.
Pat Floyd	<b>HVAC</b> - Not sure where this booster station will be located in the environment	I	The location of the HVAC booster station is shown in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description.
Pat Floyd	<b>PEIR Surveys</b> - Obviously the project will not improve the landscape while under construction and affects wildlife. All building along the route must be kept to a minimum height. I also have suspicions about the amount of turbines now situating in the North Sea and how this impacts whale migrations and could be partly responsible for so many whales being beached along the Norfolk and Suffolk coasts this year	I	Thank you for your feedback. The final assessment for offshore birds is presented in Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore Ornithology and the final assessment for Marine Mammals presented in Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine Mammals with no impacts of major significance identified for either receptors.
Edward de Feyter	<b>Onshore cable</b> - Why if using HVAC do you need link boxes when offshore you do not?	I	Link boxes are required for both HVAC and HVDC technology to allow for easy operational access in the event that maintenance is required. Offshore it is not practical to install similar structures due to the technical complexity of working in such environments as well as the more mobile nature of the seabed. The primary aim offshore is to bury cables to sufficient depth to ensure that they are adequately protected. Should cables become damaged offshore and hence there is a need for a cable repair, the cables must first be recovered from the seabed so that they can be worked on in safe and dry conditions on board a vessel where new cable sections can be spliced in to replace damaged sections.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>7</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Edward de Feyter	<b>80m Refinement</b> - If HVDC was used the corridor would be narrower	I	HVDC cable circuits are typically able to transport more power than HVAC cable circuits therefore if using HVDC it is possible we may be able to use a reduced number of circuits (currently the maximum is six circuits) which could result in a narrower corridor being required. However, as noted, a HVDC scenario may result in the largest parameters of the HVDC converter/HVAC substation near Norwich Main being required. Given that a decision on HVDC and HVAC technology will not be taken prior to the application submission, Hornsea Three has conducted the EIA based on a realistic worst-case scenario, which could be either HVDC or HVAC technology depending on the receptor.
Edward de Feyter	<b>HVAC</b> - If HVDC was used booster stations would not be needed. East Anglia Three - According to a Scottish Power presentation published in November 2015, the Project will utilise either a single HVDC converter station (including rectified option) or implement a new LFAC technology. The export route to shore will need to carry the power a total of 190km, meaning standard HVAC technology will not be suitable. During October 2016, Scottish Power renewables ruled out the possibility of a conventional HVAC, as additional onshore infrastructure (such as reactive compensation equipment) would be required, which carries extensive footprint that is not desirable for East Anglia Three	I	If HVDC technology is selected, then neither an offshore or onshore HVAC booster station will be required. However, a HVDC scenario may result in the largest parameters of the HVDC converter/HVAC substation near Norwich Main being required. Current market information suggests a HVDC scenario would require the larger building height.  Given that a decision on HVDC and HVAC technology will not be taken prior to the application submission, Hornsea Three has conducted the EIA based on a realistic worst-case scenario, which could be either HVDC or HVAC technology depending on the receptor.
Edward de Feyter	<b>Converter</b> - A HVDC converter may be bigger than a HVAC substation, but it will prevent rural Norfolk from being spoilt by Booster Stations.	I	If HVDC technology is selected, then neither an offshore or onshore HVAC booster station will be required. However, as noted, a HVDC scenario may result in the largest parameters of the HVDC converter/HVAC substation near Norwich Main being required. Current market information suggests a HVDC scenario would require the larger building height.  Given that a decision on HVDC and HVAC technology will not be taken prior to the application submission, Hornsea Three has conducted the EIA based on a realistic worst-case scenario, which could be either HVDC or HVAC technology depending on the receptor.
Edward de Feyter	<b>PEIR construction</b> - If using HVDC, cable installation would be quicker and less disruptive	I	HVDC cable circuits are typically able to transport more power than HVAC cable circuits therefore if using HVDC it is possible we may be able to use a reduced number of circuits (currently the maximum is six circuits) which could result in a narrower corridor being required. However, as noted, a HVDC scenario may result in the largest parameters of the HVDC converter/HVAC substation near Norwich Main being required. Given that a decision on HVDC and HVAC technology will not be taken prior to the application submission, Hornsea Three has conducted the EIA based on a realistic worst-case scenario, which could be either HVDC or HVAC technology depending on the receptor.
Edward de Feyter	<b>Proposal</b> - I support renewable energy but not its dirty footprint. If HVDC was used the cable route would be narrower, easier to lay, quicker to reinstate, no booster stations, and the people of Norfolk would support you in your project.	I	HVDC cable circuits are typically able to transport more power than HVAC cable circuits therefore if using HVDC it is possible we may be able to use a reduced number of circuits (currently the maximum is six circuits) which could result in a narrower corridor being required.  If HVDC technology is selected, then neither an offshore or onshore HVAC booster station will be required. However, as noted, a HVDC scenario may result in the largest parameters of the HVDC converter/HVAC substation near Norwich Main being required. Current market information suggests a HVDC scenario would require the larger building height.  Given that a decision on HVDC and HVAC technology will not be taken prior to the application submission, Hornsea Three has conducted the EIA based on a realistic worst-case scenario, which could be either HVDC or HVAC technology depending on the receptor.
Edward de Feyter	<b>Further Comments</b> - Please will DONG explain the problems with HVDC. It is not new technology. Many HVDC connections, above and below ground, are being used around the world. It is that HVDC converter stations cannot hand power fluctuation from wind farms, or is it money? Please tell the people of Norfolk the truth. What is the cost difference between HVAC, HVDC and LFAC?	I	Due to current uncertainty (see previous responses), a decision on which transmission system (HVDC or HVAC) to adopt will not be made until post consent after extensive engagement with potential systems suppliers has taken place. As a result of this, we have conducted our assessments based on a realistic worst-case scenario, which could be either HVDC or HVAC technology depending on the receptor.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>7</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Edward de Feyter	<b>Information</b> - Why will DONG not commit to HVDC until after planning permission is granted? Why is low frequency alternating current transmission not being explored?	I	Due to current uncertainty (see previous responses), a decision on which transmission system (HVDC or HVAC) to adopt will not be made until post consent after extensive engagement with potential systems suppliers has taken place. As a result of this, we have conducted our assessments based on a realistic worst-case scenario, which could be either HVDC or HVDC technology depending on the receptor. Due to the distance from shore, the project needs to utilise high voltage technology
Roger Hughes	<b>80m Refinement</b> - I have no concerns regarding the corridor itself. However, I do have concerns regarding the proposed duration of the cable installation. Should the project run over three phases, presumably due to funding restrictions, it would be approaching 2030 before its completion. Laying all three cables together would shorten the period and minimise the disruption caused by years of heavy vehicle and land disturbance.	Y	During the design refinement Hornsea Three has sought to minimise the duration of any disruption, and has reduced the total duration of the construction phase onshore to eight years. Within this, the maximum duration for construction of the onshore cable corridor is approximately 2.5 years, this therefore means that the maximum duration over which construction could occur would be 5.5 years incorporating two phases (assuming a three-year gap between the two phases). The work associated with each phase is expected to progress along the Hornsea Three onshore cable corridor with a typical active construction works duration of three months at any particular location.
Roger Hughes	<b>HVAC</b> - I have a number of concerns regarding the proposed HVAC booster station. A possible height of 25m or even 12m is in my view totally unacceptable. I understand that a DC cable system would obviate the need for a booster station, and failing totally unacceptable design, construction or cost constraints, this shown to be the preferred option. In the event that an AC system is imposed, the height should not exceed (circa 8m) that of the agricultural buildings in the surrounding buildings. Any building should also be screened with appropriate native trees and vegetation, and should, at a future date, the building or infrastructure become redundant, it should not be used as a precedent for future use or development but restored to its original state.	I	Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description sets out the maximum dimensions of the HVAC booster station, which is 12.5 m (up to 17.5 with lightning protection).  It is acknowledged that if HVDC technology is selected, then neither an offshore or onshore HVAC booster station will be required. However, a HVDC scenario may result in the largest parameters of the HVDC converter/HVAC substation near Norwich Main being required. Current market information suggests a HVDC scenario would require the larger building height (up to a maximum of 25 m).  Given that a decision on HVDC and HVAC technology will not be taken prior to the application submission, Hornsea Three has conducted the EIA based on a realistic worst-case scenario, which could be either HVDC or HVDC technology depending on the receptor.  Appropriate mitigation measures for visual disturbance associated with the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation are outlined in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources. This includes, for example, the restoration of habitats (including hedgerows) which cannot be avoided and landscape planting around the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.
John Norman	<b>HVAC</b> - I am aware that environmental groups are concerned about the visual impact on the local area and the light pollution spoiling the dark Norfolk sky-line. The local community have already had great success in stopping the building of wind turbines at Bodham and Selbrigg, so I suggest their comments are taken very seriously.	I	We note your concerns regarding lighting close to the designated Dark Sky Discovery Sites. It is noted that lighting during the onshore construction phase will be short term and temporary, used only when required (and generally limited to certain working hours) and designed to avoid unnecessary illumination. Light spill during out of hours working will be minimised through the use of task-orientated lighting, as set out in the outline CoCP which accompanies the DCO application.  In terms of permanent onshore infrastructure, the cables within the AONB will be buried and there will be no operational lighting. The closest part of Hornsea Three to the AONB, and thus the dark sky discovery sites, that would have lighting during the operational phase is the potential HVAC booster station (as security lighting may be required during operation to ensure a safe working environment), which is located over 6 km from the AONB. The HVDC converter/HVAC substation also lies outside the AONB. Notwithstanding this, light spill from these permanent elements would be minimised through design, in particular the use of directional lighting. Based on the mitigation and management measures in place, no significant light spill is anticipated, particularly within the AONB.
Ray Bennett	<b>HVAC</b> - As the North Norfolk coast is an AONB which will if be possible to bury the stations and return the landscape back to here if was with a small access point?	I	Impacts relating to landscape and visual resources are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual resources. Particular consideration has been given to the AONB as a sensitive receptor, and it is noted that Hornsea Three has consulted with the Norfolk Coast Partnership to agree viewpoints to inform the assessment of impacts on the AONB.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>7</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Ray Bennett	<b>Proposal</b> - I prefer them at sea as long as where they come onshore the infrastructure is done sympathetically into the national grid	I	Noted. Both offshore and onshore HVAC boosters remain in the project envelope.
Matthew Martin	<b>Onshore Cable Corridor</b> - Given the proposed location of the HVDC Converter/HVAC substation it makes every sense to locate the corridor next to the Norwich southern by-pass and not swing it out to the South	I	Information pertaining to the routing of the onshore cable corridor is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives. This includes information on the constraints that must be considered when designing the route for onshore cables.
Matthew Martin	<b>HVAC</b> - This should be as low as possible so as to be an inobtrusive as possible in what is a largely rural area. Measures should be put in place to keep noise levels as low as possible	I	<p>The dimensions of the HVDC converter/HVAC substation is set out in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description. The maximum height would be up to 25 m.</p> <p>Where there are impacts to sensitive receptors associated with the HVDC converter/HVAC substation and/or HVAC booster station, these are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3), for example noise during the operation of the permanent infrastructure is assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 8: Noise and Vibration, with mitigation measures also identified in this chapter where relevant.</p> <p>Appropriate mitigation measures for visual disturbance are outlined in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources. This includes, for example, the restoration of habitats (including hedgerows) which cannot be avoided and landscape planting around the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.</p>
Maria Veronese	<b>HVAC</b> - We have been assured no form of station will be built near Weston Longville - thanks	Y	The Main construction compound proposed near Weston Longville has not been taken forward to the application. The main construction compound for the project will be located at Oulton Airfield, accessed off the B1149.
George Francis - Swardston Village Hall	<b>HVAC</b> - Site B does not seem to be substantially more advantageous than Site A, but I could not argue that it was significantly less advantageous	I	Hornsea Three has taken forward the HVDC converter/HVAC substation option located at Little Barningham (Site B) based on a review of a range of factors including technical and engineering constraints. Further information on site selection is set out in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives.
Valerie Stubbs	<b>Landfall</b> - The previous windfarm landfall zone had a huge area to the west of the car park at Weybourne for cable/pipe connection running along the edge of the Muckleborough collection. Where is the equivalent area - I do not see it on the proposal map?	I	All works required for Hornsea Three would be undertaken within the boundary shown on the plans which accompany the DCO application. This includes the laydown of ducting.
Valerie Stubbs	<b>Onshore Cable</b> - In Weybourne the route to the east of the village goes very close to a lot of homes. Pink-footed geese graze on the fields in that area. Many of the properties in the village are holiday lets, which will be very sensitive to noise disturbance (and other disruption). The peak holiday season is May to the end of September, but runs April to the end of October.	I	<p>Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts to local residential receptors, either through site selection/route refinement or through the identification of suitable mitigation measures. Where there are impacts to residential receptors, these are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3). Impacts on socio-economics and tourism in particular is assessed within Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 10: Socio-Economics.</p> <p>Environmental Statement, volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation considers potential impacts on ecological receptors as a result of Hornsea Three. This includes potential impacts on species such as Pink-footed Geese.</p>



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>7</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Christine Walton	<b>HVAC</b> - I do not believe that as this is the 3rd project that you cannot use the infrastructure you already have or at least significantly reduce the amount of new building work necessary. 25m high building - really? Serious green screening and noise reduction needs to be sorted out being dealing with the building of it. I do not believe there has been enough consideration given to the reality of the disruption, noise and destruction of the countryside	I	Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts to local residential receptors, either through site selection/route refinement or through the identification of suitable mitigation measures. Where there are impacts to receptors, these are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3), for example visual impacts associated with the HVDC converter/HVAC substation is addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources. This chapter also identifies appropriate mitigation measures. This includes, for example, the restoration of habitats (including hedgerows) which cannot be avoided and landscape planting around the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application. Impacts relating to noise during the operational phase is assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 8: Noise and Vibration.
Christine Walton	<b>Substation</b> - There has already been considerable land destruction/disruption/noise in East Anglia due to unthought through building against local residents wishes and through the building of the Northern bypass around Norwich and through Norfolk. Consideration to routes put in place for this would also apply to other building projects. More thinking needs to take place re minimising this destruction and also honest feedback re how long it will take and how much disruption there would be. I do not think the occurrence of this project is worth losing our beautiful countryside.	I	Further information on the site selection and refinement process for the HVDC converter/HVAC substation is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Alternatives. Hornsea Three has sought to minimise disturbance through the identification of relevant mitigation measures which are outlined in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3).
Christine Walton	<b>Onshore Cable</b> - This is a huge area, would cause enormous disruption to the residents near to and in the villages it passes through. Open cut should be used as little as possible. Screening and more sophisticated noise reduction techniques necessary. Once the countryside has been mutilated no amount of replanting will bring it back	I	Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts to sensitive receptors, either through site selection/route refinement or through the identification of suitable mitigation measures. This includes for example, impacts from Hornsea Three have been avoided where possible through commitments to use trenchless technologies such as Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD). Where there are impacts to receptors (e.g. residential or ecological), these are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3).
Christine Walton	<b>Temporary Construction</b> - No 'temporary construction' should be done unless absolutely necessary as the destruction of wildlife habitats would not be temporary	I	A number of secondary construction compounds, and a main construction compound are proposed during the construction phase of Hornsea Three. These are required to enable the construction of the project. The location of these, as well as a summary of their function, is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description.
Francis Farron	<b>Export Cable Corridor</b> - The main consideration in the MC2 Cromer reef even if avoided there could be impact from suspended sediment from trenching operations nearby. What mitigation is in place? - HDD/working at slack water. Again not enough detail seen.	I	The offshore cable corridor in the nearshore environment has now been rerouted to avoid direct impact from cable installation on the Subtidal Chalk feature of the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ (see Environmental Statement volume 5, annex 2.3: MCZ Assessment). Consideration is also given to potential impacts associated with suspended sediment.
Ruth Bullard	<b>PEIR Construction Methods</b> - I am pleased that cables will be underground. The coverter/substation will need landscaping. It would be good to improve the locality from an environmental perspective - more trees, more hedgerows, ponds etc.	Y	Noted.  Appropriate mitigation measures for visual disturbance are outlined in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources. This includes, for example, the restoration of habitats (including hedgerows) which cannot be avoided and landscape planting around the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.  The replacement of hedgerows at the end of the construction phase to be undertaken will ensure there is no net loss of hedgerow habitat as a result of Hornsea Project Three. Furthermore, restoration of hedgerows, currently in poor condition, provides an opportunity to achieve long term benefits for the biodiversity associated with this habitat type. Further details on hedgerow removal, retention and replacement can be found in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation as well as the Outline Ecological Management Plan and the Outline Landscape Management Plan which form part of the DCO application.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>7</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Ruth Bullard	<b>Proposal</b> - I strongly support the development of wind power. As I live in Swardeston, I would prefer that the substation was built somewhere else. It is an area under huge existing pressure for further development - all of which will change the character of the locality. If care was genuinely taken over landscaping, building design and environmental impact, then I could support the development. However, as local residents, we have been promised much before the developers prior to gaining planning consent and then none of it has been stuck to once building commences.	I	Noted.  Appropriate mitigation measures for visual disturbance are outlined in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources. This includes, for example, the restoration of habitats (including hedgerows) which cannot be avoided and landscape planting around the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.  Other potential impacts associated with Hornsea Three are assessed in the relevant topic chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3). Where appropriate, mitigation measures are identified in the topic specific chapters, these are summarised in Environmental Statement volume 4, chapter 5.1: Enhancements, Mitigation and Monitoring Commitments along with the mechanism by which they would be secured.
G. Dansey-Smith	<b>Substation</b> - Siting the HVDC converter and HVAC substation on the proposed site south of A47 and north of Swardeston will pose difficulties with its position and construction. The building will be an absolute eyesore if it is not bunkered to a large extent. It will be difficult to access with large heavy items, such as turbines on large vehicles. The B1113 is totally unsuitable due to its width and tight bends. The only access point by road could be the access road off the A140 to the A47 in a westerly direction. The road could then run parallel to the A47 to the site	I	Impacts relating to access are addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport. It is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this forms part of the DCO application.
Elaine Parkinson	<b>Proposal</b> - Understand the need for renewable energy	I	Noted. The need for renewable energy is detailed in government policy which is summarised in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 2: Policy and Legislation.
Elaine Parkinson	<b>Export Cable</b> - Minimise impact and removal of debris. Reinstate public footpaths	I	Through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive ecological receptors. For example, Weybourne Cliffs and Kelling Heath SSSI have been avoided and no direct impacts are predicted on these designated sites from Hornsea Three. Additional mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project are outlined in topic specific chapters, and include the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts on local road networks, ecological receptors (e.g. hedgerows) and hydrological features (e.g. main rivers).  A site waste management plan forms part of the DCO application and sets out Hornsea Three's approach to waste management.  Where the onshore cable corridor crossed public rights of way, Hornsea Three has sought to avoid impacts through the use of HDD technology. Where this has not been possible and thus open cut, or HDD with a haul road over, is proposed, the routes will be temporarily diverted along existing tracks, for a maximum of one month per cable. Following the completion of the construction works all areas of access land, recreational resources, PRoWs and other linear routes affected by the onshore works would be re-instated to their current condition and/or along their current alignments. There would be no physical effects on these resources arising from the operation or maintenance of Hornsea Three. The measures to be taken to ensure the continued use of all linear recreational resources during the construction phase of the project have been discussed with Norfolk County Council and are set out in the Outline CoCP. This dialogue will continue during the detailed design process. The assessment of impacts on individual public rights of way (where appropriate) are set out in Environmental Statement, volume 3, chapter 6: Land Use and Recreation.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>7</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Elaine Parkinson	<b>Landfall Zone</b> - Minimise impact and reinstate beaches etc	I	Through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive ecological receptors. For example, Weybourne Cliffs and Kelling Heath SSSI have been avoided and no direct impacts are predicted on these designated sites from Hornsea Three. Additional mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project are outlined in topic specific chapters, and include the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts on local road networks, ecological receptors (e.g. hedgerows) and hydrological features (e.g. main rivers).  At the culmination of construction, Hornsea Three would reinstate the beach and landfall to baseline conditions. Further details on impacts to recreational users at the beach is assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 6: Land Use and Recreation.
Elaine Parkinson	<b>Local Matters Landfall Zone</b> - Make it better when reinstated	I	At the culmination of construction, Hornsea Three would reinstate the beach and landfall to baseline conditions. Further details on impacts to recreational users at the beach is assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 6: Land Use and Recreation.
Elaine Parkinson	<b>80m Refinement</b> - Refine it as much as you can	Y	Environmental Statement, volume 3, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives sets out the process of site selection and route refinement. Through this design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive ecological receptors.
Elaine Parkinson	<b>PEIR Construction Method</b> - Good to put cables underground. Shame you cannot do the same with local pylons (Swainsthorpe).	N	Noted.
Neil Buxton	<b>Onshore Cable</b> - Your proposals are vague in the Weybourne/Norfolk zone.	I	Further clarification on the landfall is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description.
John Mangan	<b>Landfall Zone Local Matters</b> - I would be concerned that when the sea defence is breached for the corridor, the gap will allow the sea to flood through on a high tide and flood the hinterland	I	Appropriate mitigation measures have been design-in to Hornsea Three to minimise impacts on drainage and flooding. Details are provided in volume 3, chapter 2: Hydrology and Flood Risk (see Table 2.17) as well as the outline CoCP which forms part of the DCO application.  A flood risk assessment is provided in Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 2.1: Onshore Infrastructure FRAs and identified historic flooding events relevant to Hornsea Three. This has been developed in accordance with the NPS, NPPF, PPG ID7 and the SuDS Manual. The Flood Risk Assessment which has been undertaken for the Project concludes that Hornsea Three meets the requirements of NPS EN-1 and the NPPF.
Louisa Peaver	<b>PEIR - Construction Methods</b> - Using HDD for all road crossings would significantly reduce impacts. No replacing of old hedgerows would be needed. Public access issue and traffic inconveniences would be negated. A three phase construction approach is completely unacceptable. It would have significant impacts on my community	Y	During the design refinement Hornsea Three has sought to minimise the duration of any disruption, and has reduced the total duration of the construction phase onshore to eight years.  In respect to the construction methodology, impacts from Hornsea Three on the local road network, hydrological features, designated sites and ecological features (including hedgerows) has been avoided where possible through commitments to use trenchless technologies such as Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD). A full list of crossings, along with the methodology proposed, is provided in Environmental Statement volume 4, annex 3.6: Onshore Crossing Schedule.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>7</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Louisa Peaver	<b>PEIR Surveys</b> - PEIR volume 3 chapter 6 land use and recreation does not consider the indefinite impact of the Booster Station. It only discusses the cable corridor. The booster station's visual/noise presence will permanently reduce recreational use of the nearby PROWs. The height of the flood light lamp-posts does not seem to have been considered in the visual assessments	I	Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 6: Land Use and Recreation provides an assessment of potential impacts from Hornsea Three during construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning. It considers impacts from all onshore infrastructure, including the onshore cable corridor, the HVAC booster station, the HVDC converter/HVAC substation, compounds, storage areas and access roads.  Any effects on the amenity of visitor resources, including PRoW arising from changes to the visual and acoustic environment are addressed in Environmental Statement, volume 3 chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources and chapter 8: Noise and Vibration respectively.  At the HVAC booster station site lighting will only operate when required and will be directional to avoid unnecessary illumination. Given the rochdale envelope approach to assessment within the EIA, the landscape and visual effects assessment considers the maximum design parameters, which the height of any lamp-posts would sit within. This approach is discussed in more detail in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 5: EIA Methodology and Assessment as well as volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources.
Louisa Peaver	<b>Proposal</b> - Please have HVDC as your preferred method, not AC. DC would significantly reduce the detrimental effects of a booster station i.e. the industrialisation of countryside. Whilst it may be more extensive, it is viable, has been used elsewhere and would be a national example of forward thinking, environmentally sensitive development	I	HVDC cable circuits are typically able to transport more power than HVAC cable circuits therefore if using HVDC it is possible we may be able to use a reduced number of circuits (currently the maximum is six circuits) which could result in a narrower corridor being required. Furthermore, if HVDC technology is selected, then neither an offshore or onshore HVAC booster station will be required. However, as noted, a HVDC scenario may result in the largest parameters of the HVDC converter/HVAC substation near Norwich Main being required. Current market information suggests a HVDC scenario would require the larger building height.  Given that a decision on HVDC and HVAC technology will not be taken prior to the application submission, Hornsea Three has conducted the EIA based on a realistic worst-case scenario, which could be either HVDC or HVAC technology depending on the receptor.
Maureen Durrant	<b>Onshore Cable</b> - 200m is completely unacceptable	Y	Hornsea Three has sought to minimise direct impacts on sensitive receptors by reducing the onshore cable corridor from 200 m to approximately 80 m. A number of factors have fed into this refinement process, including technical and environmental, as summarised in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives.
Merlyn Bibb	<b>PEIR Construction Methods</b> - Can you say how long the excavations will be in place? That is, from the commencement of the work adjacent to our property to the restoration of the terrain. I understand that this may be for a prolonged period, and if so, it is difficult to understand why the alternative route is being considered. It would be incredibly disruptive to our neighbours, and likely more so for us too.	I	During the design refinement Hornsea Three has sought to minimise the duration of any disruption, and has reduced the total duration of the construction phase onshore to eight years. Within this, the maximum duration for construction of the onshore cable corridor is approximately 2.5 years, this therefore means that the maximum duration over which construction could occur would be 5.5 years incorporating two phases (assuming a three-year gap between the two phases). The work associated with each phase is expected to progress along the Hornsea Three onshore cable corridor with a typical active construction works duration of three months at any particular location.  Further details on the construction programme are available in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description.
Merlyn Bibb	<b>Consultation</b> - Generally very good but it was only the last consultation meeting that the true extent of the required excavations became apparent (three widely spaced cables, not one, and a much wider working corridor than initially conveyed)	I	Hornsea Three has sought to minimise direct impacts on sensitive receptors by reducing the onshore cable corridor from 200 m to approximately 80 m. A number of factors have fed into this refinement process, including technical and environmental, as summarised in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives.  The project parameters, including the number of cable circuits is set out in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description. There would be up to a maximum of six cable circuits, in six trenches.
Sarah Griggs-Smith	<b>Offshore Array</b> - No, I support wind generation of electricity	N	Noted.



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>7</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Sarah Griggs-Smith	<b>Substation</b> - This is in the field directly opposite my house. Why cannot this be next to the Main Grid on a field just to the south of it. No uses there. Concerns about links to the Main Grid - electric magnetic field. Please ensure tree planting prior to the building. Noise - views ruined. House value slashed. Unable to move/se;; - compensation? Access and water supplies to Mangreen? Need to know level of disruption/noise/safety. Cables (80m?) as far from house as possible e.g. in the next field - put substation next to the main grid. Ancient hedges 400 years old. Sink substation unde ground level. Embankment around it to reduce view/noise	I	Hornsea Three has sought to avoid residential areas, as well as sensitive historic receptors through site selection and cable routing, this has included scheduled monuments, listed buildings, registered park and gardens etc. Hornsea Three has also committed to the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts on local road networks, ecological receptors (e.g. trees, hedgerows) and hydrological features (e.g. main rivers).  Compensation is paid for the freehold depreciation of the land directly affected by the easement and for all reasonable and substantiated losses arising from construction of the project.  Impacts related to access, noise, disruption and hedgerows are all assessed in topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3).
Sarah Griggs-Smith	<b>Temporary Construction</b> - Tree planting around substation work for noise/fencing. Timescale for this. Access on local lanes. Footpath access. Substation behind the existing trees and hedges which are very old	I	The landscapes within the study areas of the onshore HVAC booster station and onshore HVDC converter/HVAC substation are characterised by fields and local roads enclosed by dense hedgerows, hedgerow trees, tree blocks and woodlands. This provides layers of vegetation that would help to screen and filter views of Hornsea Three, and integrate the onshore HVAC booster station and onshore HVDC converter/HVAC substation into the landscape. As such, Hornsea Three has sought to avoid directly impacting existing features (including trees and hedgerows) through cable routing or the use of trenchless technologies. Any hedgerows which cannot be avoided will be replaced at the end of the construction phase. Furthermore, restoration of hedgerows, currently in poor condition, provides an opportunity to achieve long term benefits for the biodiversity associated with this habitat type as well as gap up hedgerows providing landscape and visual mitigation. Further details on hedgerow removal, retention and replacement can be found in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation as well as the Outline Ecological Management Plan and the Outline Landscape Management Plan which form part of the DCO application.  To supplement this existing landscape screening, proposals for mitigation planting have been identified to provide further screening. Landscape proposals are detailed in the Outline LMP which forms part of the DCO application.  Hornsea Three has committed to using trenchless technologies to cross all roads, to minimise impacts on the local road network. Similarly, where the onshore cable corridor crossed public rights of way, Hornsea Three has sought to avoid impacts through the use of HDD technology. Where this has not been possible and thus open cut, or HDD with a haul road over, is proposed, the routes will be temporarily diverted along existing tracks, for a maximum of one month per cable. Following the completion of the construction works all PRoWs and other linear routes affected by the onshore works would be re-instated to their current condition and/or along their current alignments. The assesment of impacts on individual public rights of way (where appropriate) are set out in Environmental Statement, volume 3, chapter 6: Land Use and Recreation.
Sarah Griggs-Smith	<b>PEIR Construction Methods</b> - Safety of underground cables from substation to main grid. Why not put the substation next to the main grid? Without need for cables next to homes. Why not put substation on the existing gravel pit area?	I	Information pertaining to the site selection for the HVDC converter/HVAC subsattion station is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives, whilst maximum dimensions are provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description.
Sarah Griggs-Smith	<b>PEIR Surveys</b> - Not read details of this, but saw information at the meeting. High building, please dig embankment and put it below level of ground. Hedges, woodland. Do not cut ancient trees of perimeter	I	The parameters of the permanant infrastructure is set out in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description. Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts from these features on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive ecological receptors. For example, the orientation of the HVAC booster station has been optimised to minimise impacts on nearby field boundaries (hedgerows and trees) as well as maximise natural screening. Additional mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project are outlined in topic specific chapters, and include the use of trenchless technologies (i.e. HDD) to avoid or minimise impacts on local road networks, ecological receptors (e.g. hedgerows and woodland) and hydrological features (e.g. main rivers).

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>7</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Sarah Griggs-Smith	<b>Mitigation Methods</b> - Protect woodland, housing. Archeology and historical 400 year old hedges and Embankment and dig in the structure	I	<p>We recognise that protection of hedgerows and woodland is important to minimise any negative impact on biodiversity or landscape. Impacts from Hornsea Three on ecological features, including hedgerows and trees (including woodlands) has been avoided where possible through commitments to use trenchless technologies such as Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD). As a result of this, Hornsea Three has no direct impacts on ancient woodland.</p> <p>The replacement of hedgerows at the end of the construction phase to be undertaken will ensure there is no net loss of hedgerow habitat as a result of Hornsea Project Three. Furthermore, restoration of hedgerows, currently in poor condition, provides an opportunity to achieve long term benefits for the biodiversity associated with this habitat type. Further details on hedgerow removal, retention and replacement can be found in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation as well as the Outline Ecological Management Plan and the Outline Landscape Management Plan which form part of the DCO application.</p> <p>Hornsea Three has also sought to avoid direct impacts on heritage assets through route refinement and site selection (see Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives). Any remaining impacts on heritage assets are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 5: Historic Environment.</p> <p>Where properties are located in close proximity, the Project will ensure that sensitive construction management measures, such as noise, dust and traffic control are considered. These are documented in an outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), which accompanies the DCO application.</p>
Sarah Griggs-Smith	<b>Proposal</b> - I support wind power but would like as much as possible to mitigate the negative effects this will have on my home of 35 years. Please consider putting the substation nearer to mains - not in the field behind my garden. My house will definitely not be sellable and will lose a lot of value. Please can we arrange a face to face meeting with Mangreen residents/ Embankment around the site would be very important	I	<p>Information pertaining to the site selection for the HVDC converter/HVAC substation is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives. The site selection process was informed by a number of factors including community feedback, technical constraints and environmental constraints.</p> <p>Through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts from the HVDC converter/HVAC substation. For example, Hornsea Three has proposed landscape planting around the HVDC converter/HVAC substation to provide additional natural screening to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.</p>
Karl Feistner	<b>EIA</b> - Impossible to judge the Environmental impact of the HVAC booster station when at consultation there was no information as to exactly how big it would be, how noisy, how screened etc.	I	<p>Information pertaining to the site selection for the HVAC booster station is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives, whilst maximum dimensions are provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description.</p> <p>Through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts from the HVAC booster station on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive receptors. For example, the orientation of the HVAC booster station has been optimised to minimise impacts on nearby field boundaries (hedgerows and trees) as well as maximise natural screening. Additional mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project are outlined in topic specific chapters, and include the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts on local road networks, ecological receptors (e.g. hedgerows) and hydrological features (e.g. main rivers); and landscape planting around the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>7</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Karl Feistner	<b>Mitigation Methods</b> - Didn't find much mention of mitigation measures for HVAC booster station. Most listings for the environmental impact of the booster station were 'Adverse' so best mitigation would be to do away with it altogether by going down the HVDC route. As I understand it that would also reduce cable requirements and thereby mitigate cable installation impacts as well.	I	Information pertaining to the site selection for the HVAC booster station is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives, whilst maximum dimensions are provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description. Through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts from the HVAC booster station on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive receptors. For example, the orientation of the HVAC booster station has been optimised to minimise impacts on nearby field boundaries (hedgerows and trees) as well as maximise natural screening. Additional mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project are outlined in topic specific chapters, and include the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts on local road networks, ecological receptors (e.g. hedgerows) and hydrological features (e.g. main rivers); and landscape planting around the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.  If HVDC technology is selected, then neither an offshore or onshore HVAC booster station will be required, and it is possible we may be able to use a reduced number of circuits (currently the maximum is six circuits) which could result in a narrower corridor being required. However, a HVDC scenario may result in the largest parameters of the HVDC converter/HVAC substation near Norwich Main being required.  Given that a decision on HVDC and HVAC technology will not be taken prior to the application submission, Hornsea Three has conducted the EIA based on a realistic worst-case scenario, which could be either HVDC or HVDC technology depending on the receptor.
Karl Feistner	<b>Proposal</b> - I strongly support development of renewable energy sources and believe that offshore wind has a significant beneficial part to play. However I am opposed to the transmission technology being proposed (HVAC). A technology exists (HVDC) that is more efficient and that would have reduced environmental impact and it should therefore be chosen as part of properly 'green' energy provision.	I	Due to current uncertainty (see previous responses), a decision on which transmission system (HVDC or HVAC) to adopt will not be made until post consent after extensive engagement with potential systems suppliers has taken place. As a result of this, we have conducted our assessments based on a realistic worst-case scenario, which could be either HVDC or HVDC technology depending on the receptor.
Karl Feistner	<b>Further Comments</b> - I couldn't find obvious mention of the predicted (or design) lifespan of the project elements. There were assessments of decommissioning impacts but no information of when or why decommissioning could be expected. I believe this should be viewed as a long term project, designed and built with that in mind rather than as cheaply as possible to turn a quick profit. We shouldn't be expecting to go through all this again in another 20 years or so time...	I	The operational life of Hornsea Three is 35 years, as set out in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description.  For onshore works, a Decommissioning Plan is secured by the draft Development Consent Order. For the EIA, we assume that all onshore infrastructure (except the onshore cables) is removed at the point of decommissioning the project. However, the requirements for decommissioning will be revisited nearer to the point of decommissioning of the project. There could be an opportunity to review the wind farm and seek an application for repowering if this was viable. In the repowering scenario, the project would need to reapply.
Karl Feistner	<b>Information</b> - When will a decision on transmission technology will be taken, and what it will be based on. What are the designed lifespans of the project elements.	I	Due to current uncertainty (see volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives), a decision on which transmission system (HVDC or HVAC) to adopt will not be made until post consent after extensive engagement with potential systems suppliers has taken place. This will also be informed by a feasibility study. As a result of this, we have conducted our assessments based on a realistic worst-case scenario, which could be either HVDC or HVDC technology depending on the receptor.  The operating life of Hornsea Three are set out in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>7</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Karl Feistner	<b>Landfall</b> - Any required beach access restrictions should limited to as short a period of time as possible and there should be nothing visible once works are completed.	I	<p>In respect to beach access, a Beach Access Management Plan will be developed in consultation with, and agreed with Norfolk County Council. This Plan would include management measures to be put in place on the beach at either side of the construction working areas to guide walkers along the diverted coastal path, and would also set out the measures to be followed for the reinstatement of the coastal path following the completion of construction works. Information on these temporary changes to the route of the coastal path would be posted in the beach side car park to the north of Weybourne, together with general information of the construction activities</p> <p>Following the completion of the construction works all areas of access land, recreational resources, PROWs and other linear routes affected by the onshore works would be re-instated to their current condition and/or along their current alignments. There would be no physical effects on these resources arising from the operation or maintenance of Hornsea Three.</p> <p>The assessment of impacts on individual public rights of way (where appropriate) and recreational access to the beach are set out in Environmental Statement, volume 3, chapter 6: Land Use and Recreation.</p>
Karl Feistner	<b>Local Matters Landfall Zone</b> - Any beach reshaping due to tidal / storm surges should not leave any installation works exposed.	N	This comment is noted and such considerations are critical to the detailed design work associated with the cable landfall.
Karl Feistner	<b>HVAC</b> - There would be no requirement of this booster station if HVDC was implemented as the transmission technology. HVDC has the advantage of being more efficient and would negate the need to build a large noisy industrial installation (the booster station) in the middle of unspoilt countryside. Contrary to some things that were said at the consultation, HVDC has been successfully used for other North Sea wind farms ( <a href="http://new.abb.com/news/detail/1689/ABB-delivers-DolWin2-wind-connection">http://new.abb.com/news/detail/1689/ABB-delivers-DolWin2-wind-connection</a> ) and should be seen as the technology of the future. I believe every effort should be made to use HVDC transmission. IF there is a compelling case for HVAC (none was suggested at the consultation) then every effort should be made to conceal the booster station from sight (high earth bunds, tree planting etc., and to make sure that it does not cause any sound or light pollution by enclosing machinery in soundproofed buildings as required.	I	<p>Due to current uncertainty (see previous responses), a decision on which transmission system (HVDC or HVAC) to adopt will not be made until post consent after extensive engagement with potential systems suppliers has taken place. As a result of this, we have conducted our assessments based on a realistic worst-case scenario, which could be either HVDC or HVDC technology depending on the receptor.</p> <p>In this regard, an assessment of potential impacts of the HVDC converter/HVAC substation is provided in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement, volume 3. In respect to the three points mentioned in the response, appropriate mitigation measures for visual disturbance are outlined in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources. This includes, for example, the restoration of habitats (including hedgerows) which cannot be avoided and landscape planting around the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.</p> <p>Noise during the operation of the HVDC converter/HVAC substation is addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 8: Noise and Vibration, where mitigation is also proposed to minimise the potential for significant effects.</p> <p>Lighting during the operational phase is likely to be required at the HVDC converter/HVAC substation (as security lighting may be required during operation to ensure a safe working environment). Notwithstanding this, light spill from these permanent elements would be minimised through design, in particular the use of directional lighting. Based on the mitigation and management measures in place, no significant light spill is anticipated.</p>
Karl Feistner	<b>Construction</b> - The cables should be sufficiently deeply buried.	I	The depth of the cable trenches are set out in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description.
Geoff Fisher	<b>Onshore Cable</b> - Length of total time of land disturbance if cable laying is conducted over more than one phase	I	During the design refinement Hornsea Three has sought to minimise the duration of any disruption, and has reduced the total duration of the construction phase onshore to eight years. Within this, the maximum duration for construction of the onshore cable corridor is approximately 2.5 years, this therefore means that the maximum duration over which construction could occur would be 5.5 years incorporating two phases (assuming a three-year gap between the two phases). The work associated with each phase is expected to progress along the Hornsea Three onshore cable corridor with a typical active construction works duration of three months at any particular location.



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>7</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Julia Peters	<b>Landfall</b> - The anticipated 'complete loss' of the small wetland by the beach should be averted by placing the ECR some 200m to the west.	Y	Since the PEIR, a refined landfall location has been identified (western re-route around Kelling) and the area identified for landfall works has reduced. This was informed by a number of factors including community feedback in the area of Kelling and Weybourne, avoidance of the Kelling Heath SSSI/CWS and Holiday Park as well as engineering/technical considerations. Remaining impacts on the landfall area are assessed in topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement volume 3, with impacts on ecological habitats specifically assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation.
John Seymour	<b>Onshore Cable</b> - The issues relating to the possible phasing of the project over some 11 years is unacceptable. The disturbance to the countryside will be significant anyway and to have to do it in three phases would be a disaster for all those living on or near the route.	Y	Following design refinement, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise the duration of any disruption during construction, reducing the total duration of the construction phase onshore to eight years in a maximum of two phases. Within this, the maximum duration for construction of the onshore cable corridor is approximately 2.5 years, this therefore means that the maximum duration over which construction of the onshore cable corridor could occur would be 5.5 years incorporating two phases (assuming a three-year gap between the two phases).  Hornsea Three has designed the project to avoid or minimise impacts on residential receptors. Specific measures are identified in the relevant topic chapters of the Environmental Statement.
John Seymour	<b>80m Refinement</b> - As above, phasing the project is unacceptable.	Y	During the design refinement Hornsea Three has sought to minimise the duration of any disruption, and has reduced the total duration of the construction phase onshore to eight years. Within this, the maximum duration for construction of the onshore cable corridor is approximately 2.5 years, this therefore means that the maximum duration over which construction could occur would be 5.5 years incorporating two phases (assuming a three-year gap between the two phases). The work associated with each phase is expected to progress along the Hornsea Three onshore cable corridor with a typical active construction works duration of three months at any particular location. Further information on the proposed construction programme is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1: Project Description.
John Seymour	<b>HVAC</b> - Put serious consideration of the DC alternative to the top go the agenda. It has been used elsewhere and if used here would obviate the need for the booster station. If the booster station is to be built then much more needs doing to mitigate the issues of screening, light pollution, noise and vibration. Nothing in your documentation addresses these concerns adequately. The construction of a scaffold tower of the proposed height would indicate what might be seen and from where in an absolute method which no amount of visualisations can achieve.	I	HVDC cable circuits are typically able to transport more power than HVAC cable circuits therefore if using HVDC it is possible we may be able to use a reduced number of circuits (currently the maximum is six circuits) which could result in a narrower corridor. However, as noted, a HVDC scenario may result in the largest parameters of the HVDC converter/HVAC substation near Norwich Main being required. The EIA therefore conducts the assessments based on a realistic worst-case scenario, which could be either HVDC or HVDC technology depending on the receptor.  Through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts from the HVAC booster station and HVDC converter/HVAC substation on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive ecological receptors. For example, the orientation of the HVAC booster station has been optimised to minimise impacts on nearby field boundaries (hedgerows and trees) as well as maximise natural screening. Additional mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project are outlined in topic specific chapters, and include the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts on local road networks, ecological receptors (e.g. hedgerows) and hydrological features (e.g. main rivers).  Landscape and visual impacts are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual resources. Photographic panels along the cable corridor, as well as indicative visualisations have been prepared to inform the assessment of impacts and are provided in Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 4.5: Photographic Panels, Wireframes and Photomontages. Lighting during the operational phase may be required at the HVAC booster station (as security lighting may be required during operation to ensure a safe working environment). Notwithstanding this, light spill from these permanent elements would be minimised through design, in particular the use of directional lighting. Based on the mitigation and management measures in place, no significant light spill is anticipated,

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>7</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
John Seymour	<b>Temporary Construction</b> - Again, the possibility of phasing the project makes the whole argument that 'temporary' compounds will be anything but temporary.	I	<p>During the design refinement Hornsea Three has sought to minimise the duration of any disruption, and has reduced the total number of phases from three to two, and the total duration of the construction phase onshore to eight years. Within this, the maximum duration for construction of the onshore cable corridor is approximately 2.5 years, this therefore means that the maximum duration over which construction could occur would be 5.5 years incorporating two phases (assuming a three-year gap between the two phases). The work associated with each phase is expected to progress along the Hornsea Three onshore cable corridor with a typical active construction works duration of three months at any particular location. Further information on the proposed construction programme is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1: Project Description.</p> <p>Temporary construction compounds, storage areas and accesses will be cleared as work progresses and when they are no longer required. On completion of construction work all plant, temporary buildings or vehicles will be removed. If works are delivered in phases, temporary construction compounds and accesses will be removed on completion of construction work associated with that phase unless otherwise approved by the Local Planning Authority. Following completion of the onshore cable installation, the working area will be reinstated to a state commensurate with condition prior to the commencement of works. Further details are provided in the outline CoCP which forms part of the DCO application.</p>
John Seymour	<b>PEIR Construction Method</b> - If phasing is inevitable the use of cable ducts to provide ducting for all three phases should be installed in the first phase to minimise future disruption during phases 2 and 3. Under road and hedgerow horizontal boring is something that would assist in reducing the damages to the environment.	I	<p>During the design refinement Hornsea Three has sought to minimise the duration of any disruption, and has reduced the total number of phases from three to two, and the total duration of the construction phase onshore to eight years.</p> <p>Mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project are outlined in topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3), and include the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts on local road networks, ecological receptors (e.g. hedgerows) and hydrological features (e.g. main rivers).</p>
Brian Donovan	<b>Local Matters Landfall Zone</b> - Please don't damage the cliffs or beach. They are historical and have been disrupted many times (above) .Your cable going out to sea from the land will need to be deep under the beach to account for the significantly shifting shingle on the beach.The very low cliffs to the west of the car park are very fragile and are eroding quickly. Please do not add to the damage of them. Beach Lane is not wide enough for HGV vehicles delivering to the beach	Y	<p>Following design refinement, the area identified for landfall works has reduced and the beach lane car park is not under consideration as a construction compound. Further details on the proposed landfall, including access are set out in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description and volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport.</p>
Brian Donovan	<b>Proposal</b> - Your project staff at the Holt consultation do not seem to understand the importance of the impact of decommission or the service support risks. How ever all the staff were friendly and tried to be helpful . Some staff seemed to have more experience than others	I	<p>For the EIA, impacts have been assessed on the basis that all onshore infrastructure (except the onshore cables) is removed at the point of decommissioning the project. However, the requirements for decommissioning will be revisited nearer to the point of decommissioning of the project. There could be an opportunity to review the wind farm and seek an application for repowering if this was viable. In the repowering scenario, the project would need to reapply.</p> <p>Additional information on decommissioning is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description.</p>
John Humberstone	<b>EIA</b> - Seems the route runs from countryside and therefore needs to demolish any type of building	I	<p>The onshore cable route runs primarily through agricultural land. The final route that has been selected does not require any buildings to be demolished.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>7</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Robert Speck	Yes, disguise it. Make it quiet. Do not take ambient noise readings from next to roads which is what you have done. This is one of the quietest counties in the SE. Keep it so [check end of this to make sure info not missed off]	I	Through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts from permanent infrastructure on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive ecological receptors. Mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project are outlined in topic specific chapters, and include the use of trenchless technologies to maintain natural screening and ecological receptors (e.g. hedgerows) as well as landscape planting around the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.  The results of the baseline noise surveys are presented in Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 8.1: Baseline Noise Surveys, and sets out how the project has ensured that a realistic worst case assessment has been undertaken.
Simon Clarke	<b>Offshore array area</b> - Why is the array situated so far off the coast? Surely this is more expensive and inefficient	I	Details are set out in the Environmental Statement Volume 1 Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives explaining the history of the Hornsea Three array area.
Simon Willcox	<b>HVAC Booster Station</b> - Its proposed site will spoil forever a greenfield site in a special part of North Norfolk. The site covers a large area and will have buildings of up to 15m (50 feet) high. This is something that cannot be hidden by 'careful landscaping' and will spoil a very picturesque part of the countryside	I	Information pertaining to the site selection for the HVAC booster station is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives, whilst maximum dimensions are provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description.  Through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive ecological receptors. For example, the orientation of the HVAC booster station has been optimised to minimise impacts on nearby field boundaries (hedgerows and trees) as well as maximise natural screening. Additional mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project are outlined in topic specific chapters, and include the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts on local road networks, ecological receptors (e.g. hedgerows) and hydrological features (e.g. main rivers); and landscape planting around the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.
David Joice	I would be interested to know if the power will be A/C or D/C	N	Due to current uncertainty (see volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives), a decision on which transmission system (HVDC or HVAC) to adopt will not be made until post consent after extensive engagement with potential systems suppliers has taken place. As a result of this, we have conducted our assessments based on a realistic worst-case scenario, which could be either HVDC or HVDC technology depending on the receptor.
Graham & Susan Mette	<b>Landfall</b> - Yes - The Rocket House is located immediately prior to the Beach Lane, Weybourne car park. A proposed site for a works compound for up to 11 years! The car park area has been vulnerable shingle bank which has been breached twice in the last few years and flooded our garden. Very concerned about the activity and the effect it might have on the bank.	Y	Following design refinement, the area identified for landfall works has reduced and the beach lane car park is not under consideration as a construction compound. Further details on the proposed landfall, including access are set out in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description and volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport.  Appropriate mitigation measures have been designed-in to Hornsea Three to minimise impacts on drainage and flooding. Details are provided in volume 3, chapter 2: Hydrology and Flood Risk (see Table 2.17) as well as the outline CoCP which forms part of the DCO application. A flood risk assessment is also provided in Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 2.1: Onshore Infrastructure FRAs and identifies historic flooding events relevant to Hornsea Three. This has been developed in accordance with the NPS, NPPF, PPG ID7 and the SuDS Manual. The Flood Risk Assessment which has been undertaken for the Project concludes that Hornsea Three meets the requirements of NPS EN-1 and the NPPF.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>7</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Tina Hayward	<b>HVAC Booster Station</b> - I understand if you used a certain type of transmission you will need a booster station at Little Barningham. Surely it is better for everyone involved to use the other type of transmission. A booster station will take a significant piece of precious farmland and be a blot on the landscape forever.	I	<p>As noted in previous comments, there is a certain level of confidence in the UK wind industry that HVDC technology will become more mature before Hornsea Project Three will connect, but there is currently no certainty. Therefore, committing to solely HVDC now could restrict or even prevent the development of the project in the future if we do not see the necessary developments in the market. We may well eventually choose to opt for HVDC transmission technology; however, it is considered that to only seek a consent (planning permission) for such a technology (and excluding HVAC) at this time could make the eventual Project unbuildable and/or unprofitable.</p> <p>Due to current uncertainty, a decision on which transmission system to adopt will not be made until post consent after extensive engagement with potential systems suppliers has taken place. This will be informed by a feasibility study.</p> <p>Information pertaining to the site selection for the HVAC booster station is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives, whilst maximum dimensions are provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description.</p> <p>Through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive ecological receptors. For example, the orientation of the HVAC booster station has been optimised to minimise impacts on nearby field boundaries (hedgerows and trees) as well as maximise natural screening. Additional mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project are outlined in topic specific chapters, and include the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts on local road networks, ecological receptors (e.g. hedgerows) and hydrological features (e.g. main rivers); and landscape planting around the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.</p>
Tina Hayward	<b>Construction methods</b> - I was told at the last consultation that you will be doing short stretches at a time and then 'making them good'. I hope this is right - last time we had a cable put though Heydon the corridor lay open for 3 years.	I	The work associated with each phase is expected to progress along the Hornsea Three onshore cable corridor with a typical active construction works duration of three months at any particular location. Further details on programme are provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description.
<b>Section 48: Duty to publicise</b>			
Janet Holden	Yes - I agree that development of offshore arrays are the best way of delivering wind power to the UK.	N	Noted.
Janet Holden	HVAC - No comments, as long as the cables are buried	N	Noted, cables will be buried (as described in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Project Description).
Douglas Walters (Norfolk Geographical Association)	<b>Cable corridor</b> - It sounds a good idea to have the cabling underground. And should be built in a way that doesn't have too much impact on the coastal typography and local landmarks. Also be careful with cabling under streets and on possible flood plains	I	Through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive assets. Mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project are outlined in topic specific chapters, and include the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts on local road networks, ecological receptors (e.g. hedgerows) and hydrological features (e.g. main rivers).
George Carman, Geodirect Resources P/L	<b>Landfall Zone</b> - In view of the environmental sensitivity at Weybourne we do not understand why DONG is considering two or three scenarios around the hamlet of Weybourne. We would prefer DONG to use existing engineering capability to under-drill the fragile shingly beach and its fishing infrastructure, the shoreline, the village and the busy Coastal Road with a c.1.75 km bore noting that Table 3.4.4 of provided information indicates capability is to install 2.5im lengths of duct.	I	<p>Through the design development process, the onshore cable corridor now follows the 'alternative route under consideration' and therefore the onshore cable corridor now avoids the designated sites in close proximity to the landfall. Consideration of alternate landfall locations, as well as justification for the choice of landfall location is set out in Environmental Statement, volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Alternatives.</p> <p>The technology to be used at landfall will be decided during detailed design, as set out in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description.</p>
George Carman, Geodirect Resources P/L	HVAC - We are concerned that the proposed onshore Shrubs Farm Booster Station will create a real and significant risk of a significant adverse impact to our family amenity through (i) long term visual impact from approach roads between our market town Holt and homes (ii) long term increased background noise (iii) Light pollution	I	<p>The maximum parameters associated with the HVAC booster station is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description.</p> <p>Generally, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts to local residential receptors, either through site selection/route refinement or through the identification of suitable mitigation measures. Where there are impacts</p>



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>7</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>Figure 1 shows the results of Viewshed modelling (in green) using the Google Earth Digital Terrain Model and algorithm for a 12.5 m high structure at the proposed HVAC Shrubs Farm site indicating it will be visible (at ground level) over</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) 20 ha of land including houses at Edgefield (intersection of Ramsgate Street and Holt Road- including popular 17th Century country pub -The Pigs.</li> <li>(ii) About 200 ha of land including houses around Little Barningham village and Corpusty Road being 3 km east of the site</li> <li>(iii) 60 ha of land west of the proposed site. Whilst topography and trees provide a screen to the east and south east it is noted that trees are not a permanent feature of the landscape and in fact harvesting of some of the plantation has already commenced.</li> <li>(iv) Some 30 ha of undeveloped land 5 km southwest of the proposed site south of the Corpusty-Briston Road.</li> </ul> <p>Figure 2 shows the increased viewshed for the proposed 17.5 metre above ground level lighting proposed for the 2.5Ha site</p> <p>Therefore, there is considerable risk the North Norfolk landscapes will be “industrialised” over more than many hundreds of hectares by the 150 x 30 m buildings and the 17.5 m high lighting of the site. Furthermore, we are concerned the final location of the HVAC booster station may change and move closer to family property</p> <p>In Conclusion with respect to the proposed HVAC Booster stations we wish (in order of priority)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) There be NO onshore HVAC booster station and that this is achieved by (a) constructing all booster stations offshore and/or (b) use of DC current</li> <li>(ii) Height of Booster station above ground level be reduced by excavating 3 to 5 metre and construction of an appropriate waterproof cellar.</li> <li>(iii) That the noise emission be reduced to the very highest of industry capability and exceeds current Best Industry Practice (not ALARP4 and not the minimum of the Statutory Requirement). It is not acceptable to say the project will meet the minimum regulatory requirements since TIME as shown that previous standards are no longer appropriate e.g. highway driving speeds or the use of asbestos.</li> <li>(iv) Sound mitigation be installed including cladding and berms (to a height equal to the height of the building)</li> <li>(v) We question the need for any lighting – particularly at 17.5 m. above ground level. DONG is respectfully requested to consider the use of infra-red technology for security which would obviate the need for any lighting. Any other security lighting to be kept below 10 metres and installed with motion sensors so that lights are not left on permanently</li> </ul> <p>We are concerned that the proposed onshore Shrubs Farm Booster Station will create a real and significant risk of a significant adverse impact to our family amenity through</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) long term visual impact from approach roads between our market town Holt and homes</li> <li>(ii) long term increased background noise</li> <li>(iii) Light pollution</li> </ul> <p>Figure 1 shows the results of Viewshed modelling (in green) using the Google Earth Digital Terrain Model and algorithm for a 12.5 m high structure at the proposed HVAC Shrubs Farm site indicating it will be visible (at ground level) over</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) 20 ha of land including houses at Edgefield (intersection of Ramsgate Street and Holt Road- including popular 17th Century country pub -The Pigs.</li> <li>(ii) About 200 ha of land including houses around Little Barningham village and Corpusty Road being 3 km east of the site</li> <li>(iii) 60 ha of land west of the proposed site. Whilst topography and trees provide a screen to the east and south east it is noted that trees are not a permanent feature of the landscape and in fact harvesting of some of the plantation has already commenced.</li> <li>(iv) Some 30 ha of undeveloped land 5 km southwest of the proposed site south of the Corpusty-Briston Road.</li> </ul> <p>Figure 2 shows the increased viewshed for the proposed 17.5 metre above ground level lighting proposed for the 2.5Ha site</p> <p>Therefore, there is considerable risk the North Norfolk landscapes will be “industrialised” over more than many hundreds of hectares by the 150 x 30 m buildings and the 17.5 m high lighting of the site.</p>		<p>to residential receptors, these are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3), for example noise during the operation of the HVDC converter/HVAC substation is addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 8: Noise and Vibration.</p> <p>Impacts relating to landscape and visual resources are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual resources. Photographic panels along the cable corridor, as well as indicative visualisations have been prepared to inform the assessment of impacts and are provided in Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 4.5: Photographic Panels, Wireframes and Photomontages. Appropriate mitigation measures for visual disturbance are outlined in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources. This includes, for example, the restoration of habitats (including hedgerows) which cannot be avoided and landscape planting around the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.</p> <p>Due to current uncertainty (see volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives), a decision on which transmission system (HVDC or HVAC) to adopt will not be made until post consent after extensive engagement with potential systems suppliers has taken place. As a result of this, we have conducted our assessments based on a realistic worst-case scenario, which could be either HVDC or HVAC technology depending on the receptor.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>7</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>Furthermore, we are concerned the final location of the HVAC booster station may change and move closer to family property</p> <p>In Conclusion with respect to the proposed HVAC Booster stations we wish (in order of priority)</p> <p>(i) There be NO onshore HVAC booster station and that this is achieved by (a) constructing all booster stations offshore and/or (b) use of DC current</p> <p>(ii) Height of Booster station above ground level be reduced by excavating 3 to 5 metre and construction of an appropriate waterproof cellar.</p> <p>(iii) That the noise emission be reduced to the very highest of industry capability and exceeds current Best Industry Practice (not ALARP4 and not the minimum of the Statutory Requirement). It is not acceptable to say the project will meet the minimum regulatory requirements since TIME as shown that previous standards are no longer appropriate e.g. highway driving speeds or the use of asbestos.</p> <p>(iv) Sound mitigation be installed including cladding and berms (to a height equal to the height of the building)</p> <p>(v) We question the need for any lighting – particularly at 17.5 m. above ground level. DONG is respectfully requested to consider the use of infra-red technology for security which would obviate the need for any lighting. Any other security lighting to be kept below 10 metres and installed with motion sensors so that lights are not left on permanently</p>		
George Carman, Geodirect Resources P/L	<p>PEIR Construction Methods - The PIERS report provides absolutely NO DETAILS on the proposed crossing of the River Bure and adjacent sensitive water meadows. Family landowner (reference 682336) And family stakeholder REQUEST is that the River Bure is HDD under-drilled from a point south of the disused/dismantled railway to go under (i) railway track site (ii) Heath Road which is a raised approach road to the railway bridge with an elevation of 1-c.4metres (iii) family property ref# 682336 including arable pasture/cropping land, precious close drinking water well, water meadow, two ponds and important bio-corridor (iv) River Bure and (v) Approximately 150 metre of water meadow with drainage ditches and 3 types of native bat habitat in treed hedgerow north of the River Bure. Total distance of HDD would be about 600 metres and the stakeholder minimum depth requirement would be 10 metres to be 5 metres below base of house/domestic water well to preserve land/property value, future land use and to obviate any disturbance at Ref# 682336/681157 during the construction period. Furthermore, the stakeholders insist that the HDD drilling be completed for all potential future cable by the drilling and placement of all six (6) cable ducts in one phase of operations.</p>	Y	<p>Through design refinement, Hornsea Three has committed to using trenchless technologies (e.g. HDD) beneath the River Bure in order to minimise direct impacts on this sensitive receptor. Where possible HDDs have been designed to avoid associated sensitive habitats, informed by the Hydrological Characterisation Note which is provided in Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 2.4.</p> <p>The extent of all HDDs is shown on the Crossing Schedule which forms part of the DCO application.</p>
Richard Perry	<p><b>80m Refinement</b> - Heavy traffic re HVAC Booster Station location. This effects bridleways which are used every day of the year especially Shrub Farm entrance road to the proposed station. Horses and traffic of a heavy nature do not mix. Also bridelway from Pimlico Cottage towards Plumstead area.</p>	I	<p>Principles for construction traffic management, including interaction with other road or recreational users (e.g. bridleways and pedestrians) are set out in the outline construction traffic management plan (CTMP) which forms part of the DCO application. The CTMP will be developed in consultation with the local authorities during the detailed design stage, in order to identify site specific measures, with separation of users prioritised wherever possible.</p>
Richard Perry	<p><b>HVAC</b> - Heavy traffic to booster station at New Covert, Old Covert, route from Shrub Farm. This is a bridleway not a road. We use this path every day all year round with our horses. Horses and heavy traffic do not mix. The path is narrow with no get off points if horses and traffic meet. This would be a health and safety issue.</p>	I	<p>Principles for construction traffic management, including interaction with other road or recreational users (e.g. bridleways and pedestrians) are set out in the outline construction traffic management plan (CTMP) which forms part of the DCO application. The CTMP will be developed in consultation with the local authorities during the detailed design stage, in order to identify site specific measures, with separation of users prioritised wherever possible.</p>

Table 3.9: Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.B) relating to the Project Description.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>8</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 42: Prescribed consultees (The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009: Schedule 1)</b>			
Estelle Hook, Norfolk Coast Partnership	We note that AC technology involves a wider cable route, more cables and the use of a cable relay station. Thus we suggest the use of DC technology is preferable. We suggest that the criteria for selection of AC or DC technology should be based on 'best value for money' rather than 'least cost', taking into a number of other factors including impact on the local area and community.	I	Due to current uncertainty (see volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives), a decision on which transmission system (HVDC or HVAC) to adopt will not be made until post consent after extensive engagement with potential systems suppliers has taken place. As a result of this, we have conducted our assessments based on a realistic worst-case scenario, which could be either HVDC or HVDC technology depending on the receptor.
CPRE Norfolk	Map 3. There is a section missing in between maps 2 and 3, no doubt because there are no changes proposed for the cable corridor. The 'missing' section is centred on the Baconsthorpe Castle (Grade I, and a SAM) area. The headwaters of the Glaven are at Lower Bodham and Baconsthorpe Castle with a spring feeding the moat before this tributary runs into the river near Selbrigg Pond. The larger part of the silt entering the Glaven comes from the upper reaches, and then over time moves down the whole length of the river and into the SAC estuary. As such we consider that when crossing the tributary HDD should be used rather than open trenching and diversion of the stream.	I	The nature of the onshore cabling laying activities are described in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description. Mitigation measures have been identified to the creation of preferential pathways for minimise the generation of silt and prevent runoff entering the watercourses. These measures are set out in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 1: Geology and Ground Conditions. volume 3, chapter 2: Hydrology and Flood Risk as well as in the Outline CoCP which forms part of the DCO application. Measures include a commitment to prepare Pollution Prevention and Emergency Response Plans.  Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 2: Hydrology and Flood Risk and confirms that there would be no effect on the hydrology of the moat at Baconsthorpe Castle.
CPRE Norfolk	Map 3 again. We continue to argue for the use of HVDC rather than HVAC for a number of reasons, including there would be no requirement for a booster station at Little Barningham. If the final decision is for HVAC, then we suggest that the screening area shown is not adequate. That shown on the map provides some screening from the Edgefield to Little Barningham road, at the section facing the site from Fuel Farm to the Barningham Plantation; and from Fuel Farm another section to the parishes' boundary marked by a dotted line. This would offer some screening to Edgefield and Edgefield Street. We suggest that this length should be extended and continue to Shrub Farm. This would offer better screening for Edgefield and The Street; and the B1149 Holt to Norwich, much used for a B road.	I	Due to current uncertainty (see Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives), a decision on which transmission system (HVDC or HVAC) to adopt will not be made until post consent after extensive engagement with potential systems suppliers has taken place. As a result of this, we have conducted our assessments based on a realistic worst-case scenario, which could be either HVDC or HVDC technology depending on the receptor.  Appropriate mitigation measures for visual disturbance are outlined in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources. This includes, for example, the restoration of habitats (including hedgerows) which cannot be avoided and landscape planting around the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.
CPRE Norfolk	CPRE Norfolk has also responded to the Vattenfall PEIR. In the two months separating the two consultations we now better understand the use of the Rochdale Envelope; and for the onshore cabling corridor the range of benefits for the use of HVDC rather HVAC. For both companies we feel there is a lack of transparency and clarity in presenting the data, and this masks the fact that it is HVAC which is the worst case scenario throughout for assessing impacts. We consider that this approach is not justified, and that HVDC should become an embedded mitigation alongside Horizontal Direct Drilling.	I	Due to current uncertainty (see Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives), a decision on which transmission system (HVDC or HVAC) to adopt will not be made until post consent after extensive engagement with potential systems suppliers has taken place. As a result of this, we have conducted our assessments based on a realistic worst-case scenario, which could be either HVDC or HVDC technology depending on the receptor.
NATS	In respect of the wind turbines, having assessed the new proposal for 325m tip heights, NATS has determined that these are sufficiently distant offshore NOT to have any undesired impact upon its infrastructure, as such it anticipates raising no objections when consulted by BEIS or other relevant authority.	N	Hornsea Three acknowledges that NATS anticipates raising no objections. No further action was required.
Edgefield and Corpusty & Saxthorpe Parish Councils	We are concerned that you are asking us to comment on the further screening of the booster station in Little Barningham. It is impossible to comment on the screening of something when it has still not been disclosed the size of the booster station you want to screen. Is it possible to confirm the proposed size of the booster station, and perhaps erect scaffolding on the site to the height it will be, so we can see how visible it will be from each direction?	N	The dimensions of the HVAC booster station are set out in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description (and had previously been provided in the same chapter of the PEIR). Appropriate mitigation measures for visual disturbance are outlined in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources. This includes, for example, the restoration of habitats (including hedgerows) which cannot be avoided and landscape planting around the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.

<sup>8</sup> Y = Yes change made; N = No change made; I = Incorporated into or considered when producing the assessment or landowner voluntary agreement offer; N/A = Not applicable

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>8</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Natural England	<p><b>Offshore cable corridor</b></p> <p>The current consultation presents two potential re-route options for the offshore cable corridor search area. Natural England has the following comments:</p> <p>Seaward potential re-route</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- We support the proposed re-route in the seaward part of the corridor (closest to the array). The proposed alternative would reduce the direct impact to the North Norfolk Sandbanks and Saturn Reef (NNSSR) SAC due to the cable laying activities. It is our view that impacts to designated sites should be avoided and while the re-route does not take the cable fully outside the NNSSR SAC, it has a potential to minimise the overall impact to the site.</li> <li>- We also note that the site-specific benthic sampling was carried out for the proposed re-route as part of the project benthic sampling programme. It is our view that there is sufficient data to adequately characterise the baseline for that area.</li> </ul>	Y	<p>The seaward re-route has been taken forwards for the final application for Development Consent. Details of the Hornsea Three offshore cable corridor reroute in the offshore area are outlined in paragraph 2.6.1.4 of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology. All impacts, where relevant, on designated features of the North Norfolk Sandbanks and Saturn Reef SAC are assessed in section 2.11 of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology. Conclusions on the effects of Hornsea Three on the conservation objectives of the North Norfolk Sandbanks and Saturn Reef SAC are presented in full within the RIAA for Hornsea Three.</p> <p>The baseline characterisation of benthic habitats and species in the offshore cable corridor, including those within designated sites, is presented in section 2.7.1 of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology.</p>
Natural England	<p>Near-shore potential re-route</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Natural England is pleased to note that Orsted is considering an alternative route in the near-shore area, which has the potential to avoid most of the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ. However, the proposed re-route has a larger footprint within The Wash and Norfolk Norfolk Coast SAC. We note that the Environmental Statement should include detailed consideration of the potential impacts on the SAC.</li> <li>- We note that no site-specific data collection has been done or is proposed for the section of the re-route that deviates from the original cable corridor. The consultation document provides a list of evidence sources available for characterisation of the baseline benthic environment. Natural England provided comments in the Evidence Plan meeting on 4 December 2017, where we specified that we have low confidence in the outputs of Sheringham Shoal and Dudgeon OWFs benthic surveys and have not signed off their survey reports. The data from the OWFs and other surveys was collected in 2006-2013 and may not necessarily represent the most up to date picture of the benthic habitats in the area. We therefore advise Hornsea Three to treat these data with caution and provide a detailed confidence assessment of the evidence sources used for the baseline characterisation of the re-route. Natural England recommends that Hornsea Three project specific data is used as the main source of evidence where possible.</li> </ul> <p>As discussed with Orsted on 4 December 2017, Natural England would be keen to review a 'side by side' comparison of the habitats along each route and potential impacts, their magnitude and proposed mitigation for the two near-shore route options prior to the formal application submission. The information provided should include careful consideration of the pre-construction preparation activities that may be required, different cable installation methods and their feasibility, confidence in achieving the optimum cable burial depth, potential need for cable protection and sensitivity and recoverability of the benthic features along the two routes.</p>	I	<p>Details of the Hornsea Three offshore cable corridor reroute in the nearshore area are outlined in paragraph 2.6.1.4 of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology. All impacts, where relevant, on designated features of The Wash and North Norfolk Coast SAC and the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ are assessed in section 2.11 of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology.</p> <p>With respect to the data used to characterise the baseline in the nearshore area, it was agreed with the Benthic and Fish Ecology and Marine Processes Expert Working Group (EWG) at the meeting on 4 December 2017 that the nearshore area, including the re-route (i.e. in the vicinity of the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ), is characterised by a combination of site specific and desktop data sources. These are fully discussed in volume 5, annex 2.1: Benthic Ecology Technical Report and summarised in section 2.7.1 of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology.</p> <p>Natural England's concerns on the use of the Sheringham Shoal and Dudgeon OWFs data are assumed to relate to the design of these surveys and aims of the monitoring, as opposed to sampling technique and laboratory analyses. The data have been used to inform the Hornsea Three characterisation (i.e. identification of biotopes based on grab sample data collected and analyses by a participating member of the NMBACQ), therefore it is considered such concerns should be allayed. The use of these data in combination with a range of other datasets to support the analyses of the Hornsea Three site specific survey data is considered appropriate and the consistency in the reported sediment and community composition across all site specific and desktop data sources provides confidence in the characterisation for the Hornsea Three project.</p> <p>A note was provided with Natural England, following the Benthic and Fish Ecology and Marine Processes Expert Working Group (EWG) meeting on 4 December 2017, presenting further detail on the approach to baseline characterisation of the nearshore area, including Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ, and the use of site specific survey data and desktop data sources. This note also presented a 'side by side' comparison of each route as requested (see Table 1.1 in volume 5, annex 2.3: MCZ Assessment for full details on the consultation undertaken).</p>



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>8</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Natural England	We would like to re-iterate that Natural England does not support rock placement for cable protection with designated sites. The use of permanent rock placement around structures should be minimised as much as possible in soft sediment environments.	I	Hornsea Three intend to bury the export cable wherever possible but, in locations where this is not feasible, cable protection will be required. Within areas of designated sites that coincide with Hornsea Three, sensitive cable and scour protection measures will be employed. These cable and scour protection measures will not include concrete mattresses. The cable and scour protection will consider the local seabed conditions, including sediment/substrate type. The measures proposed for each site are as follows and are outlined in Table 2.18 of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Within the North Norfolk Sandbanks and Saturn Reef SAC: this may include measures which may encourage the burial of the scour/cable protection by the surrounding sediment or rock protection which takes into account the typical grain sizes known to occur naturally within the SAC (i.e. coarse gravel, cobbles and boulders);</li> <li>• Within The Wash and North Norfolk Coast SAC: this may include measures which may encourage the burial of the scour/cable protection by the surrounding sediment or rock protection which takes into account the typical grain sizes known to occur naturally within the SAC (i.e. coarse gravel and cobbles);</li> <li>• Within the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ: cable protection may comprise gravel and cobbles with a mean grain size of 100 mm, maximum grain size of 250 mm; and</li> <li>• Within the Markham's Triangle rMCZ: cable protection may comprise gravel and cobbles with a mean grain size of 100 mm, maximum grain size of 250 mm, while scour protection for foundations, if required, may have a maximum diameter of 360 mm.</li> </ul>
Natural England	The inclusion of the alternative route options will not affect the proposed approach to the EIA, but greater consideration of the interest features of the Wash and North Norfolk Coast SAC may be required in the RIAA depending on the outcome of the high level review above. Orsted should refer to Natural England's comments to the PEI consultation for more detailed views on the methodology.	I	A full assessment of the effects of Hornsea Three on benthic ecology, including on features of designated sites, including The Wash and North Norfolk Coast SAC, is presented in volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Subtidal and Intertidal Ecology. Conclusions on the effects of Hornsea Three on the conservation objectives of The Wash and North Norfolk Coast SAC are presented in full within the RIAA for Hornsea Three.
Marlingford and Colton Parish Council	Marlingford and Colton Parish Council welcomed the confirmation that was provided at the Briefing and Q&A session for South Norfolk, held on 6th December, of the intention to use horizontal drilling from land on the north side of the Bawburgh Road, under the road and the River Yare.	N	Noted, Environmental Statement volume 4, annex 3.5: Onshore Crossing Schedule confirms locations where HDD is proposed.
Oulton Parish Council	At the cross over point of both projects there is concern that the cables will not be assessed as a whole regarding <b>EMF</b> but as individual projects. It would appear that at the cross over point there could be a combination of HVAC/HVDC cabling (HOW3) & HVAC/HVDC (Norfolk vanguard) depending on what each company finally decides on. If each company opts for HVDC then there is no need for a Booster station, there does seem to be a lack of information regarding which technology will be used yet the projects are very close to pre application stage. As time goes on and with more questions than answers it would be useful if someone from Orsted could come and explain to Oulton Parish councillors and residents what the impact will be regarding the compound and some more information regarding EMF and the cabling crossover points and the impact of a large Booster station in the locality.	I	Environmental Statement, volume 3, annex 3.3: EMF Compliance Statement comprises an assessment of the static and extremely low frequency (ELF) EMFs that will be generated by the Hornsea Project Three onshore transmission infrastructure (cabling), giving maximum predicted field strengths to assess compliance with health protection guidelines for public exposure to EMFs.  Annex 3.3 concludes that the maximum magnetic field strength directly above a cable, using worst-case assumptions where required, is also well below the guideline public exposure limits set to protect health. The cables eventually selected for the project will be required to fall within the envelope assessed and meet the prescribed standards and hence will not generate greater EMF. At the crossing point, the same principle applies and projects (individually, or cumulatively) will need to ensure that the EMF created remains within the health protection thresholds set for public exposure to EMFs.
Little Melton Parish Council	<b>Great Melton Road</b> The PC will request that the cables furthest from GM Rd are installed in Phase 1 as this may give the opportunity to measure the actual magnetic field before subsequent phases are installed - which will be subject to a further planning process.	I	Environmental Statement, volume 4, annex 3.3: EMF Compliance Statement comprises an assessment of the static and extremely low frequency (ELF) EMFs that will be generated by the Hornsea Project Three onshore transmission infrastructure (cabling), giving maximum predicted field strengths to assess compliance with health protection guidelines for public exposure to EMFs. The assessment concludes that based on the maximum field strengths, using worst-case assumptions where required, the proposals are well below established levels and the Project is compliant. The cables eventually selected for the project will be required to fall within the envelope assessed and meet the prescribed standards and hence will not generate greater EMF.  In demonstrating that the cables installed for Hornsea Project Three will be compliant with health protection guidelines for public exposure, any subsequent need to monitor is not required or planned to occur, although we note that broader quality control checks are undertaken during the manufacturing and installation process.
<b>Section 42: Local Authorities (prescribed under section 43 of the Act)</b>			
No comments were received from the local authorities relating to the Project Description under Phase 2.B.			

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>8</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 42: Persons with an interest in the land (prescribed under section 44 of the Act)</b>			
C F Bond, Bidwells (on behalf of clients) on behalf of Nicholas Edward Evans-Lombe, Frances Marilyn Evans-Lombe & Great Melton Farms Limited	We now respond and comment, on a without prejudice basis, as follows:- Access to the west of Beech Grove – we assume that access is required around Beech Grove, as Beech Grove itself is to remain in situ with the cable route installed by Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD) beneath it. Could you please confirm this is the case-if so we have no objection to this access route.  Please contact Christopher Bond if any further explanation is required on the points raised. Christopher Bond would be prepared to meet on site with Ørsted's representatives if required. Please could you acknowledge receipt of this email.	Y	The cables are proposed to be installed under Beech Grove via HDD as suggested, with the access to the west being outside of the woodland to avoid this being directly impacted.
Jane Kenny, Savills, on behalf of Easton & Otley College, Easton	POTENTIAL ONSHORE CABLE CORRIDOR RE-ROUTES There are a number of requested route changes which have not been considered. In particular: • Easton & Otley College, Easton – the current proposed route has been raised at informal consultations and within the PEIR response, however it appears in the second consultation not to have been re-routed and as it currently stands will interfere with the College's future expansion plans.	Y	A refined route located to west of cable corridor has been adopted, following a request from the College in order to reduce potential impact to area at Broom Farm. Further detail was requested on the proposed expansion plans in order for these to be taken into consideration if the proposed route does not meet the requirements.
Christopher Bond, Bidwells on behalf of Nicholas Edward Evans-Lombe & Great Melton Farms Limited	2. Nicholas Edward Evans-Lombe, [REDACTED] & Great Melton Farms Limited, [REDACTED] (Map 7 of 9) Potential onshore cable corridor re-routes (Inset 1) We note the potential cable corridor re-route to the south of the existing route, we assume to avoid the Church Farm Barns complex. We do not raise any objection to this proposed re-route on the assumption that the area of wood to the south of Little Melton Reservoir will be crossed by HDD —can you please confirm this is the case. Proposed access routes (Inset 1) We also note and approve the potential access route.	Y	Hornsea Three confirmed this woodland would be crossed via HDD, as suggested.
Michael and Louise Savory The Muckleburgh Military Collection	I confirm that all the points recorded are correct and that I have received the latest consultation documents. In addition I mentioned that access to the transition area could be made via our main entrance on the condition that the entrance road is repaired after the project is completed. I am now patching holes etc and have in mind that when Hornsea Three is completed the road will be tar sprayed and chipped. J A Asphalt who undertake our road maintenance estimate this will cost about £10,000. This would be the cheaper alternative to making and restoring a temporary road off the A149.	N/A	Hornsea Three noted the response, no further action was required.
<b>Section 47: Duty to consult local community</b>			
Diana Jenkinson	There are very few options for keeping horses in the area and no where comparable to Kelling Heath stables in terms of the off road riding and peacefulness and privacy. I live in Sheringham and this yard is the nearest I could find to my home. I fear that this construction will completely ruin what we have but with no other options I don't know what I would do.	Y	See comment above regarding the alternative route option being taken forward by Hornsea Three.
Mark Flatman on behalf of Mr & Mrs DW Flatman	Clients are not against the development, however vehement objection is lodged to the routing of the onshore cabling between Kelling Heath and Kelling caravan park and request that the cable routing should completely bypass Kelling Heath and the caravan park in its entirety.	Y	Since the PEIR, a refined landfall location has been identified (western re-route around Kelling) and the area identified for landfall works has reduced. This was informed by a number of factors including engineering/technical considerations, community feedback in the area of Kelling and Weybourne, avoidance of the Kelling Heath SSSI/CWS and Holiday Park. Environmental Statement, volume 3, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives sets out the process of identifying a landfall location and the route refinement process.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>8</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Mark Flatman on behalf of Mr & Mrs DW Flatman	In particular a studded blue butterfly colony is located north of the railway cutting and also an adder colony is centrally located within the PEIR corridor as it crosses Kelling Heath and the caravan park and therefore both lie within the identified corridor through Kelling Heath and the caravan park. Notwithstanding the exactitude of the designated SSSI boundary, the plan based boundary of that designation is an artifice that does not physically constrain the habitat and range of legislatively protected species. Each habitat, and indeed that of other protected species in the area would highly likely be detrimentally disturbed as a consequence of the proposed associated earthworks and machinery movements undertaken to bury the electricity cable in close proximity to these habitats.	Y	Since the PEIR, a refined landfall location has been identified (western re-route around Kelling) and the area identified for landfall works has reduced. This was informed by a number of factors including engineering/technical considerations, community feedback in the area of Kelling and Weybourne, avoidance of the Kelling Heath SSSI/CWS and Holiday Park. Environmental Statement, volume 3, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives sets out the process of identifying a landfall location and the route refinement process.
Councillor Greg Peck, Broadland District Council	It is also important that the disruption caused during the laying process is kept to a minimum. I would therefore request that you try and speed up this process to limit the time you are at any specific site and reduce to a minimum the area which is effected at any one time.	Y	During the design refinement Hornsea Three has sought to minimise the duration of any disruption, and has reduced the total duration of the construction phase onshore to eight years. Within this, the maximum duration for construction of the onshore cable corridor is approximately 2.5 years, this therefore means that the maximum duration over which construction could occur would be 5.5 years incorporating two phases (assuming a three-year gap between the two phases). This is also a reduction compared to the construction programme presented within the PEIR. The work associated with each phase is expected to progress along the Hornsea Three onshore cable corridor with a typical active construction works duration of three months at any particular location.
Councillor Greg Peck, Broadland District Council	There is a specific issue on the Reepham/Salle boundary at the proposed crossing point of both the Orsted and Vattenfall schemes, which I know you are aware of. You need to revisit your plans and move the cable routes and the cross over point further away from the effected residents. I seek your assurance that you will work together to make this happen.	I	The potential for impacts arising as a result of Hornsea Three to combine with other planned developments (including the Vattenfall projects) is assessed in each respective topic chapter of the Environmental Statement (volume 3), under the heading 'Cumulative Effect Assessment'. Where relevant, specific mitigation measures have been identified to minimise the cumulative effects.
Judy Holland	I am now extremely concerned about the entire wind farm cabling routes by both Ørsted and Vattenfall (I have written to them too) which will cross in the field behind our home (address below) and which will have far more impact on us than we previously thought now that the working corridors, site access routes and construction compounds/marshalling yards are coming to light. If plans are passed this will have a massive long term impact on us with noise, dust and access in and out of our home.	I	Acknowledged, where sensitive receptors are located in close proximity to the onshore cable corridor, the Project will ensure that sensitive construction management measures, such as noise, dust and traffic control are considered. These are documented in an Outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), which accompanies the DCO application.
Judy Holland	I am not opposed to off shore wind farms per se, however there is a cleaner more environmentally way than carving through the miles of farmland and countryside. I will be lobbying government and Norfolk County Council to impose that the HVDC option is taken up with the Shore Ring Main which will mean wind farm companies having to wait for this new technology to be developed instead of racing ahead whilst the subsidies are still on offer.	N	An assessment of under keel clearance has been undertaken as part of the Environmental Statement (see section 18.4 of the NRA) and provides an overview of the key areas of risk identified throughout the export cable route, including the offshore HVAC booster station search area.
Councillor Jo Copplestone, Broadland District Council	Further to attending the further statutory consultation on 6th December at Weston Longville, I am writing to express my concerns about the project. Firstly I believe that your application for three phases of construction of the cable route over an 11 year period is too protracted for communities to endure, and I would like the project to be limited to two phases over a 7-8 year period only.	Y	During the design refinement Hornsea Three has sought to minimise the duration of any disruption, and has reduced the total duration of the construction phase onshore to eight years. Within this, the maximum duration for construction of the onshore cable corridor is approximately 2.5 years, this therefore means that the maximum duration over which construction could occur would be 5.5 years incorporating two phases (assuming a three-year gap between the two phases). The work associated with each phase is expected to progress along the Hornsea Three onshore cable corridor with a typical active construction works duration of three months at any particular location.
Councillor Jo Copplestone, Broadland District Council	Finally I support the use of Oulton Airfield as a compound and storage site, subject to local concerns being addressed. I have concerns about the proposed cable crossing point at Salle (Orsted & Vattenfall Schemes) and I hope there will be collaborative working between both companies to mitigate the disruption to the community there.	Y	Following this consultation, Hornsea Three has confirmed that the Oulton Airfield will be used as the Main Construction Compound.  We are in close contact with Vattenfall at all levels of the project in relation to their proposed Norfolk Vanguard and Norfolk Boreas projects; we liaise on environmental consents, communications, stakeholder engagement, technical aspects etc., so it's not just one point of contact for both businesses. We are of course paying extra attention to where the proposed projects may cross in terms of the underground cables, as we recognise that, if both projects are built simultaneously, coordinating construction works will minimise disruption. Additionally, we are in close consultation regarding any areas where there could be potential for cumulative impacts to arise as a result of both developments to ensure we progress the projects appropriately and sensitively.  Notwithstanding the above, it is important to note that Norfolk Vanguard is a project with its own technical and environmental characteristics and constraints, and is subject to a separate DCO process.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>8</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
CPRE Norfolk	Map 3. There is a section missing in between maps 2 and 3, no doubt because there are no changes proposed for the cable corridor. The 'missing' section is centred on the Baconsthorpe Castle (Grade I, and a SAM) area. The headwaters of the Glaven are at Lower Bodham and Baconsthorpe Castle with a spring feeding the moat before this tributary runs into the river near Selbrigg Pond. The larger part of the silt entering the Glaven comes from the upper reaches, and then over time moves down the whole length of the river and into the SAC estuary. As such we consider that when crossing the tributary HDD should be used rather than open trenching and diversion of the stream.	I	The nature of the onshore cabling laying activities are described in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description. Mitigation measures have been identified to the creation of preferential pathways for minimise the generation of silt and prevent runoff entering the watercourses. These measures are set out in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 1: Geology and Ground Conditions. volume 3, chapter 2: Hydrology and Flood Risk as well as in the Outline CoCP which forms part of the DCO application. Measures include a commitment to prepare Pollution Prevention and Emergency Response Plans.  Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 2: Hydrology and Flood Risk and confirms that there would be no effect on the hydrology of the moat at Baconsthorpe Castle.
CPRE Norfolk	Map 3 again. We continue to argue for the use of HVDC rather than HVAC for a number of reasons, including there would be no requirement for a booster station at Little Barningham. If the final decision is for HVAC, then we suggest that the screening area shown is not adequate. That shown on the map provides some screening from the Edgefield to Little Barningham road, at the section facing the site from Fuel Farm to the Barningham Plantation; and from Fuel Farm another section to the parishes' boundary marked by a dotted line. This would offer some screening to Edgefield and Edgefield Street. We suggest that this length should be extended and continue to Shrub Farm. This would offer better screening for Edgefield and The Street; and the B1149 Holt to Norwich, much used for a B road.	I	Due to current uncertainty (see Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives), a decision on which transmission system (HVDC or HVAC) to adopt will not be made until post consent after extensive engagement with potential systems suppliers has taken place. As a result of this, we have conducted our assessments based on a realistic worst-case scenario, which could be either HVDC or HVDC technology depending on the receptor.  Appropriate mitigation measures for visual disturbance are outlined in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources. This includes, for example, the restoration of habitats (including hedgerows) which cannot be avoided and landscape planting around the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.
CPRE Norfolk	CPRE Norfolk has also responded to the Vattenfall PEIR. In the two months separating the two consultations we now better understand the use of the Rochdale Envelope; and for the onshore cabling corridor the range of benefits for the use of HVDC rather HVAC. For both companies we feel there is a lack of transparency and clarity in presenting the data, and this masks the fact that it is HVAC which is the worst case scenario throughout for assessing impacts. We consider that this approach is not justified, and that HVDC should become an embedded mitigation alongside Horizontal Direct Drilling.	I	Due to current uncertainty (see Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives), a decision on which transmission system (HVDC or HVAC) to adopt will not be made until post consent after extensive engagement with potential systems suppliers has taken place. As a result of this, we have conducted our assessments based on a realistic worst-case scenario, which could be either HVDC or HVDC technology depending on the receptor.
Michael and Felicity Walmsley	Following the meeting for Parish councillors at Bawburgh Golf Club we have considered the three routes for the cables, to pass Church Farm Barns, Little Melton. The best route that we would absolutely support would be the third option - the blue route. This takes the cables a good way from our barns. However we would support the original route if it went through the middle of the field a good distance from the barns. We would definitely not support the second route which would closely border our property.	Y	As set out in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives, the alternate option has been taken forward by Hornsea Three (shown in blue on the consultation documents). This route is shown on the plans which are submitted in support of the DCO application and has been chosen based on a review of technical and environmental constraints as well as community feedback.
Councillor Graham Everett, Broadland District Council	2) The alternative route around Salle appears to be better than the original route, however, I still have concerns around the sensitivity of this whole area, therefore I seek assurances that residents and business concerns are fully addressed, also that the impact on this area is kept to the absolute minimum time period required for the works to be completed with a minimal land area being affected and disrupted.	I	Noted, where sensitive receptors are located in close proximity to the onshore cable corridor, the Project will ensure that sensitive construction management measures, such as noise, dust and traffic control are considered. These are documented in an outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), which accompanies the DCO application.  During the design refinement Hornsea Three has sought to minimise the duration of any disruption, and has reduced the total duration of the construction phase onshore to eight years. Within this, the maximum duration for construction of the onshore cable corridor is approximately 2.5 years, this therefore means that the maximum duration over which construction could occur would be 5.5 years incorporating two phases (assuming a three-year gap between the two phases). The work associated with each phase is expected to progress along the Hornsea Three onshore cable corridor with a typical active construction works duration of three months at any particular location.



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>8</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Councillor Graham Everett, Broadland District Council	3) This same area on the Reepham/Salle boundaries is the proposed crossing point of both the Orsted and Vattenfall schemes so I seek assurances that there will be there maximum collaborative working between both companies to again minimise the impact and time period on local residents and businesses.	I	We are in close contact with Vattenfall at all levels of the project in relation to their proposed Norfolk Vanguard and Norfolk Boreas projects; we liaise on environmental consents, communications, stakeholder engagement, technical aspects etc., so it's not just one point of contact for both businesses. We are of course paying extra attention to where the proposed projects may cross in terms of the underground cables, as we recognise that, if both projects are built simultaneously, coordinating construction works will minimise disruption. Additionally, we are in close consultation regarding any areas where there could be potential for cumulative impacts to arise as a result of both developments to ensure we progress the projects appropriately and sensitively.  Notwithstanding the above, it is important to note that Norfolk Vanguard is a project with its own technical and environmental characteristics and constraints, and is subject to a separate DCO process.
Councillor Graham Everett, Broadland District Council	4) As I have already stated, the area on the boundaries of Reepham and Salle is affected by both schemes therefore I would request that any secondary compound/ facility is located away from this area and an alternative site is found.	I	The locations of the main and secondary compounds are shown in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description.
The River Glaven Conservation Group - Henry Crawley	The addition of screening to the HVAC booster site at Barningham again is welcome. I assume this implies a tree belt. We would of course prefer that HVDC is used, not only precluding need for a Booster site, but also needing a much narrower cabling excavation corridor and less damage to the vulnerable countryside and river valley.	I	Due to current uncertainty (see Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives), a decision on which transmission system (HVDC or HVAC) to adopt will not be made until post consent after extensive engagement with potential systems suppliers has taken place. As a result of this, we have conducted our assessments based on a realistic worst-case scenario, which could be either HVDC or HVDC technology depending on the receptor.  Appropriate mitigation measures for visual disturbance are outlined in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources. This includes, for example, the restoration of habitats (including hedgerows) which cannot be avoided and landscape planting around the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.
George Owen	My main anxieties about the scheme are mostly to do with the length of time over which the project may be spread. If, as you say, that, dependent upon economic conditions, all the cables may not be run at the same time (indeed may be dug-in over a period of 10-odd years) then this would cause a large and persistent disruption all along the cable route over many years. My concern is obviously mostly focused on the part of the cable route near to Hole Farm, Hempstead.	Y	During the design refinement Hornsea Three has sought to minimise the duration of any disruption, and has reduced the total duration of the construction phase onshore to eight years. Within this, the maximum duration for construction of the onshore cable corridor is approximately 2.5 years, this therefore means that the maximum duration over which construction could occur would be 5.5 years incorporating two phases (assuming a three-year gap between the two phases). The work associated with each phase is expected to progress along the Hornsea Three onshore cable corridor with a typical active construction works duration of three months at any particular location.
George Owen	It would be useful if you could firm-up your transmission options (AC or DC) because the DC option seems to have the least impact on the extent of the cabling and thus the likelihood of the project running on for years and years.	I	Due to current uncertainty (see Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives), a decision on which transmission system (HVDC or HVAC) to adopt will not be made until post consent after extensive engagement with potential systems suppliers has taken place.  As a result of this, we have conducted our assessments based on a realistic worst-case scenario, which could be either HVDC or HVDC technology depending on the receptor.
Jim Crossley	Many have pointed out that using DC transmission would avoid the need for ugly booster stations along the line of the transmission cable.	I	Due to current uncertainty (see Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives), a decision on which transmission system (HVDC or HVAC) to adopt will not be made until post consent after extensive engagement with potential systems suppliers has taken place. As a result of this, we have conducted our assessments based on a realistic worst-case scenario, which could be either HVDC or HVDC technology depending on the receptor.
Dale Heaton	2 Wind farms are not 'efficient' in terms of power generation particularly with the need to improve battery technology. However its currently the best we have.	N	Noted.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>8</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
John Walmsley	<p>I would like to state my complete support for the alternative rout outlined on map7 in you further consultation document.</p> <p>If this route were taken on the far side of the lake as opposed to being adjacent to our property [REDACTED] it would be a huge relief to me and my wife. I imagine also welcomed by the occupants of [REDACTED] whose property the prior alternative route would have gone straight through although of course I cannot speak for them.</p> <p>I sincerely hope the new alternative route on map 7 is chosen Yours Michael and Felicity Walmsley</p>	Y	<p>As set out in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives, the alternate option has been taken forward by Hornsea Three (on the opposite site of the lake). This route is shown on the plans which are submitted in support of the DCO application and has been chosen based on a review of technical and environmental constraints as well as community feedback.</p>
<b>Section 48: Duty to publicise</b>			
<i>No comments were received in response to the Public Notice relating to the introduction under Phase 2.B.</i>			

### 3.5 Environmental Impact Assessment

Table 3.10: Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.A) relating to EIA.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>9</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 42: Prescribed consultees (The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009: Schedule 1)</b>			
Health & Safety Executive	Would hazardous substances consent be needed? The presence of hazardous substances on, over or under land at the 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 Controlled Quantities, are set out in the Planning (Hazardous Substances) Regulations 2015. Hazardous Substances Consent would be required in the 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. Further information on HSC should be sought from the relevant Hazardous Substances Authority.	N	At this stage, no hazardous substances consent is anticipated to be required.
Swardeston Parish Council	2. Has Dong Energy exhausted all alternatives before determining the precise site location for the substation?	I	To identify a suitable site for locating the onshore substation, Hornsea Three developed a set of guiding principles to establish a search area (approximately 3 km from the existing Norwich Main substation). A constraints mapping exercise was then applied to this search area, which involved layering known constraints / sensitivities on top of one another to identify the potentially least constrained zones within this area. The results of this exercise, in the form of heat map was presented at our March 2017 consultation events, where members of the local community were invited to highlight aspects that they would like us to take into consideration. At that time, we were still considering which sites were technically viable and hence were not able to present specific options as we could not confirm that these options would have been feasible. This feedback was considered by the Project alongside environmental, commercial and technical considerations in selecting the proposed site. The proposed site was then highlighted in the September 2017 consultation events and within the PEIR document which was formally consulted on under section 42 of the planning process.  More information on our site selection process can be found in volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Considerations of Alternatives.
Marine Management Organisation	1.5. The MMO recommends that assessments of the magnitude and significance of effects throughout the PEIR should be checked and supported by clearly referenced scientific evidence. DONG Energy has used a matrix to calculate the significance of effects of the proposed Project (e.g. Table 1.16, page 46, Volume 2, Chapter 1 – Marine Processes, and replicated in subsequent 'Offshore' chapters). There are several instances (e.g. paragraphs 2.11.2.17, 2.11.3.18, 2.13.2.39, Volume 2, Chapter 2 – Benthic Subtidal and Intertidal Ecology) where potential impacts have been assessed incorrectly, for example as being of "Minor" magnitude on a receptor with high sensitivity, giving an overall assessment for the significance of the impact as "Minor Adverse" which, according to the matrix, should result in an overall assessment of significance of "Minor or Moderate".	I	In the Environmental Statement in volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology it is clarified that, in cases where a range is suggested for the significance of effect, there remains the possibility that this may span the significance threshold (i.e. the range is given as minor to moderate). In such cases the final significance is based upon the expert's professional judgement as to which outcome delineates the most likely effect, with an explanation as to why this is the case. This is consistent with the methodology presented in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 5: EIA Methodology.  Additional explanatory text has been inserted into the relevant assessments in the Environmental Statement in volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology to clarify why, in instances where there is a choice in the matrix table, an effect has been considered as minor rather than moderate.

<sup>9</sup> Y = Yes change made; N = No change made; I = Incorporated into or considered when producing the assessment or landowner voluntary agreement offer; N/A = Not applicable.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>9</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Marine Management Organisation	<p>1.6. Where the significance of a predicted impact is calculated as “Minor or Moderate”, the MMO recommends that the significance is assessed as “Moderate” in accordance with the ‘worst case scenario’ principle of the ‘Rochdale Envelope’ appraisal. Such impacts would therefore be significant in terms of the subsequent analysis required under the appropriate Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) regulations, according to the matrix rules used by DONG Energy in the PEIR (paragraph 2.9.1.9, Volume 2, Chapter 2 – Benthic Subtidal and Intertidal Ecology and replicated in subsequent ‘Offshore’ chapters).</p>	I	<p>Regarding Benthic Ecology, In the Environmental Statement, Paragraph 2.9.2.5 of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Subtidal and Intertidal Ecology clarifies that, in cases where a range is suggested for the significance of effect, there remains the possibility that this may span the significance threshold (i.e. the range is given as minor to moderate). In such cases the final significance is based upon the expert’s professional judgement as to which outcome delineates the most likely effect, with an explanation as to why this is the case.</p> <p>Additional explanatory text has been inserted into the relevant assessments in sections 2.11.1 to 2.11.3 of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology to clarify why, in instances where there is a choice in the matrix table, an effect has been considered as minor rather than moderate.</p> <p>For Ornithology, the process used to determine the significance of impacts upon relevant receptors is presented in Section 5.9.4 of Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore Ornithology. Where the significance value falls between two categories (e.g. minor or moderate significance) expert judgement is used to determine the significance value</p> <p>For Marine Mammals the magnitude and sensitivity matrix has been updated and all updates have been communicated to the relevant key stakeholders through the EWG.</p> <p>As discussed in the Marine Processes, Benthic Ecology and Fish and Shellfish EWG meeting of 5 December 2017, impact assessment conclusions have been amended to provide further justification for why a significance of minor (i.e. not significant) has been concluded for species of medium to high sensitivity. These are presented in the relevant impact assessments in Section 3.11 (for Hornsea Three alone) and Section 3.13 (for Cumulative Effects) of volume 2, chapter 3: Fish and Shellfish Ecology.</p>
River Glaven Conservation Group (RGCG) and CPRE Norfolk	<p>SPECIFIC COMMENTS ON THE NON-TECHNICAL SUMMARY: The Non-Technical Summary makes a very useful overview, but also a ‘way in’ to reading the specialist chapters, which go in to considerable detail and length on a wide range of topics; and provide an overview of the specialist topics of particular interest. We make some comment on N-TS by referring to the numbered paragraph. We look to be brief and pick on points where we might either want to just note, support what we say above, and/or come back to later in the consultation process. We do this also with the ecology and nature conservation chapter, and the landscape chapter. We start with the NTS, and work down in order of paragraph number, and quote in full, abbreviate or paraphrase what Dong say to relate to the point we wish to make, or just note.</p> <p>3.5.1.1: The two primary transmission types are HVAC and HVDC for off-shore windfarms; the UK has traditionally used HVAC. With interconnectors between countries HVDC will become more technically and/or economically viable as such are used on a number of projects in Germany. We assume there are more problems in connecting the UK to a wider European system. We understand the need for Dong to take both systems through all planning stages, but hope by then they will be in a position to use HVDC. We also assume that as wind energy is more variable and less predictable than ‘conventional’ energy production, there is a greater need and opportunity for flexibility to ‘chase’ demand if inter-connection between countries is widespread.</p> <p>4.9.1.1: We note and welcome the statement: Hornsea Three will continue to develop and refine the project as it progresses towards a final application to Development Consent and beyond as it moves towards construction. The process will be informed by further stakeholder engagement and interpretation of the outputs from ongoing engineering, commercial and environmental investigations.</p> <p>5.1.1.1: In discussing the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Methodology dealing with the construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning of the project we have: Where significant effects are predicted, where possible it identifies mitigation to reduce the significance of these effects where that is practicable. The bold emphasis is ours, as this seems unduly negative in relation to what we say above. The technical term significant as associated with an EIA requires it must be determined in the Environmental Statement, but an issue deemed to be below this level gets less scrutiny. The word ‘practicable’ is capable of being interpreted in a range of ways, and can be taken as reluctance to deal with anything less than moderate/major adverse adverse significant.</p> <p>5.4.1.5: We welcome: Onshore surveys taken to date include ecological field surveys (bird, bat, badger, invertebrate and reptile), archaeological desktop and geophysical surveys, baseline noise surveys and landscape and visual assessments.</p>	I	<p>This response is noted.</p> <p>In respect to the comments made, through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive ecological receptors. Potential impacts which remain on ecological receptors are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation. This assessment considers the interactions between the project and ecological receptors, and is informed by the relationship between hydrogeology, hydrology and water-dependant habitats which are described in the Hydrological Characterisation Note which forms Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 2.4. This approach was discussed and agreed with the onshore ecology expert working group which comprised Natural England, the Wildlife Trust, Environment Agency and the RSPB amongst others.</p> <p>Mitigation measures have been identified to the creation of preferential pathways for groundwater flow, minimise flood risk, minimise the generation of silt and prevent runoff entering the watercourses. These measures are set out in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapters 1 and 2: Geology and Ground Condition and Hydrology and Flood Risk chapters respectively, as well as in the Outline Code of Construction Practice which forms part of the DCO application. Drainage provisions at the HVAC booster station and HVDC converter/HVAC substation will be further developed during detailed design in agreement with the Norfolk County Council as LLFA.</p> <p>The Glaven Valley Conservation Area is considered in Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 5.5: Screening Assessment - Onshore HVAC Booster Station, as well as annex 5.1: Desk Based Assessment.</p>



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>9</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>5.4.1.6: We welcome: In addition to the surveys which have already been undertaken, a number of surveys are ongoing (such as aerial surveys of birds and marine animals, and onshore ecological surveys) or are proposed (e.g. geophysical survey of the nearshore extent of the Hornsea Three offshore cable corridor) and will inform the EIA presented in the Environmental Statement.</p> <p>5.5.1.1: We welcome: The Hornsea Three assessment uses an iterative approach. This has been employed in order to demonstrate mitigation of project-related impacts. The process of EIA has therefore been used as a means of informing the Hornsea Three design.</p> <p>5.6.1.2: We note: The PEIR sets out all aspects on the environment likely to be significantly affected by the project (as required by the EIA Directive). Only effects in general judged to be of moderate to major significance are 'significant' in EIA terms (where this differs for specific assessments, this is explained within the appropriate PEIR chapters). Where effects are considered significant in EIA terms, this will normally trigger additional analysis, consultation and possibly further mitigation measures, where practicable. When the determining authority makes a decision for consent, it therefore does so in the knowledge of all likely significant effects on the environment. We comment: In this context we include on the latter that this should include an ecological network factor.</p> <p>7.2.1.1: We note: The geology and ground conditions study area comprises of a 1 km buffer around the onshore elements of Hornsea Three. There are three geological SSSI within the search area; Weybourne Cliffs, Weybourne Town Pit, Kelling Heath.</p> <p>7.3.1.3: The hydrology and flood risk study area includes a number of catchments and associated surface watercourses. These include the rivers Yare, Tud, Wensum Bure River Glaven (Gunthorpe Stream). We comment: Gunthorpe Stream is not affected by the cabling route, but is one source of flooding and accompanied by arable run-off. Arable run-off is a major problem within the catchment, including the upper Glaven. We are concerned that this is not exacerbated by open trenching operations.</p> <p>7.3.1.6: The potential use of open cut trenching, Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD) and other site activities, may impact surface water quality due to increases in turbid (murky) run-off, spillages and leaks of fuel, oil etc and an alteration in surface in surface water pathways. With the inclusion of design measures such as the use of HDD at the Landfall the effects of these impacts have been assessed to be of minor adverse significance (not significant in EIA terms). We comment: this may be true for HDD at the Landfall, but in our view is NOT true for open cut trenching, particularly given the heterogeneity of the terrain throughout the Glaven catchment, and the long time that may elapse with excavated soil waiting to be back-filled. Turbid, mucky water contains sediment, as repeated many times a major problem in the Glaven catchment (and many others, not least the Wensum SAC).</p> <p>7.4.1.3: Twenty statutory designated sites, including SSSIs, SACs and Ramsar sites were identified within 2 km of the development, with 126 non-statutory designated sites also identified. The desk top study and site specific surveys indicated the presence of protected or otherwise notable species including bluebell, holly-leaved naiad, sandy stillball, white-clayed crayfish, whorl snail species, common lizard, great crested newt, grass snake, slow worm, breeding birds, wintering birds, migratory birds, badger, otter bats and water vole. We comment: near all are present in the upper Glaven, some in abundance. We will be adding more to this list, and also see the attached paper on the upper Glaven Ecological Network.</p> <p>7.4.1.4: There are a number of possible impacts on onshore habitats with the open cut trenching required to install the export cable. The impacts include potential habitat loss, for example in designated sites, hedgerows and sensitive water courses, as well as disturbance to notable species. The significance of the effects of these impacts is assessed to be in the range moderate to major adverse. With the actions quoted it is claimed they would mitigate the effects of impacts on potentially sensitive habitats and species. Therefore, with the proposed mitigation in place the significance of these effects would be reduced to negligible or minor adverse (not significant in EIA terms). We comment: This is a sweeping and ill-considered statement, which generalises a wide number of situations; it would if taken at face value surely see an unacceptable impact on some species, some habitats, and most certainly result in considerable damage to the ecological network that is provided by the Glaven catchment.</p> <p>7.6.1.3: This paragraph relates to the Historic Environment and states that in the cable search area there are 13 scheduled monuments whose settings may be affected by the proposal there are 167</p>		

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>9</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>listed buildings, of which seven are listed at Grade I, 23 at Grade II* and 137 at Grade II. Many of these are in the North Norfolk district. There are 11 Conservation Areas, which in North Norfolk are Weybourne, Hempstead, Baconsthorpe Upper Sheringham and Glaven Valley. We comment: This is the only mention we can find of the Glaven Valley Conservation Area in the Dong documentation. It is a very large rural area, designated primarily on landscape grounds, but also the vernacular architecture and cultural associations such as the churches within it. The area is almost as large as the river catchment, and we will propose to the Council that the GVCA boundary of this could be overlain by the ecological network boundary, which essentially is the Glaven watershed boundary. This would recognise and bring together landscape and wildlife, to be incorporated in the Local Plan. 7.11.1.2/3 and 4: This relates to the activities of the New Anglia Local Enterprise Partnership (NALEP) and other major developments that might interact with Hornsea Three. There is much activity in Greater Norwich as a Growth Area. As such the Northern Distributor Road (NDR) is to be completed next year. There is a proposal for a Norwich Western Link (NWL) road to take the NDR across the Wensum Valley to the A47 west, on which dualling will start in 2020, and a Food Hub site has been given consent for a site to the west of Easton Village, and the purpose of which is to bolster and justify the county council aspiration for a NWL road. The timescale for any NWL road would be beyond that for Hornsea Three, but the cabling route crosses the A47 and run through the middle of the Food Hub site, the Local Development Order being made within the context of the Greater Norwich Food Enterprise Zone (FEZ) in which the Hub is located.</p>		
Natural England	<p>1.29 Natural England notes that the definitions used to describe magnitude of impact, environmental value and environmental significance are based on those used within the Highways Agency's EIA guidance. Whilst Natural England does not have any issues with the definitions when viewed in isolation, we have found on reviewing the separate chapters that they do not always relate well in every context. We therefore recommend that the interpretation of these definitions is carefully considered when applied in different chapters. Specific concerns are highlighted in our comments relating to individual chapters. (Volume 1, chapter 5, table 5.3)</p>	I	<p>The methodology applied within the Environmental Statement is outlined in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 5: Environmental Impact Assessment Methodology. Where a different, or amended methodology has been used due to topic specific guidance this is outlined within the relevant topic specific chapter of Environmental Statement volume 3.</p>
Natural England	<p>1.30 Tier 2 should also include instances where impacts to designated sites had occurred and not yet been demonstrated to have fully recovered. Equally, as Vattenfall are about to submit the Norfolk Vanguard PEI we believe there is sufficient information to include this project in the assessment. As with other projects we would expect to have a broader set of tiers included and assessed unless otherwise agreed as part of cumulative/in-combination discussions as part of the Evidence Plan process. (Volume 1, chapter 5, section 5.4.3)</p>	I	<p>The EIA Methodology Chapter (Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 5) sets out the rationale for the tiering which is based on the degree of certainty that can be held in a project coming forward as well as the data available for that project, not the scale of expected impact.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>9</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Natural England	<p>1.43 Vol. 1 Annex 5.1 Oil and Gas spatial screening There are a number of fields and associated infrastructure located &lt;20 km away from the array/offshore cable corridor and we would expect them to be fully assessed. It is unclear why only impacts on Fisheries have been screened in. A number of projects have been scheduled for decommissioning potentially coinciding with Hornsea Three construction/operational phase. Therefore there are pathways for potential cumulative impacts on other receptors: - Ornithology and Marine Mammals should not be screened out as vessel movements associated with decommissioning activities could have impacts on sensitive bird species (divers), and also marine mammals. - Cumulative impact may occur for marine processes (Hornsea Three cable protection and Oil and Gas placement of rock/coarse material during decommissioning). The same pathway is relevant for benthic ecology. At the moment most of the projects in the table are marked as 'no physical pathway' and screened out. - Currently operating fields within the NNSR cSAC/SCI could be identified as 'having ongoing impact'.</p>	I	<p>The 'long list' of projects that are screened for the CEA has been updated since publication of the PEIR to ensure that the CEA is based on the most up to date information at the time of writing. Where projects have a known overlap either temporally or geographically with the Hornsea Three activities and potential for an effect exists on any given receptor they have been screened into the relevant CEA.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The ornithology and marine mammal assessments have considered potential for cumulative disturbance from increased vessel traffic from other projects screened into the assessment, and where such information is available.</li> <li>2. During decommissioning, rock placement may be utilised where pipelines are left in situ. However, as stated in paragraph 1.11.8.52 et seq. of volume 2, chapter 1: Marine Processes of the Environmental Statement, the magnitude of change to patterns of sediment transport associated with the presence of profiled rock berms will be highly localised (order of a few hundred metres) and therefore of insufficient scale to interact cumulatively with Hornsea Three. Accordingly, no oil and gas infrastructure decommissioning activities have been included in the marine processes CEA (volume 2, chapter 1 of the Environmental Statement). The benthic ecology CEA (volume 2, chapter 2 of the Environmental Statement) has however considered additive effects from all known decommissioning projects within 50 km of Hornsea Three.</li> <li>3. During operation, blockage (of currents, waves and sediment transport) associated with oil and gas infrastructure are typically highly localised and of insufficient magnitude to give rise to widespread cumulative effects. This is because individual oil and gas platform structures are widely spaced and are typically supported by jacket lattice structures which are largely transparent to waves. Accordingly, no operational oil and gas infrastructure activities have been included in the marine processes CEA (volume 2, chapter 1 of the Environmental Statement).</li> </ol>
Natural England	<p>1.44 Vol. 1 Annex 5.1 Coastal Projects It is unclear why small-scale projects as far down the coastline as Thames estuary and London have been looked at, but a number of larger projects that are close to the development are not listed. A more thorough search of relevant projects in the pipeline should be carried out and the list updated.</p>	I	<p>Cross boundary developments have been taken into account within the in-combination assessment (see Environmental Statement volume 4, annex 5.3: Cumulative Effects Screening Matrix). Each project on the CEA long list has been considered on a case by case basis for scoping in or out of this chapter's assessment based upon data confidence, effect-receptor pathways and the spatial/temporal scales involved.</p>
Natural England	<p>1.45 Vol. 1 Annex 5.1 p. 29 There are a number of German (and other country) windfarms that are consented but there is no further information. While we agree they cannot be quantitatively assessed, these are yet more wind farms that could overlap with Hornsea Three adding to cumulative noise and boat traffic in the Management Unit. A number of windfarms from various countries are in pre-planning, so again, timelines could overlap with Hornsea Three. The qualitative analysis should include these projects.</p>	I	<p>A revised noise modelling approach has been taken for the EIA. Since PEIR the design envelope has been refined and for piling scenarios taken forward to reflect the most likely piling durations based on past construction experience. The updated scenarios modelled and assessed for impacts to marine mammals have been worked through and agreed with the Marine Mammal EWG.</p>
Natural England	<p>1.46 Vol. 1 Annex 5.1 p. 35 There is a need to check projects such as Deborah gas storage site and Hundale potash mine. Text says they are in early stages, but colour code is yellow stating 'in operation'. Please can this be clarified and updated.</p>	I	<p>The CEA long list (volume 4, annex 5.2) has been updated between PEIR and Environmental Statement to include the latest publicly available information.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>9</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Natural England	1.47 Vol. 1 Annex 5.1 p. 70 Natural England queries if a gas field is in the 'discovery' stage of development, could there be seismic surveys associated with the site? If so, these should be screened in, if they are within 50 km as per the other activities (e.g. 43/25a-2W Gas Field).	I	The CEAs within the Environmental Statement (volume 2, chapters 1 to 11) have been undertaken on the basis of the latest publicly available information. It is noted however that there is no easily accessible central repository for detailed information on planned or likely future seismic activities over the timescales associated with the construction of Hornsea Three (construction commencing in 2022). The marine mammal CEA (volume 2, chapter 4 of the Environmental Statement) has therefore been undertaken on the basis of 2015 activity included in the JNCC Marine Noise Registry. If any licensable future activity were to come forward following submission of the Hornsea Three application, then clearly it would need to take account of the proposed development within its cumulative assessment.
Natural England	1.48 Vol. 1 Annex 5.1 p. 133 Royal Navy submarine areas – Consideration should be given to whether there is underwater noise associated with activities undertaken at these sites. Royal Airforce Sites (UK and Netherlands) – Consideration should be given to whether there are any bombing ranges causing underwater noise at these sites.	I	Volume 2, Chapter 8; Aviation, Military and Communication identifies (at sections 8.7.2 and 8.7.3) the known military interests within the Hornsea Three study area. As identified within these sections there is very limited information in relation to the activities that may take place offshore. No known bombing ranges offshore have been identified. Two submarine exercise areas are identified that overlap with the offshore ECR however no information exists in relation to the level or indeed nature of any activity within these sites and therefore, it is not possible to consider them in the context of potential cumulative effects on marine mammal features.
<b>Section 42: Local Authorities (prescribed under section 43 of the Act)</b>			
No comments were received from the local authorities relating to the EIA under Phase 2.A			
<b>Section 42: Persons with an interest in the land (prescribed under section 44 of the Act)</b>			
Dr George Carman	Opinion on EIA Considered as Not Comprehensive It is noted that since the project scope/design is not yet finalised the EIA cannot assure that all issues are addressed.	N/A	The Hornsea Three EIA has employed a maximum design scenario approach, which reflects the Rochdale Envelope approach. By identifying, and assessing based on the maximum design scenario, it can therefore be concluded that the all issues have been addressed and any impacts will be no greater for any other design scenario.  The full details of the EIA methodology are set out in Volume 1, chapter 5: EIA Methodology.
Dr George Carman	Opinion of Overall Proposal Opposed. Opposed on grounds of incomplete information and potential impact of operations of fragile North Norfolk rural landscape and direct impact on family amenity	N/A	Noted. The Environmental Statement provides baseline information, and additional information on the potential impacts of Hornsea Three in each topic specific chapter.
Michael Walmsley	<b>EIA</b> - Having seen none of the results I could not comment	N	The Environmental Statement further develops the information provided within the PEIR, and provides conclusions of the EIA (see volume 2 and 3 for offshore and onshore respectively).
D.N Gray	<b>Baseline Information</b> - No summary of data seen. No opinion	N	Noted.
Simon Willcox	<b>Baseline info in PEIR</b> - Your informaton feels to be factual and efficient. However, it appears to be a collection of statistics,surveys, opinions which do not take into account local people's knowledge and emotions. It also seems as if the entire report has been 'copied' from another assessment froa nother scene with only names, places and some data changed	I	Where there are impacts to sensitive receptors, these are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3), and considers potential impacts to local amenity. As part of our public consultation, we have held three rounds of community consultation events through 2016 and 2017. These events were an opportunity for members of the local community to view the latest plans, to speak directly with members of the project team where individuals required further clarity, and to comment on our proposal at that stage. Attendees were encouraged to capture their thoughts and any concerns by completing one of our feedback forms or by writing to us directly. All the feedback received at and after the events has been carefully considered by the Project and will be incorporated where possible into the final design.
Natasha/Steven Hall	<b>Baseline Information</b> - Cherry picked	I	The Environmental Statement provides a summary of the baseline environment in each topic chapter (volume 3).
Natasha/Steven Hall	<b>EIA</b> - Not including all directly affected just slightly affected	I	Where there are impacts to residential receptors, these are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3). Where impacts have been scoped out, this is explained in each chapter of the Environmental Statement.



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>9</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 47: Duty to consult local community</b>			
Ray & Diane Pearce	Dong Energy, Hornsea 3 Project - PEIR dated 27th July 2017 - Volume 3, Chapter 11, Paragraph 2.1.6: 1. "The EIA Directive states that Environmental Statements should include a description of "interrelationships" between environmental aspects likely to be significantly affected by a proposed development. The Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (Paragraph 5) states that "the EIA must identify, describe and assess in an appropriate manner, in light of each individual case, the direct and indirect significant impacts of the proposed development on the following factors: a) population and human health; b) biodiversity.....; c) land, soil, water, air and climate; d) material assets, cultural heritage and the landscape; e) the interaction between the factors referred to in sub-paragraphs a) to d)."	I	Response noted. Although Hornsea Three can continue under the provisions of the 2011 EIA Directive (in accordance with Article 3(2) of Directive 2014/52/EU), Hornsea Three has adopted, where possible, the provisions of the 2017 EIA Directive in order to ensure a robust approach.
Ray & Diane Pearce	In accordance with the due process, we will reply in detail on the contents of the PEIR by formal letter to your project office. That said, there are serious omissions which we bring to your immediate attention.	N	Response noted and dealt with as individual comments below.
Ray & Diane Pearce	Not with standing the above, either, in your rush to submit the PEIR without addressing all the environmental issues, or, in a deliberate attempt to mislead, you have omitted the very crucial information regarding your project's interaction and "inter-relationship" regarding Vattenfall's Vanguard and Boreas projects; this is information you are dutifully and legally required to provide. We draw your attention to the Planning Inspectorates directive, as follows: "... the Overarching NPS [National Policy Statement] for Energy (EN-1) paragraph 4.2.5 states that "When considering cumulative effects, the ES [Energy Supplier] should provide information on how the effects of the applicant's proposal would combine and interact with the effects of other development (including projects for which consent has been sought or granted, as well as those already in existence)."	I	For any significant environmental impacts, cumulative assessments are undertaken where the impacts that result from incremental changes caused by other past, present or reasonably foreseeable actions together with the project in question could lead to a significant impact. When combined, cumulative EMF sources do not create incremental changes i.e. two equal EMF sources do not double the field strength, rather peak EMFs in effect over lay on one another. Therefore, the combination of Hornsea Project Three with any other EMF source does not result in an incremental change and therefore combined it is forecast to continue to be well below established standards.  Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 11: Inter-related effects of the PEIR provides an assessment of the likely effects should the same type of impact affect the same receptor group during each of the three key project phases (i.e. construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning), and therefore have the potential to combine and result in an overall effect of greater significance. It also provides an assessment of the likely effects should multiple impact types occur on the same receptor group (e.g. noise and landscape and visual impacts may affect the same residential properties); impacts may individually be considered insignificant, but when considered together, could amount to a significant cumulative effect. The potential for impacts arising as a result of Hornsea Project Three to combine with other planned developments (including the Vattenfall projects) is assessed in each respective topic chapter, under the heading 'Cumulative Effect Assessment'. In relation to geology and ground conditions, the cumulative effect assessment is therefore included in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 1, section 1.12.
Ray & Diane Pearce	In conclusion, you have not met the conditions of EIA Directive, quoted at the Reference, and without any direct communication you will leave us with no other option than to challenge you in Public. The Planning Inspectorate will take an adverse view of your omissions from the PEIR, as discussed above, but what is not clear is why you omitted them. It is therefore timely for you to engage with us.	I	Response noted, with individual representations responded to above. It is noted that the Hornsea Three EIA has been prepared in accordance with the 2011 (and where possible, the 2017) EIA Regulations.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>9</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Friends of North Norfolk	12. Dealing with the Hornsea Project Three Preliminary Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) and impacts/ consequences for North Norfolk, we would wish to draw attention to the following:- Cumulative and inter-relational impacts of the various elements of the Project during all phases, but most crucially the operational phase, have not been fully assessed or have been inaccurately assessed. Individual impacts have been incorrectly assessed as not significant and even if accurately assessed as not significant become significant when their inter-relationship is assessed. Critically the cumulative effects/ impacts with other major developments (such as Race Bank, Dudgeon and Sheringham Shoal offshore wind farms and cabling works and potential proposals such as the Bodham and Selbrigg wind turbines and the Vanguard/ Boreas wind farm) have not been recognised, let alone given due weight.	I	Cumulative effects are assessed in the relevant onshore and offshore topic chapters of the Environmental Statement (volumes 2 and 3). Where schemes are already operational, these will have been included within the baseline against which the impact assessment is undertaken, as such to include them in the cumulative effects assessment would result in double counting. Additional information on the approach applied to the cumulative impact assessment is set out in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 5: Environmental Impact Assessment Methodology.
Friends of North Norfolk	13. We question the many deficiencies in PEIR Volumes 2 and 3 and the areas where Dong Energy has failed to properly assess/ consider such cumulative impacts.	I	Cumulative effects are assessed in the relevant onshore and offshore Environmental Statement chapter (volumes 2 and 3). All cumulative assessments have been updated following the publication of the PEIR
Friends of North Norfolk	14. PEIR Volume 2, which deals with offshore, impacts because of inter-relationship and cumulative harm to/ with onshore receptors, notably: - Chapter 4 Marine Mammals. The importance of both grey and common seal colonies, as an ecological and tourist asset. - Chapter 5 Offshore Ornithology. - Chapter 6 Commercial Fisheries. - Chapter 10 Seascape and Visual Resources.	I	An assessment of the cumulative effects of Hornsea Three with other plans and projects is presented Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 4: Marine Mammals, chapter 5: Offshore Ornithology, chapter 6: Commercial Fisheries and chapter 10: Seascape and Visual Resources as well as throughout the remainder of Environmental Statement chapters. A description of the likely inter-related effects arising from Hornsea Three on receptors is provided in the Environmental Statement in volume 2, chapter 12: Inter-Related Effects (Offshore).
Friends of North Norfolk	22. The Consultation and Response Timetable has been too tight to properly assess such a massive project, and the volumes of data and information - beyond the resources of most authorities and public bodies, let alone ordinary folk.	N	We appreciate the large volume of information which is provided in relation to NSIP projects generally. In this regard, there has been a need to balance proportionality with a desire from local authorities, statutory consultees and the communities desire for additional information. The schedule of consultation for Hornsea Three has in all instances, either met or exceeded the statutory time period for consultation.
Friends of North Norfolk	23. We, the Friends of North Norfolk, request that the deficiencies in the PEIR and Consultation Documents provided by Dong Energy, which we have briefly outlined are properly addressed.	I	Additional information regarding Hornsea Three, and the assessment of impacts is provided within the Environmental Statement.
Friends of North Norfolk	3. Dong Energy have applied what is known as 'The Rochdale Envelope Approach' and reserve the option to choose between High Voltage Direct Current, (HVDC) or High Voltage Alternating Current (HVAC) Transmission schemes if they receive approval for both within the one application. The Rochdale Envelope Approach enables a Developer to avoid repeated applications for approval to changes in the design of a project and consequential delays in implementation. It should be used to encourage better designs and allowance for rapid advances in technology, which can reduce environmental impacts. In short, it is to allow for a project to evolve over a number of years but within clearly defined parameters. However, we strongly argue that the Rochdale Envelope Approach should not be allowed in cases such as this when changes in the features/ specifications of the design options are so fundamental, and where it allows for a Developer to manipulate a consent for purely profit motives rather than to gain a superior solution from an environmental perspective.	N	The Hornsea Three EIA has employed a maximum design scenario approach, in accordance with the Rochdale Envelope approach. By identifying, and assessing based on the maximum design scenario, it can therefore be concluded that the all issues have been addressed and any impacts will be no greater for any other design scenario.  The full details of the EIA methodology are set out in Volume 1, chapter 5: EIA Methodology.
Friends of North Norfolk	4. Guidelines regarding the use of the Rochdale Envelope Approach were issued by the former Infrastructure Planning Commission (IPC) in IPC Note 9 (February 2011). They still remain relevant to the assessment process.	N	Noted.
Friends of North Norfolk	5. The PEIR and Consultation by Dong Energy fail to meet these guidelines.	I	The Environmental Statement prepared for Hornsea Three follows the relevant guidelines of the PINS advice notes as did the PEIR so far as was practicable at that early stage of development. A full list of guidance which has been considered is listed in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 5: Environmental Impact Assessment Methodology.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>9</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Friends of North Norfolk	6. Further, they do not satisfy the underlying principles applicable to public consultation over new development requiring Environmental Impact Assessment. Unless they are adequately addressed this current process will be legally flawed.	I	The Planning Act 2008 encourages a consultation driven application process where comments regarding proposal are documented and addressed where possible. Hornsea Three  As part of our public consultation, we have held three rounds of community consultation events through 2016 and 2017. These events were an opportunity for members of the local community to view the latest plans, to speak directly with members of the project team where individuals required further clarity, and to comment on our proposal at that stage. Attendees were encouraged to capture their thoughts and any concerns by completing one of our feedback forms or by writing to us directly.  All the feedback received at and after the events has been carefully considered by the Project and has been incorporated where possible into the final design. A Consultation Report summarising all the comments received and how we have had regard to these forms part of the DCO application. This includes details of a number of design changes that were made to the project as a result of consultation feedback.
Ray & Diane Pearce	Environmental Impact Assessment: The following quote is at PEIR Volume 3, Chapter 11, Paragraph 2.1.6 : "The EIA Directive states that Environmental Statements should include a description of "interrelationships" between environmental aspects likely to be significantly affected by a proposed development. The Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (Paragraph 5) states that "the EIA must identify, describe and assess in an appropriate manner, in light of each individual case, the direct and indirect significant impacts of the proposed development on the following factors: a) population and human health; b) biodiversity.....; c) land, soil, water, air and climate; d) material assets, cultural heritage and the landscape; e) the interaction between the factors referred to in sub-paragraphs a) to d)." " By omitting the interrelationship of routing the Hornsea Three transmission cables across those of Vanguard and Boreas the conditions of EIA Directive have not been met by the PEIR. We ask that the Planning Inspectorate seriously considers why the crossing point was omitted from the PEIR. Also, why are the discussions between Dong Energy, Vattenfall and National Grid plc regarding nationally significant UK infrastructure projects are not divulged for public scrutiny.	I	As noted in previous comments relating to cumulative effects vs. inter-related effects, Volume 3, Chapter 11: Inter-related effects of the Environmental Statement provides an assessment of the likely effects should the same type of impact affect the same receptor group during each of the three key project phases (i.e. construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning), and therefore have the potential to combine and result in an overall effect of greater significance. It also provides an assessment of the likely effects should multiple impact types occur on the same receptor group (e.g. noise and landscape and visual impacts may affect the same residential properties); impacts may individually be considered insignificant, but when considered together, could amount to a significant cumulative effect. The potential for impacts arising as a result of Hornsea Project Three to combine with other planned developments (including the Vattenfall projects) is assessed in each respective topic chapter, under the heading 'Cumulative Effect Assessment'.
Marguerite Russel	<b>Baseline information</b> - Overwhelming. Very difficult for the average person to comprehend the impact this proposal will make.	I	Noted. The non-technical summary forms part of the Environmental Statement and seeks to provide a non-technical summary of the approach to, and conclusions of the Environmental Statement to enhance comprehension.
David Young (NNDC Councillor)	<b>EIA</b> - Too complex, report too large, to be able to assimilate	I	Noted, the Non-technical summary which forms part of the DCO application provides a summary of the findings of the Environmental Statement.
R. Richards, (G E Carman, Timber Merchant)	<b>EIA</b> - I presume it will have to be comprehensive and rigorous to satisfy the planning authorities	N	Noted.
Stephen Huntley	<b>Further Comments</b> - Too much (Volume and detailed technical data) for the average person to make sense of, so all views have to be based on information given during the consultation meetings	I	The non-technical summary accompanies the Environmental Statement and seeks to provide a high level summary of the approach taken within, and the conclusions of the Environmental Statement.
Stephen Huntley	<b>PEIR Detailed and Educating</b> - Disagree - too detailed to make sense of	I	The non-technical summary accompanies the Environmental Statement and seeks to provide a high level summary of the approach taken within, and the conclusions of the Environmental Statement.
Hugh Guyatt	<b>Information</b> - Evidence about views you receive have been not just considered, but acted upon.	I	All the feedback received at and after the consultation events, or during Statutory Consultation has been carefully considered by the Project and will be incorporated where possible into the final design. A summary of this process is provided in the Consultation Report which accompanies the application and responses are provided in this annex.
Hugh Guyatt	<b>Dong's use of Consultation opinions</b> - Not sure - I am sceptical about this, often these questions are simply 'window dressing'	I	All the feedback received at and after the consultation events, or during Statutory Consultation has been carefully considered by the Project and will be incorporated where possible into the final design. A summary of this process is provided in the Consultation Report which accompanies the application

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>9</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Hugh Guyatt	<b>PEIR information</b> - Disagree - Things such as damage to the environment not mentioned by DONG	I	The Environmental Statement prepared for Hornsea Three follows the relevant guidelines of the PINS advice notes and provides an assessment of the potential significant effects which may arise due to Hornsea Three.
Peter Youart	<b>Baseline Assessments</b> - Insufficient information	I	Baseline information relating to Hornsea Three is provided within the relevant topic chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 2 and 3).
Roger Hughes	<b>Baseline Assessments</b> - At this stage it is rather loose and broad brush	I	Baseline information relating to Hornsea Three is provided within the relevant topic chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 2 and 3).
Roger Hughes	<b>EIA</b> - There will inevitably be a number of unknown variables	I	Noted. The Hornsea Three EIA has employed a maximum design scenario approach, which reflects the Rochdale Envelope approach. By identifying, and assessing based on the maximum design scenario, it can therefore be concluded that the all issues have been addressed and any impacts will be no greater for any other design scenario.  The full details of the EIA methodology are set out in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 5: EIA Methodology.
Valerie Stubbs	<b>EIA</b> - Provided all the surveys which are not yet complete are carried out as thoroughly as the others, the research appears to have looked at all aspects.	I	Noted. The results of surveys undertaken as part of the EIA are detailed in the relevant topic specific chapter, or their accompanying annexes (Environmental Statement volumes 3 and 6).
Christine Walton	<b>EIA</b> - Because it does not take into account the real value of what would be lost forever if this project goes ahead	I	Hornsea Three has, through site selection and route refinement sought to minimise impacts on environmental and social receptors. Where there are impacts associated with Hornsea Three, these are assessed within the Environmental Statement, along with mitigation identified to minimise them.
Christine Walton	<b>Consultation</b> - Honest information concerning the length and the real impact it has on those of us who live in this area and on our environment	I	Hornsea Three has, through site selection and route refinement sought to minimise impacts on environmental and social receptors. Where there are impacts associated with Hornsea Three, these are assessed within the Environmental Statement (see Volume 2 and 3), along with mitigation identified to minimise them.  The onshore cable corridor is approximately 55 km in length. Further details on the project are provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description.
Christine Walton	<b>Consultation</b> - Disagree - People at consultation have no realistic information about the impact of this project	I	Noted, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts to local residential receptors, either through site selection/route refinement or through the identification of suitable mitigation measures. Where there are impacts to residential receptors, these are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3)
Francis Farron	<b>PEIR</b> - A summary table of mitigation measures with suggested methodologies at the end of each chapter would make for easier reading	I	A summary of enhancement, mitigation and monitoring is provided in Environmental Statement volume 4, chapter 5.1: Enhancement, Mitigation and Monitoring Commitments.
Francis Farron	<b>Information</b> - I had hoped to see the 'mitigation methods' as stand alone tables	I	In addition to a summary table of both designed in mitigation measures and further mitigations measures within the topic specific chapters Environment Statement volume 2 and 3, a summary of enhancement, mitigation and monitoring is provided in Environmental Statement volume 4, chapter 5.1: Enhancement, Mitigation and Monitoring Commitments.
Gervase Walton	<b>PEIR</b> - In general I support the project so long as all that is possible can be done for the environment and local communities to mitigate any negative effects	I	Hornsea Three has, through site selection and route refinement sought to minimise impacts on environmental and social receptors. Where there are impacts associated with Hornsea Three, these are assessed within the Environmental Statement, along with mitigation identified to minimise them.
Elaine Parkinson	<b>Baseline Information</b> - Can only hope you are seriously listening to people like the Wildlife trust and other stakeholders that know the issues	I	Noted, Hornsea Three has identified how the project has had regard to all consultation comments received within this Consultation Report which forms part of the DCO application.



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>9</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Elaine Parkinson	<b>Cable Corridor</b> - Reinstate sensitivity and minimise impact during this project	I	Through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive ecological receptors. For example, Weybourne Cliffs and Kelling Heath SSSI have been avoided and no direct impacts are predicted on these designated sites from Hornsea Three. Additional mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project are outlined in topic specific chapters, and include the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts on local road networks, ecological receptors (e.g. hedgerows) and hydrological features (e.g. main rivers).  Information relating to the reinstatement of temporary land take is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description. To summarise, prior to construction commencing a Schedule of Condition of the land will be taken and we have an obligation to return the land in the same state. Thus, following the completion of the construction works all areas of temporarily impacted land, including recreational resources, PRowS and other linear routes affected by the onshore works would be re-instated
Neil Buxton	<b>Offshore Array</b> - I do not feel sufficiently informed to comment here. I think there is still a great deal of uncertainty associated with the construction and operatuib of offshore windfarms wherever they are located. What is the environmental impact?	I	The Hornsea Three EIA has undertaken a full Environmental Impact assessment and impacts are presented by topic area within the Environmental Statement that accompanies the application for Development Consent
Neil Buxton	<b>Further Comments</b> - I think the consultation will not take into account the views of individuals, I expect you will plough on with this development whatever local people say. I heard nothing at the consultation event to convince me otherwise. In fact there were many contradictory statements made by DONG staff on the day. No appropriate work done on the local environment or economic impact.	I	The community consultation events, as well as the wider Statutory Consultation presented an opportunity for members of the local community to view the latest plans, to speak directly with members of the project team where individuals required further clarity, and to comment on our proposal at a given stage. All the feedback received at and after the events has been carefully considered by the Project and will be incorporated where possible into the final design. A summary of this process is provided in the Consultation Report which forms part of the DCO application.
Louisa Peaver	<b>Baseline Assessments</b> - It seems fit for purpose at this early stage	N	Noted.
Louisa Peaver	<b>EIA</b> - More location specific data required and from longer data collection period. One year's worth isn't enough.	I	Baseline information relating to Hornsea Three is provided within the relevant topic chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 2 and 3). The data collected is considered sufficient to characterise the baseline conditions for the purpose of the Environmental Statement and has in many instances been agreed with statutory consultees e.g. the onshore Ecology EWG.
Maureen Durrant	<b>Consultation</b> - It is the time given to respond to this consultation. I am not in agreement with. The presentation was on 13th September and our comments are required by the 20th!	N/A	The consultation documents were published on the Hornsea Three website on 27 July 2017 and a document detailing the consultation was issued to the newsletter distribution area and libraries in the vicinity of the website. Ørsted provided more than the 28 day minimum for responses. It is noted that the associated community consultation events were held in early September, as the Ørsted had been advised to avoid the Summer holidays.
Karl Feistner	<b>Offshore Array</b> - No - on the assumption that wildlife / environmental factors are properly taken into account	I	Thank you for your feedback. See the Environmental Statement where impacts have been assessed for various receptors (such as Marine Mammals and Ornithology) and mitigation measures proposed where appropriate.
Karl Feistner	<b>PEIR - Assessments</b> - There seemed to be a lot of emphasis on the temporary works and decommissioning phases and less on impact of the proposed permanent installations e.g. HVAC booster station!	I	The Environmental Statement assesses impacts during the construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning phases of Hornsea Three. As such, consideration is given to both temporary and permanent elements of the project and impacts are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3).
Karl Feistner	<b>Export Cable</b> - No - on the assumption that wildlife / environmental factors are properly taken into account	I	Through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive ecological receptors. For example, designated sites have been avoided and no direct impacts are predicted from Hornsea Three. Additional mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project are outlined in topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3), and include the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts on local road networks, ecological receptors (e.g. hedgerows) and hydrological features (e.g. main rivers).

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>9</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Julia Peters	<b>EIA</b> - Information from ongoing survey work will be of assistance.	I	A number of surveys have been completed for the purpose of the EIA. For example, Environmental Statement volume 6, annexes 3.1 - 3.14 report on the full suite of ecological baseline surveys undertaken to inform the assessment of impacts on ecology and nature conservation as reported in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation.  Surveys which may be required during the detailed design, or prior to construction, are identified in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description.
John Seymour	<b>Baseline Information</b> - Was the baseline data established by yourselves? Is it available for independent scrutiny?	I	Baseline information relating to Hornsea Three is provided within the relevant topic chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 2 and 3). The data was collected by means of desk study and site specific surveys and is considered sufficient to characterise the baseline conditions for the purpose of the Environmental Impact Assessment. In each case, statutory advisors have been consulted on the scope and results of relevant surveys
Simon Willcox	<b>Baseline info in PEIR</b> - Your informaton feels to be factual and efficient. However, it appears to be a collection of statistics,surveys, opinions which do not take into account local people's knowledge and emotions. It also seems as if the entire report has been 'copied' from another assessment froa nother scene with only names, places and some data changed	I	Where there are impacts to sensitive receptors, these are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3), and considers potential impacts to local amenity. As part of our public consultation, we have held three rounds of community consultation events through 2016 and 2017. These events were an opportunity for members of the local community to view the latest plans, to speak directly with members of the project team where individuals required further clarity, and to comment on our proposal at that stage. Attendees were encouraged to capture their thoughts and any concerns by completing one of our feedback forms or by writing to us directly. All the feedback received at and after the events has been carefully considered by the Project and will be incorporated where possible into the final design.
<b>Section 48: Duty to publicise</b>			
Douglas Walters (Norfolk Geographical Association)	<b>PEIR</b> - It seems like you have had comprehensive preliminary environmental information report	N	Noted
Douglas Walters (Norfolk Geographical Association)	<b>Baseline Information</b> - It seems good	N	Noted
Douglas Walters (Norfolk Geographical Association)	<b>EIA</b> - It seems to have been done in a thorough way with good local consultation for people's views	N	Noted.
George Carman, Geodirect Resources P/L	<b>EIA</b> - It is noted that since the project scope/design is not yet finalised the EIA cannot assure that all issues are addressed.	I	The Hornsea Three EIA has employed a maximum design scenario approach, which reflects the Rochdale Envelope approach. By identifying, and assessing based on the maximum design scenario, it can therefore be concluded that the all issues have been addressed and any impacts will be no greater for any other design scenario.  The full details of the EIA methodology are set out in Volume 1, chapter 5: EIA Methodology.
George Carman, Geodirect Resources P/L	<b>Proposal</b> - Opposed on grounds of incomplete information and potential impact of operations of fragile North Norfolk rural landscape and direct impact on family amenity (residential (depreciation in property value), commercial, pasture, equine, arable, sporting amenity, camping and further 'unforeseen' uses in the future).	I	Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including landscapes, sensitive ecological receptors and land uses. Impacts which have been identified are assessed within the relevant topic chapter of the Envionmental Statement (volume 3).
George Carman, Geodirect Resources P/L	<b>Consultation</b> - Online access is spurious in North Norfolk. Whilst DONG has provided the PEIRS report on a USB, it is missing some data/information elements and sifting through the almost 1 GB of information is most confusing and onerous for inexperienced and time-poor stakeholders holding down jobs, supporting families and maintaining their properties.	I	Response noted. Orsted has sought to make the documents as accessible as possible by providing USB sticks to all relevant consultees as well as uploading all documentation onto the project website. Furthermore, hard copies of the PEIR (including documents, plans and maps) was available at several locations during the Phase 2 consultation period, which ran from 27 July to 20 September. Locations included: North Nofolk District Council office, Broadlands District Council office, South Norfolk District Council office, Norwich City Council office, Norfolk County Council office and six local librарys along the proposed cable corridor.  Hard copies of the DCO Application will be available in Norfolk and details of locations are confirmed in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 1: Introduction

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>9</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
George Carman, Geodirect Resources P/L	<b>Information</b> - Assurance that this feedback and all feedback is fed into the Final Design MAY be improved by making ALL FEEDBACK PUBLIC	I	All consultation feedback has been considered when making final design decisions and these are reflected in the Project Description.
George Carman, Geodirect Resources P/L	<b>Baseline Information</b> - It is far too rudimentary and flawed to be of any significance. It is noted that further surveys are recommended by the report.	I	Environmental Statement volume 6, annexes 3.1 - 3.14 report on the full suite of ecological baseline surveys undertaken to inform the assessment of impacts on ecology and nature conservation as reported in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation.

Table 3.11: Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Further Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.B) relating to the EIA

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>10</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 42: Prescribed consultees (The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009: Schedule 1)</b>			
Estelle Hook, Norfolk Coast Partnership	In addition, this is a very environmentally-sensitive area with SPA, SAC, SSSI, EMS and MCZ designations involved or close by.	I	Through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive ecological receptors (including designated sites). For example, Weybourne Cliffs and Kelling Heath SSSI have been avoided and no direct impacts are predicted on these designated sites from Hornsea Three. Additional mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project are outlined in topic specific chapters (Environmental Statement volume 3), and include the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts on ecological receptors (e.g. hedgerows) and hydrological features (e.g. main rivers).  The impact of the offshore elements of the project on environmentally designated sites has been considered in the application where applicable. The potential impact on Marine Conservation Zones is assessed in Environmental Statement Volume 5, Annex 2.3: Marine Conservation Zone Assessment. The potential effect on SACs is assessed in the Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment (application document number A5.2).
Historic England	<b>Onshore</b> We note that the new onshore mapping information is not accompanied by any corresponding report or addendum therefore it is difficult to assess these additions in relation to the historic environment. We would however expect the same consideration to be given to these new areas in the ES as has been afforded to the main cable corridor in respect of the assessment and analysis of impacts. In particular, if these new areas are found to be unsustainable in planning policy terms because of the likely impact upon the significance of designated or non-designated heritage assets then they will not be taken forward. We do however, accept that changes may be necessary during the planning to provide the most effective and most sustainable route and therefore this is a necessary process. The comments that we made in relation to the original Hornsea 3 PEIR should be considered as appropriate for these alternatives routes. We would welcome confirmed from applicant that a full assessment would be undertaken for the ES.	I	An assessment of impacts on heritage assets is provided in Environmental Statement, volume 3, chapter 5: Historic Environment.
<b>Section 42: Local Authorities (prescribed under section 43 of the Act)</b>			
<i>No comments were received from the local authorities relating to the EIA under Phase 2.B.</i>			
<b>Section 42: Persons with an interest in the land (prescribed under section 44 of the Act)</b>			
<i>No comments were received from persons with an interest in land relating to the EIA under Phase 2.B</i>			
<b>Section 47: Duty to consult local community</b>			
<i>No comments were received from the local community relating to the EIA under Phase 2.B</i>			
<b>Section 48: Duty to publicise</b>			
<i>No comments were received in response to the Public Notice relating to the EIA under Phase 2.B</i>			

<sup>10</sup> Y = Yes change made; N = No change made; I = Incorporated into or considered when producing the assessment or landowner voluntary agreement offer; N/A = Not applicable.



### 3.6 HRA

Table 3.12: Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.A) relating to the HRA.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>11</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 42: Prescribed consultees (The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009: Schedule 1)</b>			
Ministry of Infrastructure and the Environment, Dutch Government	I write as the Danish Point of Contact for notifications regarding to the Espoo convention. In Denmark, we are a bit confused about how we understand your Espoo-process and thus the letter from Dong Energy dated July 27th. In Denmark, it is always the Espoo authority that sends hearings to parties, but as I read your letter, a builder in England also sends out consultations? However, I understand your letter as being the same hearing, as the one we received from the English authority by Kathrine King. As a result of this understanding, Denmark initiated a hearing based on the notification from Katherine King. This consultation has now been completed in Denmark, and with this mail I will forward the responses I have sent today to Katherine King to you - the attached files contain the Danish consultation response. This also means that no public consultation has been initiated based on your letter of 27 July. If I have completely misunderstood your process, I would like to hear from you more closely. SEE LINK AS INCLUDES RESPONSE TO HRA Screening	N	Under the EIA Regulations 2017 Regulation 37, the duty sits with the Planning Inspectorate to contact stakeholders. However, as best practice and in an effort to get early sight of any concerns a stakeholder might have so that we can respond appropriately, we also key stakeholders directly ourselves.
Ministry of Infrastructure and the Environment, Dutch Government	Thank you for the HRA report and your interest in our view on it. We have noted that the Hornsea Three project is going to be a very large wind farm - with 400 mills - each with a capacity of up to 6 MW. Being situated 160 km east of the Yorkshire coast the shortest distance to the two nearest Danish SAC's namely nr. 40 and 44 in figure 5.1 on page 68 in the HRA is approx. 300 and 380 km respectively.	N	Acknowledged
Ministry of Infrastructure and the Environment, Dutch Government	Nr. 40 is designated to protect sandbanks (HD type 1110), harbour porpoise, harbor seal and grey seal, and as a bird protection area two species of divers and little gull.	I	Acknowledged
Ministry of Infrastructure and the Environment, Dutch Government	Nr. 44 is the southwestern part of mainland Jutland with islands where marshland mixes with several other plant communities on the habitat directives Annex 1 and many species including mammals, birds and fish.	I	Acknowledged
Ministry of Infrastructure and the Environment, Dutch Government	The Danish Environmental Protection Agency find it unlikely that a significant effect on Danish nature sites will be observed due to the construction of Hornsea Three Offshore Wind Farm - especially with reference to the substantial distance. In the HRA report - section 6 - NIRAS reach the same conclusion,	I	Acknowledged
ScottishPower Renewables (UK) Limited	Our intention is to register as an interested party due to the potential for cumulative and in-combination habitats issues to arise with Hornsea Project Three and SPR's East Anglia projects, specifically East Anglia TWO and ONE North Offshore Windfarms for which scoping requests will be submitted to the Planning Inspectorate in November of this year. At this stage our specific interest is in relation to the potential for offshore ornithological and marine mammal impacts and therefore cumulative and in-combination impacts upon European protected sites and species.	N	Noted

<sup>11</sup> Y = Yes change made; N = No change made; I = Incorporated into or considered when producing the assessment or landowner voluntary agreement offer; N/A = Not applicable.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>11</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Whale & Dolphin Conservation	<p>In-combination effects</p> <p>Annex 1: HRA Screening Report, and the marine mammals chapter details the in-combination assessment for Hornsea 3 offshore wind farm. We note that the assessment only incorporates offshore wind farms, and does not list other offshore developments that have the possibility to have an in-combination effect, such as oil and gas developments, shipping, navigation and shipping. These other activities need to be included to ensure an effective assessment is undertaken. East Anglia One North, East Anglia Two and Norfolk Boreas also should be screened into the in-combination assessment, currently these have been left out of the list.</p> <p>Guidelines for in-combination assessment state that other developments, including cross boundary developments must be taken into account when undertaking the assessment. Any conclusion based on an incomplete assessment will be unreliable. Therefore the conclusion of the in-combination assessment, which is also highlighted in 6.5.1.7 of the PEIR non-technical summary, that there is likely to only be minor adverse significance from in combination is unreliable. It is acknowledged in Annex 1:HRA Screening Report that due to changes in the project design that the impacts on marine mammals will be re-assessed in the Environmental Statement, this assessment should take into account the combined effects of these developments with other industries operating in the marine environment, such as other marine renewable developments, shipping and oil and gas exploration, including outside of UK waters.</p> <p>Cumulative effects from across marine boundaries need to be considered to consider all potential transient impacts across such boundaries, especially considering the mobile nature of cetaceans.</p>	I	<p>The in-combination assessment has incorporated projects and plans other than solely offshore wind farms. Oil and Gas seismic surveys have been incorporated into the assessment. Shipping however is considered part of the baseline and is not included within the in-combination assessment.</p> <p>Cross boundary developments have been taken into account within the in-combination assessment (see volume 4, annex 5.3: Cumulative Effects Screening Matrix). Each project on the CEA long list has been considered on a case by case basis for scoping in or out of this chapter's assessment based upon data confidence, effect-receptor pathways and the spatial/temporal scales involved.</p>
Whale & Dolphin Conservation	<p>We are glad to see the Draft Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment Annex 1: HRA Screening Report (RIAA) included in the PEIR, and that trans-boundary sites for marine mammals are included. However throughout this chapter the Southern North Sea cSAC is detailed as a Potential Special Area of Conservation (pSAC), despite the site being designated as a cSAC seven months before the PEIR was written. We are also concerned by the incorrect statement in 6.2.21 of the above chapter "The main aim of the designation is to support the maintenance of harbour porpoise populations throughout UK waters". The purpose of the designation is to protect a site that has key habitat areas and significant population of harbour porpoise; and any assessment of the impacts of Hornsea 3 must consider the correct designation and the reason for that designation. As noted above, the site is a designated cSAC which offers strict protection, therefore the HRA must consider not only the project independently, but also cumulatively taking into account other plans and projects that will impact the harbour porpoise at the site. Site based protection cannot be met by assessing the whole North Sea population, but only by assessing the impacts for the number of individuals that are supported by the site (Rees et al., 2015).</p> <p>WDC strongly disagrees with the conclusion in the RIAA in 7.5.2.46 that "there is no indication that the potential for lethality/ injury and hearing impairment effects associated with underwater noise on the harbour porpoise qualifying feature of this site would lead to a reduction in the viability of the species or adversely impact the supporting habitats and processes relevant to this species and their prey from being maintained". We therefore believe that proven mitigation should be used to reduce impacts.</p> <p>Proven mitigation methods are also required as the maximum worst case disturbance scenarios from piling exceed the thresholds set by JNCC. The RIAA states a maximum worst case scenario of 37.13% for sequential piling and 46.97% for concurrent piling for summer component of cSAC. Also, the assessment states that there is potential for up to 14.09% on the North Sea Management Unit to be affected by disturbance impacts.</p> <p>WDC request to be included on discussions of mitigation options, to ensure that proven and effective methods are used.</p>	I	<p>The RIAA correctly references the cSAC and includes the CO's as stated within the site selection documentation. JNCC advice is to consider the wider MU population within the HRA assessment. Effects in-combination with other plans and project have been assessed.</p> <p>The assessment on effects of lethality injury has been updated on the basis of updated noise modelling results.</p> <p>The cumulative effects assessment list of projects, and tiering of projects, has been updated. Therefore the disturbance assessment for harbour porpoise and the percentage overlap of the SNS cSAC has also been updated.</p> <p>The EIA/HRA outline mitigation measures where it is considered necessary.</p>
Dutch Ministry of Infrastructure and Environment	2. The N2000 designated area Voordelta is missing on figure 4.2.	I	This N2000 site has been screened out of the assessment due to the distance from the Hornsea Three site and is no longer considered as part of the baseline.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>11</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Heather Davison	The Flamborough and Filey Coast pSPA kittiwake colony has been experiencing population declines for a number of years, in line with other North Sea colonies. Kittiwakes are specialist feeders, feeding primarily on year zero sandeels during the breeding season. It is generally accepted that these declines are due to a reduction in the availability of prey species, as a result of climate change and fishing practices. Although the studies referenced in section 6.2.159 of the HRA Screening Report acknowledge that kittiwakes are extremely pelagic birds, this doesn't take into account the availability of prey within those habitats, nor the restriction to central place foraging during the breeding season. Whilst Frederickson (2012) agreed that kittiwakes can range widely, the report also stated that very little is known about kittiwake diet, especially during the winter months. Similarly, Langston (2010) rated the species as low vulnerability to habitat and prey interactions, but it was also noted in the same paper that food shortages lead to low adult survival. Furthermore, the kittiwake tracking results as part of the FAME/STAR projects should be considered here, in order to better understand the level at which kittiwakes use the Hornsea 3 area during the breeding season.	I	The FFC pSPA breeding Kittiwake colony has shown increases in recent years with the most recent colony counts showing this. Historically the colony at FFC pSPA has shown apparent declines however, a review of the counts that informed the Flamborough Head and Bempton Cliffs SPA designation presented in Coulson (2011) identifies considerable uncertainty surrounding these counts and concludes that the number of pairs was actually the number of individuals. This would indicate that the colony has actually been stable since the 1980s  The FAME tracking data has been used where appropriate throughout the ES/RIAA.
Heather Davison	As such, in my opinion, the evidence is not strong enough to completely discount LSE for kittiwakes and gannets during the construction/decommissioning phases of the project.	I	Noted. The impact on kittiwake at the Flamborough and Filey Coast pSPA has been considered in the RIAA.
Heather Davison	General Comments - Ensure that the Flamborough and Filey Coast potential Special Protection Area (pSPA) is referenced correctly throughout the document, particularly within sections 8.4.7.22 and 8.4.7.25 of the Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment (RIAA).	I	A full check of relevant sections has been undertaken
Heather Davison	The most up-to-date seabird colony counts should be used to inform this HRA; a full colony census of the Flamborough and Filey Coast pSPA was completed in 2017.	I	Advice provided by Natural England for previous offshore wind farm projects (e.g. Hornsea Project Two) has advised that designated populations should be used. Changes in populations at the pSPA are noted in a contextual manner throughout the PEI and will be included in a qualitative manner in relevant assessments
Heather Davison	Section 8.4.5.21 of the RIAA references a slightly increased risk of mortality in razorbills due to the ongoing care required for their young after fledging. This is also true of guillemots; the report should be altered to reflect this accurately.	I	A review of the text has been undertaken and updates made where necessary
Heather Davison	References to Wade et al (2016) The Wade et al (2016) paper is referenced throughout the documents in relation to seabird vulnerability to all aspects of offshore windfarms. Although the paper uses and references vulnerability scores established by Furness et al (2013), the uncertainty scores computed by Wade et al (2016) suggest where further information may be required in order to accurately assess vulnerability (i.e. high uncertainty of the existing data) and where it can be assumed that the data already available is sufficient (i.e. low uncertainty). It would be more transparent to use the original vulnerability scores, or explain how the Wade et al (2016) scores were calculated.	I	Consideration of the uncertainty scores presented in Wade et al. (2016) is included in Annex 5.1: Baseline Characterisation Report, Annex 5.2: Analysis of Displacement Impacts on Seabirds and Annex 5.3: Collision Risk Modelling
Heather Davison	Omission of Construction/Decommissioning Phases (Kittiwakes and Gannets) and Displacement Effects (Kittiwake) The construction/decommissioning phases, and any possible effects, have not been included in Tables 4.10 and 8.1 of the RIAA in relation to kittiwakes and gannets. Furthermore, any possible displacement effects on the kittiwake population have not been considered. This extends to Annex 5.2, where kittiwakes have, again, been excluded from any displacement analysis. No satisfactory explanation for these omissions has been given in the documents available, as explored below.	I	No LSE was identified for disturbance impacts on gannet and kittiwake that may occur in the construction/decommissioning phases. A clear process to identify Valued Ornithological Receptors (VORs) for inclusion in displacement analyses is presented in Annex 5.2: Analysis of Displacement Impacts on Seabirds with the rationale for screening out kittiwake presented. Natural England have also advised that displacement analysis is not required for kittiwake as part of the Evidence Plan process

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>11</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Heather Davison	Gannet Vulnerability to Construction/Decommissioning Section 6.2.164 of the HRA Screening Report states that gannets are seemingly tolerant of human activities at sea, as discards from fishing vessels can be an important food source. Fishing practices are not directly related, nor even directly comparable, to any construction or decommissioning activities which might occur as part of this project. Therefore, with no further evidence supplied, it cannot be assumed that there will be no effect on gannets during the construction/decommissioning phases. Moreover, the Wade et al (2016) report has been used to state that gannets are of low vulnerability to disturbance from vessels and demonstrate considerable flexibility in habitat use – see comment 2.	I	As stated gannet have a low vulnerability to disturbance and demonstrate a high habitat flexibility. Further information in relation to this is provided in the Environmental Statement volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore Ornithology and the RIAA. Therefore no LSE is identified in relation to disturbance impacts
Heather Davison	Kittiwake Vulnerability to Construction/Decommissioning and Displacement Although it may be true that the construction/decommissioning phases would have no LSE on kittiwakes, the evidence used in section 6.2.158 of the HRA Screening Report is unconvincing. There seems to be a lack of evidence which specifically relates to kittiwake ecology; the broad term 'gulls' is used frequently in this section. It should also be considered whether the number of seabird observations in the studies referenced is substantial enough to be comparable with the number of kittiwakes which associate with this area of the Hornsea Zone (Table 1.45 of Annex 5.1 estimates a peak population of more than 12,000 within the development area during July). Furthermore, kittiwake has been completely omitted from the displacement analysis in Annex 5.2.	I	The process used to identify species for inclusion in displacement analyses is presented in Annex 5.1: Baseline Characterisation Report and Annex 5.2: Analysis of Displacement Impacts on Seabirds. Kittiwake have a low vulnerability to displacement impacts and therefore are not identified for consideration of displacement. This conclusion is also supported by Natural England who do not advise kittiwake is considered in relation to displacement impacts
The Wildlife Trust (joint response from Norfolk WT and TWT)	3.2. Report to Inform the Appropriate Assessment (RIAA): Southern North Sea cSAC Table 3.2 indicates that floating turbines are being considered as part of the design envelope. An assessment against entanglement should be undertaken for the Southern North Sea cSAC and also be included in the EIA marine mammals chapter. It is stated in 3.4.4.26 that if floating turbines are used, anchors to secure mooring lines could be secured by piles. Please could figures be provided on the potential hammer energy required for installing anchor piles for floating turbines.	Y	Floating turbines are no longer within the design envelope and therefore, this comment is no longer relevant.
The Wildlife Trust (joint response from Norfolk WT and TWT)	TWT does not agree with the conclusion in 7.5.2.46 "there is no indication that the potential for lethality/ injury and hearing impairment effects associated with underwater noise on the harbour porpoise qualifying feature of this site would lead to a reduction in the viability of the species or adversely impact the supporting habitats and processes relevant to this species and their prey from being maintained". We do not believe it is appropriate for any harbour porpoise to be subject to PTS or TTS impacts and therefore mitigation should be implemented to reduce impacts. This is also essential, as outlined in table 7.12, PTS noise exceeds fleeing distance for harbour porpoise. We again reiterate the strict protection which harbour porpoise are afforded as EPS.	I	An updated assessment of effects from underwater noise is presented in Section 4.11.1 of Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 4: Marine Mammals. Matters relating to the cSAC are presented in the Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment (Ørsted, 2018).
The Wildlife Trust (joint response from Norfolk WT and TWT)	Further detail would be useful on how disturbance impacts, both spatially and temporally, were calculated to draw the conclusions as outlined in 7.5.2.68 and 7.5.2.71. We question whether an average of 20 days piling per months is the worst case scenario for the temporal assessment.	I	An updated assessment of effects from underwater noise is presented in Section 4.11.1 of Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 4: Marine Mammals. Matters relating to the cSAC are presented in the Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment (Ørsted, 2018).
The Wildlife Trust (joint response from Norfolk WT and TWT)	3.2.1. In-combination assessment As highlighted in our response on the EIA cumulative impact assessment, East Anglia One North, East Anglia Two and Norfolk Boreas should be included in the in-combination assessment. TWT would also like to see more detail on Tier 2 impacts based on the statement in 7.7.2.10 "Impacts of Tier 2 projects will not be greater than Tier 1 projects". We question this, especially since Tier 2 project are expected to be of similar scale to Hornsea 3.	I	The EIA Methodology Chapter (Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 5: EIA Methodology) sets out the rational for the tiering which is based on the degree of certainty that can be held in a project coming forward as well as the data available for that project, not the scale of expected impact. The statement referenced refers to the fact that for tier two projects the information available does not provide enough for a robust assessment at this point in time.



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>11</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
The Wildlife Trust (joint response from Norfolk WT and TWT)	TWT does not agree with the overall conclusion in 7.8.1.3 that “With respect to those objectives, there is no indication, at this stage, that Hornsea Three, alone or in-combination with other plans and projects would prevent the maintenance or restoration of Annex II marine mammal features, habitats or supporting habitats, for which the sites are designated.” Maximum worst case disturbance scenarios of 37.13% for sequential piling and 46.97% for concurrent piling for summer component of cSAC exceed the thresholds outlined in the Inter-Agency Marine Mammal Working Group (IAMMWG) discussion document on the approach to determining the significance of disturbance (IAMMWG, 2017). Therefore, we would like to begin discussions on mitigation options. We would like to raise at this stage, however, that have concerns regarding the area based threshold approach. We are happy to discuss this in more detail with Hornsea 3.	I	An updated assessment of effects from underwater noise is presented in Section 4.11.1 of Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 4: Marine Mammals. Matters relating to the cSAC are presented in the Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment (Ørsted, 2018).
The Wildlife Trust (joint response from Norfolk WT and TWT)	3.3. Marine Mammal Mitigation Protocol (MMMP): Chapter 3: Marine Mammals chapter and Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment We are concerned that the current 15% ramp up level at 750kJ (to reach a maximum hammer energy of 5000kJ) results in a PTS radius of 1500m, thus defining the mitigation zone at this distance. TWT believes a mitigation zone of 1500m is too high. We also have concerns that animals may be present within the PTS zone as ramp up increases (as outlined in table 4.23 of the marine mammals chapter). We would like to open discussions with the Hornsea Three project team on potential mitigation options to reduce PTS impacts. We suggest that Acoustic Deterrent Devices (ADDs) should be included in the noise assessment methodology to take account of additional noise produced as part of the MMMP.	I	PTS effects will be controlled through the implementation of a MMMP that will be developed using best practice techniques in consultation with the statutory nature conservation body (SNCB) and approved by the MMO prior to the commencement of offshore works. The Project will not be able to proceed until the MMO is satisfied that the Project has a protocol that adequately mitigates the risk of PTS.
The Wildlife Trust (joint response from Norfolk WT and TWT)	3.4. Vessel movement: cumulative/in-combination impacts Current vessel activity in the Hornsea 3 marine mammal study area is 12,775 (4.11.2.19). It is predicted that increased vessel movements from Hornsea 3 during construction will be 11,776 (7.7.3.1 RIAA). When adding the increased vessel movements over the cumulative assessment period (table 7.30 in RIAA), there will be over 70,000 increased vessel movements. We suggest that the cumulative effects of vessel movements are investigated in more detail in relation to marine mammals, and the Southern North Sea cSAC in particular.	Y	The updated design envelope has seen a revision to the number of projected vessels associated with the construction and operation of the project. The maximum figures are presented in Table 4.15 of volume 2, chapter 4: Marine Mammals and these have been used to inform the subsequent assessment.
The Wildlife Trust (joint response from Norfolk WT and TWT)	3.5. Habituation and return times TWT has some concerns regarding the assumptions made with regards to habituation and return times in both the marine mammals chapter and the RIAA. For example, 4.11.1.65 in the marine mammals chapter highlights that the North Sea has the highest noise levels compared to other UK seas and “This suggests that marine mammals in the North Sea are likely to be acclimatised to certain level of noise in the same spectrum that is predicted to arise from piling”. We suggest that this assumption cannot be made as we do not know enough about the impacts from current baseline noise levels on the functioning of marine mammal populations within the North Sea.	I	The assessment of the impact of piling noise on harbour porpoise does not explicitly consider return times in a quantitative way because of the lack of data on individual movement patterns in relation to responses to piling noise. The assumption adopted in the assessment is that the predicted level of disturbance to harbour porpoises occurs throughout the whole period of piling activity and does not distinguish between these two scenarios (a smaller number of individuals being repeatedly disturbed or a larger number of individuals being disturbed only once).
The Wildlife Trust (joint response from Norfolk WT and TWT)	TWT suggests caution in the consideration of return time, as discussed in 4.11.1.78 of the EIA marine mammals chapter and 7.5.2.72-75 of the RIAA. There is not enough evidence to understand the true nature of harbour porpoise return behaviour following piling activity. Previous studies do highlight differing return times but we have no certainty if these are the same animals returning or new animals visiting the site. We do not know how much site fidelity relates to return times e.g. quicker return times due to good foraging areas (Brandt et al, 2016) which could result in risking overall fitness due to potential multiple flight activity from multiple piling events (Dahne et al 2013).	I	The assessment of the impact of piling noise on harbour porpoise does not explicitly consider return times in a quantitative way because of the lack of data on individual movement patterns in relation to responses to piling noise. The assumption adopted in the assessment is that the predicted level of disturbance to harbour porpoises occurs throughout the whole period of piling activity and does not distinguish between these two scenarios (a smaller number of individuals being repeatedly disturbed or a larger number of individuals being disturbed only once).
The Wildlife Trust (joint response from Norfolk WT and TWT)	There is also the consideration of other noise producing activities which take place during the construction period that can affect return times. Brandt et al (2016) suggest that “effects lasting beyond the piling time may not only be a result of piling activities, but also of other construction activities resuming after the end of piling, such as demounting noise mitigation systems and the increased shipping activity that goes with it. One factor that points towards this is that detection rates were already decreased for some time before piling.”	I	The assessment of the impact of piling noise on harbour porpoise does not explicitly consider return times in a quantitative way because of the lack of data on individual movement patterns in relation to responses to piling noise. The assumption adopted in the assessment is that the predicted level of disturbance to harbour porpoises occurs throughout the whole period of piling activity and does not distinguish between these two scenarios (a smaller number of individuals being repeatedly disturbed or a larger number of individuals being disturbed only once).
RSPB	Para 8.7.2.12 – There is a need for PVA for kittiwake.	I	PVA modelling has been considered in the final RIAA

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>11</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
RSPB	Annex 1: HRA Screening Report Para 4.4.1 – for reasons set out above, the RSPB does not agree with the assertion “This overview of the bird data indicates that Hornsea Three does not represent an area of significant importance for breeding, passage or wintering birds.” However, once the RSPB has had the opportunity to consider the full data and our concerns set out elsewhere in this document have been addressed we may be able to agree with this assertion.	I	Noted. A full dataset is included in the final RIAA/ES and associated Annexes
National Grid	Electricity and Gas Transmission infrastructure within / in close proximity to the order boundary Electricity Transmission National Grid Electricity Transmission has high voltage electricity overhead transmission lines, a high voltage substation and high voltage underground cables within the onshore scoping area. The overhead line, substation cables form an essential part of the electricity transmission network in England and Wales. Substation · Norwich 400kV Overhead Lines · 4VV (400kV) overhead line route - Norwich Main to Walpole 1 - Norwich Main to Walpole 2 · 4YM (400kV) overhead line route - Bramford to Norwich Main 1- Bramford to Norwich Main 2 · PHC (132kV) overhead line - Norwich Main to Trowse 1 · PGG (132kV) overhead line - Norwich Main to Trowse 3 Underground Cable · Norwich Main – PHC001	N/A	Ørsted acknowledged the relevant locations of the electrical infrastructure and entered into discussions with NGET regarding asset interactions.
<b>Section 42: Local Authorities (prescribed under section 43 of the Act)</b>			
No comments were received from the local authorities relating to the HRA under Phase 2.A.			
<b>Section 42: Persons with an interest in the land (prescribed under section 44 of the Act)</b>			
National Grid	Electricity and Gas Transmission infrastructure within / in close proximity to the order boundary Electricity Transmission National Grid Electricity Transmission has high voltage electricity overhead transmission lines, a high voltage substation and high voltage underground cables within the onshore scoping area. The overhead line, substation cables form an essential part of the electricity transmission network in England and Wales. Substation · Norwich 400kV Overhead Lines · 4VV (400kV) overhead line route - Norwich Main to Walpole 1 - Norwich Main to Walpole 2 · 4YM (400kV) overhead line route - Bramford to Norwich Main 1- Bramford to Norwich Main 2 · PHC (132kV) overhead line - Norwich Main to Trowse 1 · PGG (132kV) overhead line - Norwich Main to Trowse 3 Underground Cable · Norwich Main – PHC001	N/A	Ørsted acknowledged the relevant locations of the electrical infrastructure and entered into discussions with NGET regarding asset interactions.
<b>Section 47: Duty to consult local community</b>			
No comments were received from the local community relating to the HRA under Phase 2.A.			
<b>Section 48: Duty to publicise</b>			
No comments were received in response to the Public Notice relating to the HRA under Phase 2.A.			

Table 3.13: Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.B) relating to the HRA.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>12</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 42: Prescribed consultees (The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009: Schedule 1))</b>			
The Wildlife Trust	<p>This is a joint response from Norfolk Wildlife Trusts (NWT) and The Wildlife Trusts (TWT). Offshore alternative routes</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. We are pleased that the eastern cabling route within Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ has been removed from the cabling route options, avoiding potential impacts on subtidal chalk reef habitat.</li> <li>2. We are please that an alternative route has been considered which could avoid impacts on te features of Cromer Shoal Chalk Bed MCZ.</li> <li>3. We cannot say at this stage which is preferred route until a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) has been undertaken on the impacts of calbing through the Wash and North Norfolk Coast SAC. Once this is available, we will be able to provide further thoughts on the alternative route proposed as part of this consultation.</li> <li>4. Eastern IFCA is undertaking fisheries assessment work for designated sites, including the Wash and North Norfolk Coast SAC and Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ. We recommend speaking to Eastern IFCA to understand what data they have used as part of their assessment and if they have collected any additional data which could be shared to inform your assessment.</li> </ol>	I	<p>Due to the re-reroute of the Hornsea Three offshore cable corridor in the nearshore environment, there will be no direct impact from cable installation on the Subtidal Chalk feature of the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ. A full assessment of the effects of Hornsea Three on benthic ecology, including on features of designated sites, is presented in volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Subtidal and Intertidal Ecology. Discussions on the effects of Hornsea Three on the qualifying benthic habitats of the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ is presented in volume 5, annex 2.3: MCZ Assessment. Conclusions on the effects of Hornsea Three on the conservation objectives of The Wash and North Norfolk Coast SAC are presented in full within the RIAA for Hornsea Three.</p> <p>Hornsea Three contacted the Eastern IFCA about the assessment they are progressing, as suggested by TWT, however Eastern IFCA were unable to share any information on this assessment for inclusion in the final DCO application.</p>
<b>Section 42: Local Authorities (prescribed under section 43 of the Act)</b>			
<i>No comments were received from the local authorities relating to the HRA under Phase 2.B.</i>			
<b>Section 42: Persons with an interest in the land (prescribed under section 44 of the Act)</b>			
<i>No comments were received from persons with an interest in land relating to the HRA under Phase 2.B.</i>			
<b>Section 47: Duty to consult local community</b>			
<i>No comments were received from the local community relating to the HRA under Phase 2.B.</i>			
<b>Section 48: Duty to publicise</b>			
<i>No comments were received in response to the Public Notice relating to the HRA under Phase 2.B.</i>			

<sup>12</sup> Y = Yes change made; N = No change made; I = Incorporated into or considered when producing the assessment or landowner voluntary agreement offer; N/A = Not applicable.

## 2. Offshore

### 2.1 Marine Processes

Table 2.1: Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.A) relating to marine processes.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>13</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 42: Prescribed consultees (The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009: Schedule 1))</b>			
Centrica	Marine processes Further understanding would be useful to understand how modelling has been used to assess the impacts of the proposed development on the seabed and the potential for scour or deposition, especially on nearby infrastructure and pipelines.	I	A full description of the assessment techniques (including numerical modelling) used to consider the potential impacts arising from Hornsea Three are presented within the Environmental Statement, volume 5, annex 1.1: Marine Processes Technical Annex. This includes a scour assessment and an assessment of sediment deposition in response to construction related activities.
Environment Agency	Marine Processes: (Volume 2, chapter 1) Table 1.8 - please expand what MSR stands for. Table 1.12- Do you foresee any legacy of leaving the ducts after decommissioning that may lead to exposure during future change in the littoral zone? 1.11.2.6.1 - Line 3: Sediment not soil 1.11.5.17 - Preferred method for landfall would be via HDD rather than trenching 1.11.5.20 - Suggest wave modelling would be appreciated to provide evidence to this statement, as any adjustment to the bed could lead to a degree of variation in wave shoaling. 1.11.9.43 - Point 4: 'these findings are' not 'this finding is' Table 1.21 - Why not include Norfolk Vanguard (formally Anglia) wind farm in the cumulative assessment?	I	Minor text updates to the Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 1: Marine Processes have been made as suggested.  Prior to decommissioning, consideration will be given to ongoing rates of morphological change at the landfall as well as the potential for accelerated future change as a consequence of (amongst other things) climate change and any changes in shoreline management strategy. This information will be used to determine the risk of future exposure of the ducts (should they be left in situ) and inform the most appropriate decommissioning strategy.  Any morphological changes to the beach/ seabed associated with modification of the wave regime by cable trench(s) or works associated with HDD would be very localised and short term. Undertaking numerical modelling to further investigate these small-scale changes would be very unlikely to either improve confidence in the assessment or alter its overall outcome.  Cumulative changes to the wave regime associated with wind farms within the East Anglia Zone have been scoped out. This is because the only directions from which waves could pass through the Hornsea Three array area and East Anglia Zone are north through northeast and south through southwest and no marine processes receptors (in particular the coast) aligned with these pathways are located within close enough proximity to be affected.
Marine Management Organisation	2.4. A disposal site characterisation report will be required to enable the disposal of dredging and drilling spoil adjacent to foundation locations (paragraph 3.6.4.14, Volume 1, Chapter 3 – Project Description). The MMO notes that site characterisation data has been provided as a technical annex to the Report (Volume 4, Annex 3.2 – Dredging and Disposal (Site Characterisation)).	I	A Site Characterisation document has been produced as part of the Environmental Statement at Volume 4 Annex 3.2

<sup>13</sup> Y = Yes change made; N = No change made; I = Incorporated into or considered when producing the assessment or landowner voluntary agreement offer; N/A = Not applicable.



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>13</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Marine Management Organisation	4. Marine Processes 4.1. The MMO does not have confidence in the methodology used to assess the impact of waves, either as a single project or cumulatively, on sensitive receptors. The assessment presented in Section 8.4 of the Marine Processes Technical Report (Volume 5, Annex 1.1) is not, therefore, supported by the MMO. The MMO does not consider the 'Rule Based' assessment methodology for wave impacts to be sufficiently transparent, since it has no track record and has not been independently peer reviewed. Concerns with the 'Rule-Based' assessment methodology have been raised previously in the MMO's response to the Benthic and Fish Ecology and Marine Processes Expert Working Group meeting on 2 February 2017 and are summarised below in Appendix 1.	I	New spectral wave modelling has now been undertaken both for the Hornsea Three project alone and for the cumulative scenario involving Hornsea Project One, Hornsea project Two and Hornsea Three. Results are presented in the Environmental Statement volume 5, annex 1.1: Marine Processes Technical Annex, appendix B and are used to inform the assessment of wave impacts in section 1.11.6 for Hornsea Three alone and in section 1.13.6 for Hornsea Three in conjunction with other relevant developments.
Marine Management Organisation	4.2. The term "evidence base" has been used extensively in the PEIR's Marine Processes chapter (Volume 2, Chapter 1) and Marine Processes Technical Report (Volume 5, Annex 1.1), both of which rely heavily on documents supporting the Hornsea One and Hornsea Two offshore wind farm projects. Whilst these documents provide background information, the MMO does not consider that they represent a hard evidence base since they are in fact only predictions of impacts. To date, Hornsea One and Two offshore wind farm projects are not operational and therefore no monitoring has been undertaken to validate these impact hypotheses.	I	The previous modelling results from Hornsea Project One and Hornsea Project Two have been used alongside available monitoring evidence to support the assessment of changes to Marine Processes for scenarios that are sufficiently similar in terms of the activity and environmental setting. It is recognised that in the absence of associated monitoring evidence, some residual uncertainty may remain for certain assessments (e.g. changes associated with the clearance of sandwaves). Qualitative judgements of uncertainty associated with the sandwave clearance assessment has been set out within the Environmental Statement, volume 5, annex 1.1: Marine Processes Technical Annex.
Marine Management Organisation	4.3. The MMO advises that Acoustic Backscatter Sensor (ABS) and Optical Backscatter Sensor (OBS) sensors have "relatively poor consistency" because they are measuring different parts of the suspended sediment climate – the OBS measure "fines" and the ABS coarser materials (paragraph 1.7.1.38, Volume 2, Chapter 1 – Marine Processes).	I	Additional clarification has been added to the discussion of SSC in Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 1: Marine Processes, highlighting these potential reasons behind the differences in measurements from the ABS and OBS sensors
Marine Management Organisation	4.4. The MMO notes that the Southern North Sea is now a candidate Special Area of Conservation (cSAC), not a potential Special Area of Conservation (pSAC) as stated in the PEIR (paragraph 1.7.2.4 and Figure 1.16, Volume 2, Chapter 1 – Marine Processes, also paragraph 4.11.1.47 and Figure 1.16, Volume 2, Chapter 4 – Marine Mammals).	I	Hornsea Three acknowledge this comment and have amended references to the Southern North Sea so that it now reflects the fact that it is now a candidate Special Area of Conservation (cSAC).
Marine Management Organisation	4.5. Markham Hole and, to a lesser extent, the Outer Silver Pit to the north of the array area, represent different substrates to those found in the Hornsea One and Hornsea Two offshore wind farm project areas. Whilst some grab samples for particle size analysis within Markham Hole have confirmed the finer nature of sediments in this area, the MMO recommends detailed analysis of the swath bathymetry mapping using the backscatter to delineate this area and identify sediment transport patterns and pathways around the "lip" of Markham Hole and across the Markham Hole area. Finer sediment would remain in suspension longer and hence travel further outside of the finer substrate area. The MMO also requests further information as to whether inter-array cabling is intended to cross the Markham Hole area (section 1.7.44, Volume 2, Chapter 1 – Marine Processes; paragraphs 4.2.1.1 and 4.3.5.17, Volume 5, Annex 1.1 – Marine Processes Technical Report).	I	Sidescan Sonar backscatter has been analysed and used to interpret seabed sediments. This information has been presented in the Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 1: Marine Processes. Where possible, bedform asymmetry has been used to identify sediment transport pathways across the array area although it is recognised that suitable bedforms for robustly inferring sediment transport pathways are scarce. We recognise the possibility that material disturbed during the construction phase could enter into suspension, with finer grained material being advected from (or into) Markham's Hole. Hornsea Three is seeking consent to construct anywhere within the Hornsea Three array area red line boundary. Accordingly, inter-array cabling may potentially cross the Markham's Hole area.
Marine Management Organisation	4.6. The release of chalk tailings in the water column, either from ploughing of the cable routes or from release of drill arising from foundation installation could be an issue, given that particle sizes are small and could potentially travel long distances. The 'alien' nature of the material in predominantly sandy environments could also present an issue. The MMO recommends that the ES brings together issues relating to the release of chalk tailings in a consistent and thorough manner. For instance, Klaverbank SCI is within one spring tidal ellipse of the zone, which has the potential to combine plumes and transboundary impacts (section 1.7.49, Volume 2, Chapter 1 – Marine Processes).	I	Finer chalk particles may be transported further, but are therefore also more likely to be more widely dispersed to very low concentrations and are subsequently unlikely to settle and accumulate in measurable quantities locally. Although the dispersion and settling of chalk arisings has been described in the marine processes chapter (Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 1), the significance of effects to benthic receptors is covered in within the Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>13</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Marine Management Organisation	4.7. The MMO suggests that the volume of material to be removed due to sand waves for the installation of the export cable should be fully defined in the ES (Table 1.12, Volume 2, Chapter 1 – Marine Processes).	I	The volume of material to be removed within the Hornsea Three offshore cable corridor has been refined and is presented (and assessed) within the Marine Processes assessment (Environmental Statement, volume 2, chapter 1: Marine Processes).
Marine Management Organisation	4.8. Consideration should be made of the potential for cable protection measures to impact upon adjacent subtidal chalk in areas where hard cable protection measures (e.g. rock armouring or concrete mattresses) and chalk substrates are potentially likely to overlap (Table 1.12, Volume 2, Chapter 1 – Marine Processes).	I	Consideration of the potential for cable protection measures to impact upon areas of adjacent subtidal chalk has been provided in section 1.11 onwards of the Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 1: Marine Processes.
Marine Management Organisation	4.9. The impacts of jack-up barge spud can mark from construction activities on seabed processes should be fully assessed in the ES (Section 1.11.2 – Construction Activities, Volume 2, Chapter 1 – Marine Processes).	I	An assessment of the potential impacts associated with jack-up barge spud can marks has been provided in section 1.11 of the Environmental Statement, volume 2, chapter 1: Marine Processes.
Marine Management Organisation	4.10. The MMO requests inclusion of the option for a 4-legged jacket with suction buckets in the scenario testing for increases in suspended sediment concentration and deposition of disturbed sediments to the seabed due to drilling for foundation installation within the proposed Project array area. (Section 1.11.2.11, Volume 2, Chapter 1 – Marine Processes).	N	A four legged jacket with suction buckets will not require any drilling and therefore has not been included in the assessment.
Marine Management Organisation	4.11. DONG Energy state that “Two maximum design scenarios are identified in Table 1.12, corresponding to the greatest volume of drilled sediment disturbance locally (from a single foundation)”. The MMO notes that this contradicts the potential for two foundation drilling events to take place 1000 metres apart, which is stated as the ‘worst case’ scenario in paragraph 1.11.2.15 (Volume 2, Chapter 1 – Marine Processes).	I	The assessment considers the possibility that two foundations may be drilled simultaneously: this constitutes the maximum design scenario. This has been clarified in the Environmental Statement, volume 2, chapter 1: Marine Processes.
Marine Management Organisation	4.12. DONG Energy state that “the HDD exit pits [up to 4 metres deep] would be temporary features that would only be open for a short period (up to ~3 months) before being back filled with the excavated material from the temporary spoil mounds” (paragraph 1.11.5.21, Volume 2, Chapter 1 – Marine Processes). The MMO notes that it is stated elsewhere in the report that “Much of the shoreline in the area of the proposed landfall is formed of a steep shingle beach, fronting eroding cliffs of glacial till over a chalk base” (paragraph 1.7.1.63, Volume 2, Chapter 1 – Marine Processes). The MMO advises that digging HDD pits into the chalk base would represent permanent change to that substrate and suggests that a reassessment of the impact magnitude of this activity is included in the ES.	I	The assessment presented in the Environmental Statement in volume 2, chapter 1: Marine Processes has concluded that chalk is at a depth whereby it will not be encountered during the excavation of the HDD exit pits. The assessment of effects to designated features of the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ has been updated in Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology (see paragraph 2.11.1.85) to clarify that the presence of such indentation features, such as those associated with jack up footprints etc., is not predicted to have implications for sediment transport and they will infill over time. It should be noted however, that although HDD has been discussed as a potential construction activity within the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ in volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology (see Table 2.14 and paragraph 2.11.1.85), the maximum design scenario is for open cut trenching rather than HDD and, as such, numbers for temporary habitat loss associated with this activity are not presented within the chapter.
Marine Management Organisation	4.13. Offshore sand banks should be included in the shoreline morphology assessment since they form part of coastal protection measures. The MMO also recommends that marine protected areas with designated sandbank features are included in the assessment (paragraph 1.11.6.25, Volume 2, Chapter 1 – Marine Processes).	I	Offshore sand banks have been included in the assessment of potential changes to coastal morphology (see the Environmental Statement, section 1.11 of volume 2, chapter 1: Marine Processes). Potential changes to marine protected areas with designated sandbank features are also considered in the Environmental Statement, section 1.11 of volume 2, chapter 1: Marine Processes.
Marine Management Organisation	4.14. The MMO advises that cable protection measures either offshore or on the coast would have an impact on bedload sediment transport rates, patterns and pathways. Furthermore, sediment saltation would normally be considered as relatively small scale (tens of centimetres) and large ‘leaps’ greater than 2 metres would only occur during high energy events (paragraph 1.11.9.17, Volume 2, Chapter 1 – Marine Processes). Assessment of the magnitude of cable protection measures should take this information into account.	I	It is acknowledged that the cable protection measures could lead to an initial phase of localised trapping of material. In time, the voids in the cable protection will be filled, and sandy side slopes will develop. From that point onwards, bedload transport including rolling and saltation would continue at the ambient rate, just as over a natural slope or bedform of similar dimensions. The overall volume of material that would be trapped in the voids would be small (relative to ambient sediment transport rates) and the duration of the trapping effect would be of limited temporal duration. More detail has been provided on this assessment within Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 1: Marine Processes.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>13</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Marine Management Organisation	4.15. The MMO recommends inclusion of the Bacton Sand Engine / Landscaping and associated proposed offshore aggregate extraction sites in the list of projects and plans considered in the Cumulative Effect Assessment (Table 1.21, Volume 2, Chapter 1 – Marine Processes).	I	Full justification for the inclusion/ exclusion of projects within the CEA is provided in Section 1.12 of volume 2, chapter 1: Marine Processes in the Environmental Statement.
Marine Management Organisation	4.16. Whilst it is recognised that assessing detailed scour depths is not required at this point in the pre-application process, the MMO would welcome development of a scour protection plan linked with the proposed Cable Protection Plan to determine the likely scour depth and volumes associated with the final design and to justify proposed mitigation measures (Table 1.23, Volume 2, Chapter 1 – Marine Processes).	I	A Cable Specification and Installation Plan (detailing the technical specification of the offshore electrical system, including a cable burial risk assessment, cable protection specification and installation risk mitigation measures) will be developed prior to construction and is secured in the deemed marine licences within the Development Consent Order that accompanies the application.
Marine Management Organisation	4.17. The use of 0.6 as a consolidated packing density for sands yields a slurry volume of 578m <sup>3</sup> (347/0.6), which is equivalent to 50% of the material released. Further information is requested on the packing density for chalk and the fate of the remaining 50% of material released (paragraph 4.3.2.7, Volume 5, Annex 1.1 – Marine Processes Technical Report).	I	Further discussion regarding the drilling of chalk at Lynn and Inner Dowsing OWF has been provided in the Environmental Statement, volume 5, annex 1.1 – Marine Processes Technical Report.
Marine Management Organisation	4.18. DONG Energy state that “Cable burial through the Bolders Bank formation and Cretaceous chalk subsoils may result in the release of a range of sediment grain sizes, depending on the local nature of sub-soil and cable burial method used.” It is stated that the chalk is not “disaggregated entirely”, but an unknown fraction of chalk will disaggregate into the water column. The MMO recommends that an assessment of the release of chalk subsoils into the water column is included in the ES (paragraph 4.3.5.17, Volume 5, Annex 1.1 – Marine Processes Technical Report).	I	The results of the updated assessment of the release of chalk subsoils into the water column as a result of cable installation in the Environmental Statement in volume 2, chapter 1: Marine Processes has been incorporated into the assessment of SSC and sediment deposition in Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology (see paragraph 2.11.1.100 et seq.).
Marine Management Organisation	4.19. The key findings from the analysis of the LiDAR and beach topographic data revealed that beach elevation can change by up to 3 metres. The MMO recommends that the export cable burial risk assessment uses this value to inform its analysis (paragraph 6.4.3.5, Volume 5, Annex 1.1 – Marine Processes Technical Report).	I	It is anticipated that the information on past changes in beach morphology at the landfall will be used to inform appropriate burial depths for the export cable, as stated in section 1.11 of volume 2, chapter 1: Marine Processes in the Environmental Statement.
Natural England	1.39 Vol. 4 Annex 3.2 Fig. 1.1 The Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ is excluded from the proposed disposal site area, however, HDD pit excavation will involve placement of material on the seabed. Although this is described as a temporary measure, this could be in place for several years and as such should potentially be considered as disposal site. To minimise the loss of sediment from the offshore sandbank system it is important that disposal of dredged material occurs in the vicinity allowing it to be re-distributed throughout the local environment. Currently the proposed disposal site boundary follows that of the offshore cable corridor. Disposal of material restricted to that area may result in the net loss of material from the NNSSR cSAC/SCI as the sediment is brought outside site boundary by prevailing north-easterly sediment transport. The application should consider disposal of material further south outside the present cable corridor boundary to ensure the loss of sediment from the sandbank system is minimised.	I	In the Environmental Statement, paragraph 2.11.1.86 of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology outlines that material arising from sandwave clearance activities within the MCZ will be deposited within the boundary of the project and at a location that takes into account the net direction of sediment transport in the region to ensure that sediment will not be lost from the sandbank system. This will also be the case for all designated sites where With regards to Marine Processes, It is proposed to extend the disposal site to include the nearshore area and include material placed as part of HDD exit pit excavation. Hornsea Three appreciates the principal of maintaining sediment within the sandbank system. However, our understanding is that it would not be necessary to extend the disposal site in the way suggested in order to achieve this aim. Hornsea Three is happy to discuss this further with Natural England. Dredging and disposal is also considered within Environmental Statement volume 4, annex 3.2: Dredging and Disposal (Site Characterisation)
Natural England	Section 2.1 Key concerns: Vol. 1 Chapter 1 Marine Processes Section 1.11.9.24 states ‘Banks are deemed to be of minor vulnerability, moderate to high levels of recoverability and high value. The sensitivity of the receptor is therefore, considered to be medium.’ There has been no evidence presented to support the statement of high recoverability of sandbanks in the study area, unless it is mentioned in the baseline characterisation. If it is the case, better signposting is recommended to make the report more coherent. Conservation Advice for the site should be referred to when describing the sensitivity/vulnerability of the designated features.	I	The assessments of sandbank sensitivity presented in section 1.11 of volume 2, chapter 1: Marine Processes have been updated to reflect the latest conservation advice for the North Norfolk Sandbanks and Saturn Reef SCI. Further discussion of sandbank recoverability has also been provided.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>13</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Natural England	Section 2.1 Key concerns: Vol. 1 Chapter 1 Marine Processes Cable protection measures impact assessment conclusion in section 1.11.9.26: 'Overall, it is predicted that the sensitivity of the receptor [designated sandbanks] is considered to be medium and the magnitude is deemed to be minor. The effect will, therefore, be of minor adverse significance, which is not significant in EIA terms.' The SNCBs disagree with this conclusion, because we understand that the cable protection will be left in situ at the time of decommissioning, thus representing a long lasting impact to the site and its features.	I	Once the cable protection has been infilled/ buried by mobile material, it will have minimal influence on patterns of sediment transport and morphology of the surrounding sea bed. Further information has been added to the assessment in Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 1: Marine Processes on this subject.
Natural England	Section 2.1 Key concerns: Vol. 1 Chapter 1 Marine Processes Sandwave clearance – please note that the SNCBs view the mobile element of sandbanks (i.e. sandwaves on top of and adjacent to the sandbank), to be Annex I features and therefore should be considered as such in the assessment. The use of the Race Bank OWF figures and assessment in support of this EIA is not considered by the SNCBs to be strong evidence as the impacts and the recovery of the features remain unproven as the survey monitoring is yet to be provided to support the assumptions.	I	It is acknowledged that the assessment of sandwave clearance impacts associated with Hornsea Project Three draws heavily upon on the Race Bank offshore wind farm HRA results. Because of the lack of available observational evidence regarding sandwave recovery from analogous disturbance activities (either at Race Bank or elsewhere), we recognise that the desk based assessment is accompanied by some residual uncertainty. Accordingly, confidence in the assessments has been described in a qualitative manner ('high', 'medium' or 'low') and presented in section 1.11 of volume 2, chapter 1 of the Environmental Statement.
Natural England	2.1.1 Vol. 1 Chapter 1 1.7.1.25 onwards We note that consideration of stratification and frontal systems has been included as per Natural England's advice provided in the Evidence Plan process.	N	Acknowledged
Natural England	2.1.2 Vol. 1 Chapter 1 1.7.1.31 and 1.7.1.33 There is evidence of a muddy sediment layer up to 35 m deep in areas of deep water like Silver Pit and Markham's Hole. We have advised that a desktop study is undertaken to describe the physical processes within the Markham's Triangle recommended MCZ (rMCZ), particularly with respect to sedimentation. Sections 1.7.1.42 onwards provide a concise baseline description of sediment transport in the area.	I	The nature of sediments and sedimentary processes in the Markham's Triangle rMCZ (as well as elsewhere in the Hornsea Three array area) were studied with reference to the relevant available survey data and literature. Key relevant points are provided in the baseline description of sediments and geology within Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 1: Marine Processes.
Natural England	2.1.3 Vol. 1 Chapter 1 Fig. 1.11 The map shows there to be areas of 'Megarippled GRAVEL or GRAVEL with megarippled sand and/or occasional sand streaks and/or patches of featureless sand'. We believe the conditions in the area are unlikely to result in a formation of such a dynamic environment, therefore, this feature should be reassessed once samples are available. The sampling data should be used to ground truth the recent geophysical survey data and relevant biotopes correctly identified.	I	The ambient tidal currents are expected to be of sufficient strength to mobilise sand although not gravel. Accordingly, areas identified as megarippled gravel may be either relict or formed during surge events, when currents are greater than during normal tidal conditions.
Natural England	2.1.4 Vol. 1 Chapter 1 1.7.2.2 The array is in close proximity to the Southern North Sea cSAC. The array is also in close proximity (<10 km) to the North Norfolk Sandbanks and Saturn Reef SCI that contains the Annex I habitats 'Sandbanks which are slightly covered by sea water all the time' and 'Reefs'. We note that the NNSSR site is already designated as an SCI by the European Community and as a cSAC by the UK Government. We expect DONG Energy to correct all instances suggesting that the site is not yet designated.	I	The designation status for sites referred to in volume 2, chapter 1 of the Environmental Statement has been checked and updated, as necessary.



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>13</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Natural England	2.1.5 Vol. 1 Chapter 1 1.7.2.4 The Southern North Sea is now a candidate Special Area of Conservation (cSAC) after cross-Governmental clearance and Ministerial approval on 30 January 2017 and submission to the European Commission. We note that Inner Dowsing, Race Bank and North Ridge cSAC/SCI, Haisborough, Hammond & Winterton cSAC/SCI have not been considered in the marine processes chapter. The latter is within one tidal excursion from the offshore cable corridor, the former is almost within one tidal excursion. Justification should be provided prior to the assessment section as to why these sites were screened out.	I	It is recognised that the Haisborough, Hammond & Winterton cSAC/SCI and (following updates to the Hornsea Three offshore cable corridor route) the Inner Dowsing, Race Bank and North Ridge cSAC/SCI are located within a spring tidal excursion ellipse buffer surrounding the Hornsea Three offshore cable corridor. However, measurable changes to hydrodynamics, waves and sediment transport processes (including changes in SSC) arising from construction, operation and maintenance and/or decommissioning activities are not expected to extend to these sites and as such, they have received limited attention within the marine processes assessment presented in the Environmental Statement in section 1.11 of volume 2, chapter 1: Marine Processes.
Natural England	2.1.6 Vol. 1 Chapter 1 1.7.2.6 The cable route goes through The Greater Wash potential SPA (pSPA) not adjacent to it.	I	Text in the Environmental Statement has been amended, stating that 'It is noted here that the Hornsea Three offshore cable corridor goes through the Greater Wash pSPA whilst the landfall is located immediately adjacent to the North Norfolk Coast SPA.'
Natural England	2.1.7 Vol. 1 Chapter 1 1.7.4.2 'The main identified data limitation at this stage concerns the absence of geophysical and geotechnical data from the landfall. This inhibits determination of potential geological controls on future morphological change to the beach. However, DONG Energy Hornsea Project Three (UK) Ltd will be undertaking a programme of surveys during 2017 at the landfall which will inform engineering and environmental considerations at the landfall.' Natural England is concerned that this data is not yet available and whether or not it will be in time for the submission of the application in spring next year. Due the sensitive features that are present at the landfall location we believe that this is critical information that will be required to determine the scale of the impacts and inform any mitigation measures and/or Measures of Equivalent Environmental Benefit (MEEB). Due to the complexity of the project and sensitivity of the MCZ interest features an appropriate amount of time should be given to having in depth discussions on this matter.	I	New geophysical data has been collected from the landfall and is described in the Environmental Statement in the baseline section of volume 2, chapter 1: Marine Processes. This information has been used to inform the impact assessment in the Environmental Statement in section 1.11 of volume 2, chapter 1: Marine Processes and other subsequent assessments presented as part of the Environmental Statement.
Natural England	2.1.8 Vol. 1 Chapter 1 2.1.8 It is Natural England's view that the following impacts should also be considered as part of the marine processes chapter: - physical damage to sandbank structure from trenching/jetting for offshore cables; - 'Scars' left from trenching; - Bed preparation for gravity bases: introduction of substrate/substrate change (for example mixed sandy sediments dredged and replaced by gravel/rock for stability and scour protection); - Change to sediment composition and structure (with subsequent effect on flow, sediment transport pathways, benthic ecology).	I	Consideration of the potential for cable installation activities to affect the integrity of sandbank features is provided in Section 1.11 of Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 1: Marine Processes. The persistence of scars associated with cable trenching activities is also discussed in Section 1.11 (for the Hornsea Three array area and offshore cable corridor). The volumes of material involved with bed preparation/ sandwave clearance activities are presented and directly used to inform the assessment. The spatial extent of scour protection that may potentially be required is also provided. The implication of these changes to substrate on benthic ecology as a consequence of project construction is presented in within Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology.
Natural England	2.1.9 Vol. 1 Chapter 1 Table 1.13 Natural England agrees that 'transboundary impact on coastal morphology' can be scoped out.	N	Acknowledged

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>13</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Natural England	2.1.10 Vol. 1 Chapter 1 Table 1.15 Long-term and medium-term duration. The SNCBs have not set a generic temporal threshold to determine significance. It is dependent on the receptors that are being impacts either directly or indirectly. Therefore, further rational would need to be provided to support the use of these figures for the various impact pathways.	I	Where possible, additional clarification with regards to the timescales over which potential impacts may occur has been added to each assessment presented within the Marine Processes Environmental Statement chapter (volume 2, chapter 1).  With regards to Table 1.13: 'Definition of terms relating to the magnitude of an impact', it is noted here that whilst the temporal aspect of change is an important consideration in determining magnitude, other factors are also taken into consideration (e.g. spatial extent of potential change). The relative importance of each has been taken into consideration for each impact assessment on a receptor by receptor basis, using expert judgement.
Natural England	2.1.11 Vol. 1 Chapter 1 Table 1.16 We advise where the outcome of using the matrices is minor/moderate that a precautionary approach is adopted e.g. 'moderate' accepted and considered further in the assessment.	N	As outlined in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 5: Environmental Impact Assessment, the determination of significance where an impact falls into a box with two options is based on expert judgement which is then detailed in the relevant chapter at the point of determination of significance. In this case (Marine Processes, volume 2, chapter 1), the assessments are already based on a precautionary approach which uses conservative assumptions regarding (for example) the maximum design scenario. It is therefore unnecessary for this additional conservatism to be added.
Natural England	2.1.12 Vol. 1 Chapter 1 Table 1.18 Natural England notes that the impacts of having to remove the cable and replace it for maintenance have not been assessed. It is particularly important to determine the likelihood that further remedial action (such as rock armouring) will be required within the designated sites so that both the temporal and spatial scale of the impacts can be taken into consideration.	I	Hornsea Three acknowledge this and have added a statement within Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 1: Marine Processes, stating that the changes associated with any remedial works will be no greater than for the installation phase.
Natural England	2.1.13 Vol. 1 Chapter 1 1.11.2.24 'The scale of change associated with the dynamic phase of the plume (about 90% of material which falls directly to the bed as a single mass) from a single full hopper dredge spoil disposal event can be summarised as follows: - Duration at the seabed - order of seconds to minutes before becoming part of the background sedimentary environment.' Natural England would like further evidence to support the assumption that the material will immediately become part of the background environment.	I	Hornsea Three acknowledge this and have added further clarification to the text. The characteristics of sediment plumes associated with dredging activities are relatively well understood, with a large body of literature and monitoring evidence available. The dynamic phase of the plume is expected to persist for a period of seconds to minutes although the rate at which material deposited to the bed in the dynamic phase of the plume subsequently becomes incorporated into the naturally present surficial seabed sedimentary unit will be dependent upon a range of factors. These include: the nature of the released material (e.g. grain/ clast size etc.), the degree to which the seabed is mobile, the rate at which material is introduced into the water column and the total volume of material released. It may occur immediately (i.e. over a tidal cycle) or take place over a longer timescale.
Natural England	2.1.14 Vol. 1 Chapter 1 1.11.5.5 Sandwave clearance – There is no clear explanation how the number of 182 056 m3 was achieved for the total volume that could be affected by sandwave clearance. We would like to see a simple equation demonstrating how this was derived and confirmation that the total number of export cables (6) have been taken into account. Please note that the use of the Race Bank OWF figures and assessment in support of this EIA is not considered by the SNCBs to be strong evidence as the impacts and the recovery of the features remain un proven as the survey monitoring is yet to be provided to support the assumptions.	I	Hornsea Three recognise that the evidence base for sand wave clearance operations was limited at the point of PEIR and have updated the Sandwave Clearance assessment to reflect this. For the Environmental Statement, the (updated) sandwave clearance figures have been calculated using the Project specific geophysical survey (to determine bedform characteristics) combined with understanding of the cable installation engineering requirements (e.g. seabed gradient, anticipated burial depth etc.). This figure does take into consideration the dredging requirement for all six cables. As these volumes take account of the geophysical survey data, it is not possible to provide a simple equation as this is not how the volumes have been calculated albeit further information has been added to Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description to explain the assumptions used in relation to clearance tools and widths.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>13</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Natural England	<p>2.1.15 Vol. 1 Chapter 1 1.11.5.7</p> <p>'The proposed dredging or jetting activities only locally displace the disturbed sediment volume, which will remain the same sediment type as the surrounding seabed. In the case of dredging, material will be disposed of within the local sandwave field and will immediately be available again for transport at the naturally occurring rate. No sediment volume will be removed from the sandbank overall.'</p> <p>Natural England queries what is meant by the 'local sandwave field' and whether this relates to the whole of the NNSSR cSAC/SCI. Natural England advises that the EIA should consider whether sandwave clearance might be done by other type of dredging.</p> <p>The EIA should also consider a scenario whereby an MMO licence for a new dredge disposal site is not granted and an existing site needs to be used. This may not necessarily be close to the area of dredging, resulting in the material loss from the environment.</p>	I	<p>Hornsea Three acknowledge this and has updated the assessment (Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 1: Marine Processes) to take account of this. Disposal of sandwave material within the North Norfolk Sandbanks and Saturn Reef SAC (to the south east of the dredged location) to keep within the same sandbank system has been considered in the Environmental Statement, see volume 1, annex 3.2: Dredging and Disposal: Site Characterisation.</p> <p>The assessment considers sandwave clearance via mass flow excavator and through the use of a Trailing Suction Hopper Dredger (TSHD). These represent the maximum design scenario, both in terms of elevated levels of SSC (mass flow excavator) and deposit thickness.</p> <p>Consideration has been given to a scenario whereby material is disposed of some distance away from the dredging area</p>
Natural England	<p>2.1.16 Vol. 1 Chapter 1 1.11.5.9</p> <p>'The majority of the sandbanks within the Hornsea Three marine processes study area are highly dynamic and mobile features. Accordingly, they are typically considered to have moderate to high levels of recoverability enabling them to return to a state close to that which existed before the impact.'</p> <p>We advise that evidence of recoverability from a large impact such is the worst-case scenario is presented in the EIA. The EIA should also consider the recoverability of the physical structure of the sandbank should the sandbank 'core' be disturbed or damaged during installation activities.</p>	I	<p>Consideration of the potential for cable installation activities to affect the integrity of sandbank features is provided in Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 1: Marine Processes, Section 1.11. However, it is acknowledged that direct field evidence with respect to monitoring of feature recovery in this region is limited.</p>
Natural England	<p>2.1.17 Vol. 1 Chapter 1 1.11.5.10</p> <p>'In summary, sandbanks are deemed to be of minor vulnerability, moderate to high levels of recoverability and high value. The sensitivity of the receptor is therefore, considered to be medium. Sensitivity of receptor (sandbanks) – overall assigned as medium, impact considered minor, therefore minor adverse significance of effect.'</p> <p>Conservation Advice for the NNSSR SAC is available and should be referred to when describing the sensitivity/vulnerability of the designated features.</p>	I	<p>Hornsea Three acknowledge this and have updated the assessment to take account of this. The assessments of sandbank sensitivity presented in Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 1: Marine Processes, Section 1.11 have been updated to reflect the latest conservation advice for the North Norfolk Sandbanks and Saturn Reef SAC. Further discussion of sandbank recoverability has also been provided.</p>
Natural England	<p>2.1.18 Vol. 1 Chapter 1 1.11.5.11</p> <p>With up to six cables proposed for the project Natural England is concerned that such activities as dredging, trenching or ploughing may affect the integrity of the sandbank feature.</p> <p>Trench/depression width and depth should be considered from an engineering perspective and based on experience from other similar cable installations to present a realistic worst-case scenario.</p>	I	<p>Hornsea Three acknowledge this. Consideration of the potential for cable installation activities to affect the integrity of sandbank features is provided in section 1.11 onwards of volume 2, chapter 1: Marine Processes of the Environmental Statement. The biotopes of all relevant designated sites have been assessed. Conclusions specifically relating to this feature (plus all other relevant features) are included for each impact assessment in the Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 2, Benthic Ecology.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>13</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Natural England	<p>2.1.19 Vol. 1 Chapter 1 1.11.5.21 'However, it is important to note that the HDD exit pits would be temporary features that would only be open for a short period (up to ~3 months) before being back filled with the excavated material from the temporary spoil mounds.'</p> <p>We advise that the impact of material re-distribution from the mounds throughout the shallow subtidal with relatively strong local currents should be considered. This may lead to change of sediment composition in the vicinity as there is a mix of sediment types in the nearshore area. We also advise that the impacts of excavating chalk in preparation of the Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD) exit pits have not been considered in full and should be. Because the chalk is crushed when excavated it will introduce a completely foreign type of sediment 'crushed chalk' into the environment. Drilling and crushing chalk sediment may also result in an increase of suspended sediment concentrations (SSC) which is different from those concentrations assessed for the sediments currently characteristic of the local environment. Suspended chalk has a potential to persist in the water column (e.g. Lynn and Inner Dowsing and Lincs OWF) and such an impact should be considered.</p> <p>Further detail should be provided on the likely composition of the excavated material and how this will be used to backfill. It is Natural England's current understanding that the proposed exit pits fall within an area of bedrock and boulder.</p>	I	<p>The landfall assessment has been updated to include an assessment of the potential for excavated material to be redistributed throughout the nearshore area.</p> <p>A full assessment of the excavation of the HDD exit pits has been undertaken and is presented within the Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 1: Marine Processes. This assessment has also taken into account the recent (2017) nearshore geophysical survey data, that provides more accurate mapping of the presence and depth at which chalk is encountered across the nearshore area. This survey data indicates that the chalk is at a depth whereby it will not be encountered during the excavation of the HDD exit pits. The updated assessment is presented in the Environmental Statement in section 1.11 of volume 2, chapter 1: Marine Processes.</p>
Natural England	<p>2.1.20 Vol. 1 Chapter 1 1.11.5.22 The section only considers changes to the wave regime. Natural England would like to understand why 'changes to sediment transport due to HDD exit pits' has not been identified as an impact.</p>	I	<p>Hornsea Three acknowledge this and have updated the assessment in the Environmental Statement to take account of this. Consideration of the potential for the HDD exit pits to influence sediment transport is provided in the Environmental Statement in section 1.11 of volume 2, chapter 1: Marine Processes.</p>
Natural England	<p>2.1.21 Vol. 1 Chapter 1 1.11.5.24 Please note that The Wash and North Norfolk Coast designation is a Special Area of Conservation (SAC).</p>	I	<p>Hornsea Three acknowledge this and have updated the text accordingly. The Wash and North Norfolk Coast designation has been amended to SAC.</p>
Natural England	<p>2.1.22 Vol. 1 Chapter 1 Table 1.21 Please note that Triton Knoll is consented, but not yet under construction. The table should include Oil and Gas decommissioning and Viking Link interconnector. Natural England would like to understand why there are no projects included in Tiers 2 and 3. For example, East Anglia OWFs may potentially impact sandbanks in the NNSR cSAC/SCI through sediment transport. In addition Decommissioning plans are available for a number of offshore Oil and Gas fields. Removal of associated infrastructure has as a potential to impact sediment composition, SSC and scour and therefore these should be considered. The SNCBs would like to understand if there are any active disposal sites in the study area, and if this is the case advise that cumulative impacts such as increased SSC, should be considered.</p>	I	<p>Hornsea Three acknowledge this and have updated the CEA in the Environmental Statement accordingly. The status of the Triton Knoll OWF project has been updated in Table 1.20 of volume 2, chapter 1: Marine Processes.</p> <p>Full justification for the inclusion/ exclusion of projects within the CEA is provided in the Environmental Statement in section 1.12 of volume 2, chapter 1: Marine Processes.</p>



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>13</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Natural England	2.1.23 Vol. 5 Annex 1.1 4.3.4.1 'In addition to short term elevations in SSC and associated sediment deposition, sandwave clearance will necessarily result in localised changes to the sandwave and seabed topography. This section therefore also gives consideration to the potential for sandwave and seabed recovery and for longer term changes to sediment transport.' The SNCBs query consideration is only given to jetting. Although jetting offers the worst-case scenario for SSC trenching and other similar installation techniques present the worst case scenario in terms of topographic change and material removal. It is noted that the assessment in this section is based on Race Bank OFW HRA rather than direct evidence from OFW installation works. Further consideration should be given to the technical feasibility of this activity occurring on a steep slope of a sandbank.	I	Results of the assessment of changes in SSC and bed levels for cable installation using mass flow excavation (a form of jetting) is presented in Environmental Statement volume 5, annex 1.1: Marine Processes Technical Annex. Because the assessment assumes 100% disturbance of material from the trench this represents the worst- case scenario in terms of bed level change. The assessment considers the release of coarse (sands and gravels) and fine (mud) size material, thereby capturing the realistic worst case for bed level change (i.e. a thin layer of deposition over a wide area at one end of the spectrum through to a thick layer of deposition over a small area at the other).
Natural England	2.1.24 Vol. 5 Annex 1.1 4.3.4.3 Once again, the assessment of sandwave clearance impacts is based largely on Race Bank OFW HRA. Natural England would be keen to understand how the data used in the HRA compares to the actual data and observations made during cable laying activities as well as understanding whether the recovery has occurred as predicted, We would like to see some sort of an uncertainty evaluation to support the following conclusions: ' - Bed levelling is not considered likely to disrupt the form and function of the sandbank system as these are governed by processes that occur at a much larger scale than the proposed works;<...> - Bedform recovery will likely occur in relation to the migration and sediment transport processes across the system. Estimated recovery rates for sandwaves were in the order of several years, based on representative forcing conditions at a single water depth. As transport rates are variable along the Hornsea Three offshore cable corridor, bedform response would be variable, with larger flow speeds or greater transport rates resulting in faster recovery; and - The proposed bed levelling is not likely to pose any barrier to ongoing sediment transport within or to locations beyond the sandbank system.'	I	It is acknowledged that the assessment of sandwave clearance impacts associated with Hornsea Project Three draws heavily upon on the Race Bank offshore wind farm HRA results. Because of the lack of available observational evidence regarding sandwave recovery from analogous disturbance activities (either at Race Bank or elsewhere), we recognise that the desk based assessment is accompanied by some residual uncertainty. Accordingly, confidence in the assessments has been described in a qualitative manner ('high', 'medium' or 'low') and presented in the Environment Statement in volume 5, annex 1.1: Marine Processes Technical Annex.
Natural England	2.1.25 Vol. 5 Annex 1.1 9.4.2.1 As mentioned above, SNCBs advise against any cable protection in designated sites.	N	Hornsea acknowledge this comment however, following extensive technical work and surveys to investigate the potential requirement for cable protection in designated sites it has become apparent that it may be required. The project therefore must maintain a realistic envelope, the potential impacts of which have been assessed in the application.
Natural England	Section 2.2 Key concerns: Vol. 2 Chapter 2 Benthic Ecology We do not believe that DONG Energy has either provided enough evidence for, or assessment of, impact to protected features or site integrity for the North Norfolk Sandbanks and Saturn Reef (NNSSR) cSAC/SCI. As such, we cannot agree that the project is unlikely to have any significant effect on features or site.	I	A full assessment of the Annex I features are discussed in the Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment that accompanies this application.
<b>Section 42: Local Authorities (prescribed under section 43 of the Act)</b>			
No comments were received by the local authorities relating to marine processes under Phase 2.A.			
<b>Section 42: Persons with an interest in the land (prescribed under section 44 of the Act)</b>			
No comments were received by landowners or land interests relating to marine processes under Phase 2.A..			

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>13</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 47: Duty to consult local community</b>			
Pat Floyd	<b>PEIR Construction Methods</b> - It is sincerely hoped none of this will interfere with the chalk reefs.	Y	Thank you for your comment. Since the PEIR, the Hornsea Three offshore cable corridor has been rerouted such that it now avoids areas of subtidal chalk within the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ. The assessment of temporary and long term habitat loss/disturbance on benthic features of this site presented in the Environmental Statement in volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology has been updated accordingly.
<b>Section 48: Duty to publicise</b>			
<i>No comments were received by in response to the public notice issued during Phase 2.A relating to marine processes.</i>			

Table 2.2: Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Further Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.B) relating to marine processes.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>14</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 42: Prescribed consultees (The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009: Schedule 1))</b>			
Estelle Hook, Norfolk Coast Partnership	Offshore We suggest that the cable should be brought ashore in a way which does not alter/impede the coastal processes, e.g. of shingle/sand movement.	I	Potential impacts on coastal processes in nearshore areas are assessed in section 1.11.5 of volume 2, chapter 1: Marine Processes for the installation of the export cable, and in section 1.11.8 for the operational lifetime of the export cable.
Estelle Hook, Norfolk Coast Partnership	We are pleased that the offshore cable route has been selected to avoid impacts on the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ and its chalk reef habitat and suggest that any impacts on the marine EMS, MCZ and SAC should be minimised.	Y	Due to the re-reroute of the Hornsea Three offshore cable corridor in the nearshore environment, there will be no direct impact from cable installation on the Subtidal Chalk feature of the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ. A full assessment of the effects of Hornsea Three on benthic ecology, including on features of designated sites, is presented in volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Subtidal and Intertidal Ecology. Discussions on the effects of Hornsea Three on the qualifying benthic habitats of the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ is presented in volume 5, annex 2.3: MCZ Assessment.
CPRE Norfolk	Comment on the 'near shore potential alteration to route': We are not qualified to make comment on the marine environment on offshore cabling corridor as a whole. However, we note that the landfall is at the point where the movement of sediment down the east coast is at a dividing point, with tidal movements taking some west with accretions at places like Blakeney Point and Scult Head. The larger part continues down the east coast, and this feeds both beaches and areas where the deposition provides a contribution to natural sea defence further down the east coast. The proposed alternative has a greater intrusion on the Wash and North Norfolk Coast SAC. We can question why this is offered as an alternative corridor; but perhaps it would offer minimum disruption of the coastal drift effect with the corridor avoiding the sand and gravel which predominates the Weybourne frontage.	I	Environmental Statement, Volume 2, Chapter 1: Marine Processes, assesses the potential impact of the project on marine processes which includes the impact on coastal geomorphology. It is noted that while the nearshore reroute means that key habitat features of the MCZ will be avoided it does mean that more of the cable will now be located in the SAC than for the previous route. The potential impact of the project on the Wash and North Norfolk Coast SAC is assessed in the Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment (application reference number A5.2) which forms part of the project's application.
<b>Section 42: Local Authorities (prescribed under section 43 of the Act)</b>			
No comments were received by local authorities relating to marine processes under Phase 2.B.			
<b>Section 42: Persons with an interest in the land (prescribed under section 44 of the Act)</b>			
No comments were received by landowners or land interests relating to marine processes under Phase 2.B.			
<b>Section 47: Duty to consult local community</b>			
No comments were received by the local community relating to marine processes under Phase 2.B.			
<b>Section 48: Duty to publicise</b>			
No comments were received by in response to the public notice issued during Phase 2.B relating to marine processes.			

<sup>14</sup> Y = Yes change made; N = No change made; I = Incorporated into or considered when producing the assessment or landowner voluntary agreement offer; N/A = Not applicable.

## 2.2 Benthic Ecology

Table 2.3: Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.A) relating to benthic ecology.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>15</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 42: Prescribed consultees (The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009: Schedule 1))</b>			
Norfolk and Norwich Naturalists' Society	Offshore: The cables will cross the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds, recently designated a Marine Conservation Zone. Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ is Europe's longest known area of chalk reef, the Cromer Shoal Chalk reef runs east from Cley to Trimingham. Ranging between 0-20 metres in depth, marine wildlife is exceptionally diverse here due to its unique structure of boulders, gullies, stacks and arches and should not be disturbed in any way. The area is well known for its communities of crabs and lobsters, but also hosts more than 30 different species of colourful sea slugs, as well as burrowing piddocks, sea squirts, anemones and sponges some of which are unique to the area. The reef and the sea beyond are used by Harbour Porpoise and are as such vulnerable to disturbance from both construction noise and ongoing operational acoustic activity.	I	Thank you for your feedback. A full assessment of the effects of Hornsea Three on benthic ecology, including on features of designated sites, is presented in the Environmental Statement in volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology. Discussions on the effects of Hornsea Three on the qualifying benthic habitats of the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ is also presented in volume 5, annex 2.3: MCZ Assessment.

<sup>15</sup> Y = Yes change made; N = No change made; I = Incorporated into or considered when producing the assessment or landowner voluntary agreement offer; N/A = Not applicable.



<p>Eastern Inshore Fisheries and Conservation Authority</p>	<p>Policy BIO1 and MPA1 Any activity that disturbs the seabed has the potential to have negative impacts on habitats and biodiversity and the extent of these impacts can be highly dependent on sea bed habitat and the nature of activities. The location of the offshore export cable route has yet to be confirmed, however the footprint of the proposed Hornsea Project Three Cable Corridor extends across the Eastern IFCA district and falls within two Marine Protected Areas; Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds Marine Conservation Zone (MCZ) and The Wash and North Norfolk Coast Special Area of Conservation (SAC). The Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) has made some consideration to the features protected under these designations. The Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ protects subtidal chalk features which provide important habitat and nursery areas for a variety of marine species, including important commercial fish and shell fish species. To meet the conservation objectives of this designation, the general management approach for protected features is to maintain at favorable condition (Defra, 2016). A small proportion of the subtidal chalk feature lies within the cable corridor footprint. Whilst cable installation across this feature will result in the loss of a relatively small proportion of this habitat type, the effects will be irreversible with no potential for recovery and therefore efforts should be made to avoid any direct impact to this feature. Peat and clay exposures, designated features of the site, also fall within the cable corridor. Less is known about the sensitivity and recoverability of this feature, additionally there is a very small proportion of the feature within the site, therefore efforts should be made to avoid these features when planning the cable corridor route. Other protected marine features within this site include subtidal coarse and mixed sediments. Eastern IFCA agree in general that the direct effects of cable installation on these habitats and their associated benthic communities will be short-term, localised to a relatively small proportion of the habitat extent and of temporary nature. Attention has also been made to the indirect effects of cable installation activities on designations within the PEIR documentation (Volume 2, Chapter 2.11.1.42). As stated, installation activities will likely result in increased suspended sediment concentrations (SSC) and associated sediment deposition on protected features, with the potential to have negative impacts on biological communities. Such impacts have been considered "to be of local special extent, of short term and intermittent duration and reversible to baseline conditions". Whilst Eastern IFCA generally agree with this, this cannot be assumed for all habitat types. Depending on the location of the export cable route and its locality to protected features, further consideration of mitigation may be required. Whilst communities associated with subtidal coarse and subtidal mixed sediments are considered to have medium resilience and high recoverability to increased SSC and sediment deposition, communities associated with subtidal chalk and peat and clay exposures are known to have a higher sensitivity (Young, 2013) and such effects could lead to negative impacts on shellfish resources within these features.  We would like to highlight that fishermen have raised concerns to Eastern IFCA about potential impacts on crab and whelk populations from chalk particles disturbed by seabed activities entering the water column and re-settling on the seabed. Whilst Eastern IFCA has no evidence of such impacts, we feel the concerns should be explored further and findings presented in subsequent environmental assessment documentation for this project.  A small proportion of The Wash and North Norfolk Coast SAC also falls within the export cable corridor and so further consideration of protected features within this site is required. In this area sandbanks which are slightly covered by seawater all the time are a protected feature under this designation. Within the cable corridor, sub-features; subtidal coarse, subtidal mixed, subtidal sand and subtidal mud exist. Whilst an appropriate assessment has been completed for the SAC, Eastern IFCA considers that the issue has not been adequately presented in the PEIR documentation. Marine Conservation Zones and European Marine Sites (such as Special Areas of Conservation) collectively form part of the English network of marine protected areas, so all types of marine designation should be fully considered in the PEIR.  Eastern IFCA Byelaws 12 and 15 exclude trawling and dredging respectively, in inshore waters out to three nautical miles within this area of the SAC and the MCZ (EIFCA, 2016). These byelaws were implemented in 1980 and 2008, respectively, to protect habitats and species within these areas and so</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>Comments on The Wash and North Norfolk Coast SAC are acknowledged and the Benthic Ecology Environmental Statement chapter (volume 2, chapter 2) has been updated to include revisions to the VERs to better align with designated features of the relevant protected areas in the area (e.g. Annex I sandbanks has been included as a VER). Each assessment section has also been amended to include separate sections for the consideration of impacts to the features of designated sites.  We have updated the MCZ assessment (Environmental Statement volume 5, annex 2.3) to refer to the paper being put forward by the EIFCA and have reassessed the impacts of the SSC on these habitats where appropriate.  The effects of SSC associated with chalk on shellfish are considered in the Fish and Shellfish chapter of the Environmental Statement (volume 2, chapter 3).  Comments on The Wash and North Norfolk Coast SAC are acknowledged and Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology has been updated to include revisions to the VERs to better align with designated features of the relevant protected areas in the area (e.g. Annex I sandbanks has been included as a VER). Each assessment section has also been amended to include separate sections for the consideration of impacts to the features of designated sites.  We acknowledge your comment on bylaws and will continue to ensure that these are adhered to during survey work. Details on the fishing patterns, species mix, gear configurations and grounds targeted in the vicinity of the Hornsea Three offshore cable corridor have informed the Environmental Statement in the baseline section of volume 2, chapter 6: Commercial Fisheries and volume 5, annex 6.1: Commercial Fisheries Technical Report. The potential impact to local fishing fleets are considered in detail within Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 6: Commercial Fisheries.</p>
---	---	----------	---

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>15</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>there will likely be strong opposition from the fishermen to any activities that disturb these currently undisturbed habitats.</p>		
<p>Eastern Inshore Fisheries and Conservation Authority</p>	<p>Policy EC3 and ECO1 Whilst the East Marine Plans state that proposals that contribute to offshore wind energy generation within the East marine plan area should be supported, consideration needs to be made to the cumulative impacts that developments within the area and adjacent areas have on the ecosystem. Sheringham Shoal and Dudgeon Offshore windfarm export cable routes exist within the inshore end of the offshore cable corridor. The Sheringham shoal windfarm has been fully commissioned, with Dudgeon expected to be completed and fully commissioned by late 2017, therefore there are no current installation activities associated with these cable routes that would coincide with cable installation for the Hornsea 3 project. However, operation and maintenance works (e.g. cable protection works, if required) for the existing windfarm export cables could potentially coincide with Hornsea 3 cable installation. If this occurs, cumulative impacts will need to be considered before such works are consented. There are no aggregate licence areas or other activities within, or adjacent to, the cable corridor that have the potential to cause cumulative effects on the ecosystem (MMO Marine Information System, 2016). This is in agreement with the conclusion reached in the PEIR documentation (Volume 2, Chapter 2.12.1.1) stating 'cumulative impacts from aggregate extraction activities and other offshore wind farm developments were assessed and predicted to result in effects of negligible or minor adverse significance (not significant in EIA terms) upon subtidal and intertidal benthic communities within a 50 km buffer of Hornsea Three'.</p>	<p>I</p>	<p>The cumulative effect of licensed and application aggregate extraction areas and other offshore wind farms in the region on fish and shellfish ecology have been assessed in Environmental Statement Section 3.13 of volume 2, chapter 3: Fish and Shellfish Ecology.</p> <p>The East Marine Plans are considered in Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 11: Infrastructure and Other Users.</p> <p>A full assessment of cumulative effects on marine processes is presented in the Environmental Statement in volume 2, chapter 1: Marine Processes. The potential for cumulative changes to marine processes arising from installation of the Hornsea Three offshore cable and operation &amp; maintenance activities associated with other wind farm export cables has not been considered further. This is because any changes will be of very short term duration and/ or extremely localised in nature</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>15</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Eastern Inshore Fisheries and Conservation Authority	<p>Policy CAB 1</p> <p>The East Marine Plans Policy states that 'preference should be given to proposals for cable installation where the method of installation is burial'. The PEIR documentation (Volume 1, Chapter 3.6.9.) states that the cable will typically be buried between 1-2m depth and where the cable cannot be buried cables will be secured using armoring, such as rock, mattress or proprietary separation layer, to maintain integrity. This is not in keeping with the East Marine Plans policy and efforts should be made to minimise the length of cable that will require armoring. Additionally, previous requests to use armoring in The Wash and North Norfolk Coast SAC have not been consented by Natural England and the MMO. Armoring cable instead of cable burial can have increased adverse effects on the environment but also on fishing activity. For example, the presence of the export cable if not buried can result in snagging of fishing gears, a significant safety implication particularly for the small vessels operating in this area, and thus could permanently exclude fishing activities from the area. Until the cable route has been decided and the proportion and location that require armoring have been determined, the potential impacts cannot be accurately assessed. In general, the need for armoring occurs when cable crossings are required or in the presence of harder sediments, further supporting the requirement for the cable route to avoid the rock and chalk features within the offshore cable corridor.</p> <p>The PEIR documentation (Volume 2, Chapter 2.11.2.19) describes that whilst the creation of hard substrate from cable protection will have long-term adverse effects on existing local biological communities, it is also associated with increases in biodiversity and provision of habitat resulting from the formation of 'artificial reefs'. Although to some extent EIFCA agree with this, communities associated with hard substrates tend to include long-lived, and slow growing species, taking many years to colonise and become established. Any benefits that they may provide will be highly localized and need to be considered against the loss of existing habitat. Consideration also needs to be made to the disturbance and removal of any subsequently established communities during the decommissioning phase of the development.</p>	I	<p>The East Marine Plans Policy does indeed allude to a preference for cable burial but Hornsea Three note that this is a preference rather than a necessity. It will not always be possible to bury cables depending on the nature of the sediment (albeit it is possible to bury cables in chalk) and hence other methods are considered and form part of the Project envelope. Further refinements have been made to the project envelope in relation to cable protection, as detailed in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description.</p> <p>Comments relating to the removal of epifaunal communities associated with hard substrate during decommissioning are noted and assessed in paragraph 2.11.3.28 et seq. of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology in the Environmental Statement.</p>
Eastern Inshore Fisheries and Conservation Authority	<p>General comments</p> <p>It would be useful to have more detailed timings of the proposed activities as there is often seasonal variation in the sensitivity of some habitat features and the importance of fisheries can vary though out the year.</p> <p>Eastern IFCA is continually seeking to improve how we respond to consultations, both in terms of efficiency and content. Therefore, if any of the points raised in this response are reflected in the outcome we would appreciate being informed.</p>	I	<p>Acknowledged. More detail has been added the Project Description Chapter of the Environmental Statement (see Volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description), however at this stage it is not possible to provide precise timings of the proposed activities to this level of detail.</p>
The Wildlife Trust (joint response from Norfolk WT and TWT)	<p>1. Site selection and consideration of alternatives (Volume 1: chapter 4)</p> <p>As you are aware, TWT has concerns regarding the routing of cables through Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ and we are interested as to why zone 4 was discounted, which would have avoided the MCZ. We appreciate that one of the factors in discounting option 4 was to avoid the Norfolk Broads. Please could further information be provided as to why zone 4 was discounted, especially since the proposed cabling route for Norfolk Vanguard1 is located in a similar area to zone 4. Please could a summary also be provided on the differences in the assessment results for zone 2 and 4, particularly as it is outlined in 4.9.3.4 that "the level of interaction with Designated sites...could be reduced through routing to landfall zone 2".</p>	Y	<p>Thank you for your feedback. The further detail has been added to the Environmental Statement, Volume 1. Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>15</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
The Wildlife Trust (joint response from Norfolk WT and TWT)	2.1.4. Ocean quahog <i>Arctica islandica</i> TWT is interested that ocean quahog samples have been found in the Hornsea Zone. We are aware that further benthic sampling will take place within Markham's Triangle rMCZ, which has similar sediments to those in which ocean quahog was found in the wider Hornsea Zone. We would welcome feedback from this sampling on the presence of ocean quahog. As mentioned in 2.7.1.12 of the benthic ecology chapter, ocean quahog is listed by OSPAR as a threatened and/or declining species for the Greater Northern North Sea (OSPAR Region II). The main threat to ocean quahog is disturbance to the seabed (OSPAR Commission, 2009). Ocean quahog is a long lived, slowly growing bivalve that has very low resilience, with recovery likely to be in excess of 10 years, and maybe in excess of 25 years. The current EIA assessment for this species suggests a medium sensitivity (2.11.1.32). However, the current Marlin sensitivity review ( <a href="http://marlin.ac.uk/species/detail/1519">marlin.ac.uk/species/detail/1519</a> ) for ocean quahog shows high sensitivity for most physical pressures.	Y	In the Environmental Statement, Paragraph 2.7.1.22 of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology, has been updated to clarify that no ocean quahog were recorded during any of the site specific surveys within Hornsea Three. The MarESA has been revisited for ocean quahog and the sensitivity of this receptor to the effects of physical disturbance have been updated (see paragraph 2.11.1.36 of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology). Ocean quahog was not considered in Environmental Statement volume 5, annex 2.3: MCZ Assessment, as this has not been proposed as a feature for designation within this rMCZ.
The Wildlife Trust (joint response from Norfolk WT and TWT)	2.1.1. EIA assessment on subtidal chalk (volume 2: benthic ecology chapter) TWT does not agree with the conclusion of a magnitude impact of minor for subtidal chalk, as outlined in 2.11.1.22, based on the conclusion that only a small proportion of the habitat would be permanently lost. A more detailed assessment against the conservation objectives for subtidal chalk is required to conclude that this loss would not be significant (please see our further comments in 2.1.2). It is highlighted in both the benthic ecology chapter and the MCZ assessment that "one of the typical characterising species of the subtidal chalk and peat and clay exposures is likely to be the piddock <i>Pholas dactylus</i> which is one of the main characterising species of the CR.MCR.SfRPid (SfRPid): 'Piddocks with a sparse associated fauna in sublittoral very soft chalk or clay' biotope", of which the assessment has been taken against. TWT suggest that more than one biotope should be considered as part of the assessment. A description of the biotope complex associated with subtidal chalk can be found on the JNCC website.	I	The Hornsea Three offshore cable corridor has been rerouted such that it now avoids areas of subtidal chalk within the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ. The assessment of temporary and long term habitat loss/disturbance on benthic features of this site presented in the Environmental Statement in volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology has been updated accordingly. Further consideration of relevant chalk biotopes included in the assessment of SSC and associated deposition is given in the Environmental Statement in volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology, although piddocks were chosen as a proxy due to their long recovery times. Discussions on the effects of Hornsea Three on the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ is presented in full within the Environmental Statement in volume 5, annex 2.3: Marine Conservation Zone Assessment.
The Wildlife Trust (joint response from Norfolk WT and TWT)	2.1.2. MCZ assessment (Volume 5: Annex 2.3) As discussed at the previous MCZ meeting, TWT does not agree in the current approach to the MCZ assessment. We cannot agree with the conclusions of the assessment as detailed 5.1.2.6 "there is no significant risk of cable installation during the construction phase, with consequent habitat loss/disturbance effects, hindering the conservation objectives [of the MCZ]". Whilst we appreciate that further data and assessment will be undertaken in relation to cabling impacts, the significance of the effect from cabling on subtidal chalk and peat and clay exposures has been identified as moderate adverse (5.1.2.5). Therefore, until further assessment has been undertaken, the conclusion of no significant risk of hindering the conservation objectives for Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ cannot be drawn.	I	The Hornsea Three offshore cable corridor has been rerouted such that it now avoids areas of subtidal chalk and peat and clay exposures within the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ. The assessment of temporary and long term habitat loss/disturbance on benthic features of this site presented in the Environmental Statement in volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology has been updated accordingly. Discussions on the effects of Hornsea Three on the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ is presented in full within the Environmental Statement in volume 5, annex 2.3: Marine Conservation Zone Assessment.
The Wildlife Trust (joint response from Norfolk WT and TWT)	Paragraph 5.2.1.4 summarises that 0.5% of the subtidal chalk of the MCZ could be permanently lost from cable burial. When considering the scale of the impact from the removal of the subtidal chalk feature, the judgement in the Sweetman case should be borne in mind. Although this was the removal of a SAC feature rather than that of an MCZ, the principle behind the protection are comparable. In the Sweetman case, it was determined that the removal of just 0.53% of the limestone pavement feature (0.006% of the whole SAC) constituted an adverse effect on site integrity. There are numerous other examples where habitat loss of less than 1% (and as low as 0.03%) has been shown to constitute an adverse effect on the integrity of a European site (Hoskins and Tydesley (2006)).	I	On the basis of the Hornsea Three offshore cable corridor re-route presented in the Environmental Statement, direct impacts to subtidal chalk habitats and peat and clay habitats, such as may arise from cable burial, are no longer predicted to occur as these habitats were not recorded within the Hornsea Three offshore cable corridor. Discussion on the effects of Hornsea Three on the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ is presented in full within the Environmental Statement in volume 5, annex 2.3: Marine Conservation Zone Assessment.



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>15</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
The Wildlife Trust (joint response from Norfolk WT and TWT)	In terms of a future MCZ assessment, we agree with Natural England, that the MCZ assessment should be against the Conservation Objectives and Conservation Advice for the site and in the absence of this, a proxy should be used. We are pleased to see a new proposed approach to the MCZ assessment in Appendix A of the MCZ assessment document and we look forward to discussing this in more detail with the Hornsea 3 team. TWT has been in correspondence with The Department of Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy (BEIS), the Planning Inspectorate and Defra regarding the approach to MCZ assessments for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIPs). We are currently in discussion with Defra on possible approaches to NSIP MCZ assessment. We will be happy to discuss this with you in due course.	I	In the Environmental Statement, Volume 5, annex 2.3: MCZ Assessment has been updated according to advice from TWT and Natural England, specifically undertaking the assessment against the draft Conservation Advice Package provided by Natural England through the MCZ Working Group in May 2017.
The Wildlife Trust (joint response from Norfolk WT and TWT)	We note that the current MCZ assessment for Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ should assess impacts against all features listed in the designation order. This includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High energy circalittoral rock</li> <li>• High energy infralittoral rock</li> <li>• Moderate energy circalittoral rock</li> <li>• Moderate energy infralittoral rock</li> </ul> We are pleased that Dong Energy has stated in 5.1.2.17 "Should any significant risk of hindering conservation objectives remain, Hornsea Three will be required to consider further mitigation and alternatives which would further minimise this risk and potentially undertake a Stage 2 assessment if an unacceptable residual risk remains." TWT looks forward to receiving further information from the geophysical surveys and discussing alternatives and mitigations options to ensure no significant risk to the conservation objectives of Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ.	I	Moderate and High Energy Circalittoral Rock features are coincident with Subtidal Chalk mapped in (Defra, 2015) and as such, any consideration of the Subtidal Chalk habitat Feature of Conservation Interest (FOCI) also implicitly considers these two Circalittoral Rock features. Infralittoral rock was not recorded within the MCZ (see Defra, 2015).
The Wildlife Trust (joint response from Norfolk WT and TWT)	We also note that subtidal peat and clay exposures have a similar sensitivity to subtidal chalk, and any loss of this feature would be irreversible. We look forward to reviewing an updated MCZ assessment in relation to all features of Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ to ensure the conservation objectives for the site are met. For the future assessment, If Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD) is chosen as a mitigation option in relation to the MCZ, TWT would expect to see an assessment against all features of the MCZ from this activity.	Y	On the basis of the Hornsea Three offshore cable corridor re-route presented in Environmental Statement in volume 2, chapter 2, Benthic Ecology, direct impacts to subtidal chalk habitats and peat and clay habitats, such as may arise from cable burial, are no longer predicted to occur as these habitats were not recorded within the offshore cable corridor. Discussions on the effects of Hornsea Three on the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ is presented in full within the Environmental Statement in volume 5, annex 2.3: Marine Conservation Zone Assessment.  HDD has been discussed as a potential construction activity within the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ in the Environmental Statement in volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology (see Table 2.14 and paragraph 2.11.1.85), although as discussed in Table 2.14 the maximum design scenario is for open cut trenching rather than HDD and, as such, numbers for temporary habitat loss associated with this activity are not presented within this chapter.
The Wildlife Trust (joint response from Norfolk WT and TWT)	We recommend that a detailed cumulative/in combination impact assessment is undertaken as part of the MCZ assessment. The Marine Management Organisation (MMO) considers that in order to fully discharge its duties under section 69 (1) of the Marine and Coastal Access Act (2009), in combination and cumulative effects must be considered (MMO, 2013). The cumulative/in combination assessment for Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ should consider existing impacts on the site such as cabling routes and fishing activity.	I	The cumulative impact assessment for temporary habitat loss within the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ is presented in the Environmental Statement in volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology. No Tier 1 or Tier 2 plans or projects have been identified within the boundary of the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ that may contribute to cumulative temporary habitat loss of any of the broadscale habitat features. Fishing activities are considered to be part of the baseline and so are not included within the CEA (see the Environmental Statement at section 2.12 of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology). Cumulative effects of other plans and projects are also considered for each MCZ/rMCZ in the Environmental Statement in section 5 of volume 5, annex 2.3: MCZ Assessment.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>15</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
The Wildlife Trust (joint response from Norfolk WT and TWT)	2.1.3. Markham's triangle rMCZ In light of the lack of conservation objectives for Markham's triangle rMCZ, we again suggest that proxy conservation objectives and advice are used to undertake the future MCZ assessment. We note that there is potential for temporary loss of up to 11.78% subtidal sand feature within the rMCZ. TWT would like to see further details in the assessment against a proxy on the reliance and recoverability of this habitat and other habitats which may be subject to temporary loss within the rMCZ.	I	The assessment of temporary habitat loss/disturbance to features proposed for designation in Markham's Triangle rMCZ has been updated and is presented in the Environmental Statement, volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology. On the basis of the Hornsea Three offshore cable corridor, up to 2.37% of the Subtidal sand feature within the rMCZ is predicted to be affected during the construction phase. As agreed with the MCZ Working Group, the draft Conservation Advice Package for Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds as provided by Natural England in June 2017, has been used as a proxy for Markham's Triangle rMCZ (for features common to both sites). It should be noted that the overall conservation objective for this site is expected to be "restore to favourable condition". Further evidence relating to Markham's Triangle rMCZ has been presented in section 5.2 of Environmental Statement volume 5, annex 2.3: MCZ Assessment. The assessment of temporary habitat loss/disturbance to features proposed for designation in Markham's Triangle rMCZ has been updated and up to 2.37% of the Subtidal sand feature within the rMCZ is predicted to be affected during the construction phase
Holt County Division	The area immediately offshore at Weybourne is part of a Marine Conservation Zone in relation to its unique chalk reef. Previously much concern has been raised about fishing this area, how much more damage will heavy cables lying on the seabed moving with the tides do instead? Generations of fishermen have worked hard to protect this unique marine environment which provides their income.	I	A full assessment of the effects of Hornsea Three on the qualifying benthic habitats of the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ is presented in the Environmental Statement in volume 5, annex 2.3: Marine Conservation Zone Assessment.
Marine Management Organisation	1.4. The inshore section of the proposed cable corridor passes through the Cromer Shoals Chalk Reef Marine Conservation Zone (MCZ). The MMO notes that the current plan for trenching through subtidal chalk, peat and clay features would result in the permanent loss of a proportion of these features and a change of habitat type, with no potential for recovery (paragraph 2.11.1.16, Volume 2, Chapter 2 – Benthic Subtidal and Intertidal Ecology). The MMO recommends that DONG Energy further explores alternative cable corridor routes which avoid permanent impacts on designated features within the Cromer Shoals Chalk Reef MCZ.	Y	On the basis of the Hornsea Three offshore cable corridor re-route presented in volume 2, chapter 2, Benthic Ecology, direct impacts to subtidal chalk habitats and peat and clay habitats, such as may arise from jack-up operations or cable burial, are no longer predicted to occur as these habitats are not present within the offshore cable corridor.
Marine Management Organisation	5. Benthic Subtidal and Intertidal Ecology 5.1. The MMO notes that mitigation has been considered as an option where Annex I biogenic reef is identified during pre-construction surveys along the cable route (Table 2.17, Volume 2, Chapter 2 – Benthic Subtidal and Intertidal Ecology). The MMO considers this to be particularly important for the area of the cable route passing through the North Norfolk Sand Banks and Saturn Reef SCI due to its proximity to Saturn Reef and other known Annex I reef areas.	I	Although the Hornsea Three offshore cable corridor coincides with the JNCC delineated boundary of S. spinulosa reef in the North Norfolk Sandbanks and Saturn Reef SAC, no Annex I reefs were identified during the site specific surveys of the Hornsea Three offshore cable corridor coinciding with the North Norfolk Sandbanks and Saturn Reef SAC. However, should Annex I S. spinulosa reef be identified in the pre-construction survey within the North Norfolk Sandbanks and Saturn Reef SAC, appropriate measures will be put in place to avoid direct impacts to these reefs, where possible (see the Environmental Statement, Table 2.18 of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology). However, in order to address uncertainties in the assessment with regard to the potential for direct impacts on potential future for S. spinulosa reefs (i.e. where avoidance is not possible in areas where reef has developed), a precautionary assessment of the effects to potential future Annex I reef has been included in the Environmental Statement in volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology.
Marine Management Organisation	5.2. The MMO recommends that the underlying data and analyses for benthic ecology assessments are included in the ES.	I	A summary of the data and analyses used to inform the assessment for benthic ecology is presented in the Environmental Statement in section 2.7 of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology, with full details provided in the Environmental Statement in volume 5, annex 2.1: Benthic Ecology Technical Report.
Marine Management Organisation	5.3. DONG Energy state that "The other Natura 2000 sites are at least 10 km away and therefore, like the features of the Wash and North Norfolk Coasts SAC, are only likely to be affected by increased suspended sediments" (paragraph 2.7.3.3, Volume 2, Chapter 2 – Benthic Subtidal and Intertidal Ecology). The MMO requests that further evidence is provided to support this assertion in the ES.	I	On the basis of the Hornsea Three offshore cable corridor presented in the Environmental Statement, an assessment of the impacts to qualifying benthic habitats within The Wash and North Norfolk Coast SAC is now presented in the Environmental Statement in volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>15</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Marine Management Organisation	5.4. DONG Energy predict that habitat loss due to jack-up barge deployments would be temporary (Table 2.13, Volume 2, Chapter 2 – Benthic Subtidal and Intertidal Ecology). The MMO advises that jack-up barge depressions within subtidal chalk habitats have the potential to result in permanent habitat loss as a result of the change in its structure through substrate compression and recommends that this should be reflected in the impact assessment within the ES.	I	On the basis of the Hornsea Three offshore cable corridor presented in the Environmental Statement, direct impacts to subtidal chalk habitats, such as may arise from jack-up operations or cable burial, are no longer predicted to occur within these habitats.
Marine Management Organisation	1.5. The MMO recommends that assessments of the magnitude and significance of effects throughout the PEIR should be checked and supported by clearly referenced scientific evidence. DONG Energy has used a matrix to calculate the significance of effects of the proposed Project (e.g. Table 1.16, page 46, Volume 2, Chapter 1 – Marine Processes, and replicated in subsequent 'Offshore' chapters). There are several instances (e.g. paragraphs 2.11.2.17, 2.11.3.18, 2.13.2.39, Volume 2, Chapter 2 – Benthic Subtidal and Intertidal Ecology) where potential impacts have been assessed incorrectly, for example as being of "Minor" magnitude on a receptor with high sensitivity, giving an overall assessment for the significance of the impact as "Minor Adverse" which, according to the matrix, should result in an overall assessment of significance of "Minor or Moderate".	I	In the Environmental Statement in volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology it is clarified that, in cases where a range is suggested for the significance of effect, there remains the possibility that this may span the significance threshold (i.e. the range is given as minor to moderate). In such cases the final significance is based upon the expert's professional judgement as to which outcome delineates the most likely effect, with an explanation as to why this is the case. This is consistent with the methodology presented in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 5: EIA Methodology. Additional explanatory text has been inserted into the relevant assessments in the Environmental Statement in volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology to clarify why, in instances where there is a choice in the matrix table, an effect has been considered as minor rather than moderate.
Marine Management Organisation	5.6. DONG Energy state that "Any increase in hard substrate, and associated increases in biodiversity, will potentially affect Habitats A, B, C, D, E, G, H and I and will be long term, lasting for the duration of the development" (paragraph 2.11.2.20, Volume 2, Chapter 2 – Benthic Subtidal and Intertidal Ecology). The MMO advises that, given DONG Energy is considering leaving export cables and their associated protection in-situ beyond the lifespan of the project (comment 2.15 above), potential impacts could be permanent and not long term as stated. It is recommended that the potential impacts of increasing hard substrate in these marine habitats are reconsidered in the ES in this context.	I	Permanent impacts associated with the potential for cable and scour protection to be left in situ following decommissioning are assessed in the Environmental Statement in volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology.
Marine Management Organisation	5.7. Sabellaria spinulosa "reefiness" assessments for drop-down video (DDV) stations ECR02 and ECR04 have been included in paragraph 4.1.4.84 of the Benthic Ecology Technical Report (Volume 5, Annex 2.1). There is, however no indication within any of the figures or text as to where these two stations are located, in relation to either the proposed development or marine protected areas. The location of the two stations should be provided in relation to the array, cable route and marine protected areas.	I	A new figure, Figure 2.6, has been inserted in the Environmental Statement in volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology to show the location of the sites assessed for S. spinulosa reef potential. No potential Annex I reefs were found within the Hornsea Three offshore cable corridor coinciding with the North Norfolk Sandbanks and Saturn Reef SAC

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>15</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Marine Management Organisation	<p>1.6. Where the significance of a predicted impact is calculated as "Minor or Moderate", the MMO recommends that the significance is assessed as "Moderate" in accordance with the 'worst case scenario' principle of the 'Rochdale Envelope' appraisal. Such impacts would therefore be significant in terms of the subsequent analysis required under the appropriate Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) regulations, according to the matrix rules used by DONG Energy in the PEIR (paragraph 2.9.1.9, Volume 2, Chapter 2 – Benthic Subtidal and Intertidal Ecology and replicated in subsequent 'Offshore' chapters).</p>	I	<p>Regarding Benthic Ecology, In the Environmental Statement, Paragraph 2.9.2.5 of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Subtidal and Intertidal Ecology clarifies that, in cases where a range is suggested for the significance of effect, there remains the possibility that this may span the significance threshold (i.e. the range is given as minor to moderate). In such cases the final significance is based upon the expert's professional judgement as to which outcome delineates the most likely effect, with an explanation as to why this is the case. Additional explanatory text has been inserted into the relevant assessments in sections 2.11.1 to 2.11.3 of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology to clarify why, in instances where there is a choice in the matrix table, an effect has been considered as minor rather than moderate.</p> <p>For Ornithology, the process used to determine the significance of impacts upon relevant receptors is presented in Section 5.9.4 of Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore Ornithology. Where the significance value falls between two categories (e.g. minor or moderate significance) expert judgement is used to determine the significance value</p> <p>For Marine Mammals the magnitude and sensitivity matrix has been updated and all updates have been communicated to the relevant key stakeholders through the EWG.</p> <p>As discussed in the Marine Processes, Benthic Ecology and Fish and Shellfish EWG meeting of 5 December 2017, impact assessment conclusions have been amended to provide further justification for why a significance of minor (i.e. not significant) has been concluded for species of medium to high sensitivity. These are presented in in the relevant impact assessments in Section 3.11 (for Hornsea Three alone) and Section 3.13 (for Cumulative Effects) of volume 2, chapter 3: Fish and Shellfish Ecology.</p>
Marine Management Organisation	<p>1.7. The MMO recommends re-examination of the requirements for pre-construction, construction and post-construction monitoring following re-assessment of the magnitude and significance of the potential impacts of the proposed Project. The MMO advises that verification of the impact predictions as set out in the PEIR can, in many cases, only be provided by future monitoring of the relevant receptors. This important consideration should be taken into account when future monitoring requirements are detailed in the 'Offshore' chapters of the PEIR.</p>	I	<p>Consideration of the potential need for monitoring has been considered throughout the offshore chapters of the Environmental Statement. The proposed approach to monitoring for offshore elements of the project is discussed in the In Principle Monitoring Plan that accompanies the application for Development Consent.</p> <p>Explanatory text has been inserted into the relevant assessment sections in the Environmental Statement of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology to clarify why, in instances where there is a choice in the matrix table, an effect has been considered as minor rather than moderate. There are, however, no instances of effects being considered to be of moderate adverse significance. The proposals for future monitoring are outlined in the Environmental Statement in Table 2.25 of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology.</p> <p>The proposed approach to monitoring for offshore ornithology and marine mammals is discussed in the In Principle Monitoring Plan.</p> <p>Monitoring has not been proposed for fish and shellfish ecology, due to the lack of significant effects on fish ecology and the high level of confidence in the assessment presented.</p>
Marine Management Organisation	<p>9. Marine Conservation Zone Assessment 9.1. The MMO appreciates the acknowledgement that more work is required to accurately assess the impacts of the proposal on the Cromer Shoals Chalk Reefs MCZ (paragraph 1.1.1.2, Volume 5, Annex 2.3 – Marine Conservation Zone Assessment). The MMO would welcome the opportunity to work with DONG Energy wherever possible to assist with the production of a more accurate assessment, resulting in potential mitigation of the impacts of the proposed cable route through designated MCZ features.</p>	I	<p>The comment is acknowledged and Hornsea Three has continued to work with the MMO and other stakeholders through the MCZ Working Group, to resolve concerns with regard to effects on MCZ/rMCZs (see the Environmental Statement, section 1.2 of volume 5, annex 2.3: MCZ Assessment).</p>



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>15</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Marine Management Organisation	<p>1.8. It is recognised that the collection of data to inform the potential impacts of the proposed Project is an iterative process and more up to date information is likely to be available to inform the forthcoming application. The following suggestions have been made for further consideration before the application is submitted;</p> <p>A review of the benthic impacts and their significance following incorporation of the most recent project data, together with analysis of the Markham's triangle grab samples and samples taken during the Humber Regional Environmental Characterisation and the southern North Sea Synthesis surveys which fall within the array area and export cable corridor;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Use of the Dudgeon offshore wind farm pre-construction benthic ecology survey carried out in 2014, which would provide a more up to date data source than the 2009 characterisation survey used in the PEIR;</li> <li>- Incorporation of the Commercial Fisheries Scouting Survey methodology, results and interpretation, which was undertaken in 2016 and 2017 on behalf of DONG Energy for the Project;</li> <li>- Use of 2016 and 2017 data on commercial fishery landings and vessel movements, which can be provided by the MMO to ensure that potential impacts on commercial fisheries can be based upon the most current available data.</li> </ul>	I	<p>Comment acknowledged and the Environmental Statement in volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology has been updated to include the additional data collected in 2017, including Annex I reef (biogenic and stony) assessments for the offshore cable route corridor.</p> <p>The results of the Dudgeon offshore wind farm pre-construction benthic ecology survey reports have incorporated into the baseline presented in the Environmental Statement in section 2.7 of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology and are discussed in volume 5, annex 2.1: Benthic Ecology Technical Report.</p> <p>In the Environmental Statement, Table 6.6 of volume 2, chapter 6: Commercial Fisheries presents the site specific survey data which has informed the commercial fisheries baseline characterisation and includes the results of Commercial Fisheries Scouting Surveys undertaken along the inshore section of the Hornsea Three offshore cable corridor. Table 6.5 of volume 2, chapter 6: Commercial Fisheries summarises the key desktop datasets used to inform the commercial fisheries baseline which includes landing statistics data for UK registered vessels between 2012 and 2016 obtained from the MMO.</p>
Natural England	<p>2.2.8 Vol. 2 Chapter 2 2.9.1.5</p> <p>We are unsure whether VERs, as a supra-species unit not created for similar functionality, are an appropriate level from which to assess sensitivity. We would expect DONG Energy to provide the evidence base underlying decisions concerning sensitivity of VERs and comment on the scale on which this evidence base is presented (species, biotope, VER).</p>	I	<p>Environmental Statement, Volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology has been substantially revised so that the VERs better align with designated features of the relevant protected areas in the area (e.g. Annex I sandbanks has been included as a VER). Each assessment section has also been amended to include separate sections for the consideration of impacts to the features of designated sites and, as requested by Natural England, further information on the sensitivity, recoverability etc. of the component biotopes of the designated features (as mapped during the site-specific surveys) has been provided. However, outside the features of designated areas, the overall approach to the impact assessment has not be significantly revised.</p> <p>Paragraph 2.7.4.3 of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology explains that that, in the grouping of biotopes into VERs, consideration has been given to the inherent sensitivities of different habitats, such that habitats and species with similar vulnerability and recoverability, often as a result of similar broad sediment types and species complements, have been grouped together.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>15</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Natural England	<p>2.2.9 Vol. 2 Chapter 1 MarLIN sensitivity and VERs The assessment uses the MarLIN sensitivity index to consider and assess the impacts of permanent habitat loss on benthic receptors during the operational phase. While this index is widely used by a range of marine sectors and is, in effect, the industry standard, it has features and limitations that restrict its usefulness in relation to the Hornsea Three assessment. While the SNCBs do not object to the use of the index per se, we feel it is important to understand the limitations in order to address them via other means. The main limitation is that the index does not support assessment of sensitivity to permanent habitat loss. Habitat loss arising from Hornsea Three could conceivably be classified either as permanent loss, or (for any elements intended to be removed after 50 years), long-term temporary loss. We believe that we are in agreement that, for the purposes of the Hornsea Three assessment, habitat loss arising from placement of infrastructure and rock armouring during the operational phase should be treated as permanent habitat loss. However, at present the EIA assesses the sensitivity of the biotopes utilising a framework built around temporary impacts, which may result in an underestimate of impact/significance of impact. We advise that the final application clarifies whether any of the habitat loss anticipated during the operational phase is considered to be temporary rather than permanent. Only temporary losses should be assessed under the MarLIN framework (using 'smothering' as the relevant factor). All permanent losses should be considered outside the MarLIN framework and their potential impact on site integrity assessed in the Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment (RIAA). This is necessary as there is a risk that, by assessing the ecological sensitivity of the VERs, under the existing MarLIN framework then the sensitivity to permanent habitat loss is underestimated, potentially resulting in impacts on the designated sites not being sufficiently accounted for in the assessment. We recommend using the Marine Evidence based Sensitivity Assessment (MarESA ) that presents an updated list of pressures likely to affect marine species and habitats. MarESA pressures and benchmarks are now a standard used by the SNCBs to inform Advice on Operations and Conservation Advice.</p>	I	<p>In the Environmental Statement in volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology, the assessment of long term habitat loss during the operation and maintenance phase, resulting from the presence of foundations and scour/cable protection, considers that the sensitivity of all habitats to this impact is high on the basis that resistance is 'none' and recoverability is not applicable for this impact for the duration of the project. Therefore, we do not consider that the sensitivity of receptors has been underestimated.</p> <p>A consideration of permanent habitat loss, i.e. that persisting following decommissioning as a result of cable/scour protection potentially being left in situ, has been assessed separately in section 2.11.3 of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology.</p> <p>The Marine Evidence based Sensitivity Assessment (MarESA) has been used for the benthic ecology impact assessment, and the text in section 2.9 and throughout the assessments in Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology have been updated to make this clear.</p>
Natural England	<p>2.2.10 Vol. 2 Chapter 2 Table 2.13 The following impacts should also be considered and included in the table: - direct permanent loss of fauna (due to foundation placement, anchoring etc.) during construction and O&amp;M; - Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD) exit pits impacts have not been included in the design envelope (clarify if this is not the worst case); - Gravity Base Foundation (GBF) installation may require seabed preparation works, not only seabed levelling and therefore temporary habitat loss, but also placement of different material (such as granite), which would mean permanent habitat change in addition to the direct GBF footprint.</p>	I	<p>Direct long term loss of fauna from placement of foundations is assessed in the operation and maintenance phase (long term habitat loss) in the Environmental Statement in volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology. This is not however permanent as the foundations are assumed to be removed during decommissioning. Impacts associated with anchor placements during cabling are included in the assessment of temporary habitat loss/disturbance during construction, and are therefore not considered to be permanent habitat loss. Anchor placements for floating turbines are not included as these have been removed from the project description for Hornsea Three.</p> <p>In the Environmental Statement, Table 2.14 of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology has been updated to include HDD exit pits in the maximum design envelope. Although it should be noted that the maximum design scenario is associated with open cut trenching. Therefore, the numbers presented for temporary habitat loss don't include the excavation of exit pits.</p> <p>With respect to gravity base foundations, impacts associated with seabed preparation are included in the assessment of temporary habitat loss during construction (see section 2.11.1 of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology). The placement of different material on the seabed following the installation of the foundations is assessed in the operation and maintenance phase over three separate impacts (e.g. long term habitat loss, colonisation of hard substrates and the potential for the introduction of invasive and non-native species) in section 2.11.2 of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>15</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Natural England	<p>2.2.11 Vol. 2 Chapter 2 2.11.1.4 We advise that the comparison of footprint against the area of southern North Sea benthic ecology study area is not meaningful and should be removed. The comparison against the Hornsea Three benthic study area is more appropriate, but should be presented along with comparison against the area of protected sites. We advise that 'extent' of is only one factor that should be considered when assessing the impact and that impacts to form and function of a feature are equally important.</p>	I	<p>Comment noted and the proportion of the southern North Sea benthic ecology study area affected has been removed from the impact assessments, however reference is still made to this study area to provide context.</p>
Natural England	<p>2.2.12 Vol. 2 Chapter 2 2.11.1.3 onwards We advise that the following amendments and clarifications are included in to the assessment of 'Construction – Temporary habitat loss/disturbance due to cable laying operations, spud-can leg impacts from jack-up operations and seabed preparation works for gravity base foundations':</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Discussion of whether there is any difference in particle size analysis (PSA) 6 m underneath the sandwave/sandbank surface to determine if all the spoil volume be of similar/same PSA to surface sediments?</li> <li>- Considering the worst case scenario being all within VERs A-C is not helpful as this contains a considerable range of habitats and sensitivities. With the export cable running through the NNSSR cSAC/SCI, it is impossible that no impact will occur to Annex I sandbanks. Therefore impacts should be assessed against biotope/feature</li> <li>- Confirmation that sediment will not be lost from the sandbank system, even when operations are proposed along the north-west edge of the site.</li> <li>- Consideration from DONG Energy that dredged sediment will be returned to the system away from trough locations that may contain considerably different sediments.</li> <li>- Use of 100% Annex I sandbanks within the NNSSR cSAC/SCI in 2.11.1.14. The paragraph is currently incorrect in not assigning all sediment to Annex I feature.</li> <li>- Permanent loss of habitat J or K should be removed from temporary impact to allow a more realistic assessment of impact.</li> <li>- Pressure benchmarks and level of impact should be discussed in paragraphs 2.11.1.23 onwards (Sensitivity of the receptor), particularly with regard to several metres of sediment being deposited on benthic habitats and/or Sabellaria spinulosa reef. We advise that the EIA should consider sensitivity using pressure benchmarks. MarESA benchmarks can be found here <a href="http://www.marlin.ac.uk/habitats/SNCB-benchmarks">http://www.marlin.ac.uk/habitats/SNCB-benchmarks</a>. Benchmarks appropriate for this situation are detailed in Appendix 2B (See NE Hornsea Three responses page 32).</li> <li>- Further justification should be provided to identify whether or not Round 1 windfarm footprints are an appropriate analogy for the proposed operations (2.11.1.25).</li> <li>- Clarification of the results of Andrulowicz et al. (2003). 2.11.1.27 currently does not seem to agree with the paper's conclusions.</li> <li>- Recognition of the fact that protective materials are considered to be permanent impacts if not removed at the time of decommissioning. This means that hard substrata remains in a soft sediment environment which is inconsistent with OSPAR that states that the seabed should be returned to its original/surrounding characteristic. We advise that the cable protection and cable crossings protection being left in situ is estimated at 1 348 200 m2.</li> <li>- Habitats A-C should be considered to have national value. Arctica islandica should be considered to be of international value.</li> </ul> <p>2.11.1.3 onwards</p>	I	<p>1: With regards to particle size within the sandwaves, text has been added to the assessment of temporary habitat loss/disturbance (see the Environmental Statement, section 2.11.1 of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology) to clarify that, on the basis of sediment transport processes, it is reasonable to assume similarity of sediment particle size with depth. Therefore, the proposed sandwave clearance activities will result in local displacement of the disturbed sediment volume, which will remain the same sediment type as the surrounding seabed and with no loss of seabed sediments from the local area.</p> <p>2: See the full response to Natural England comments in previous response above. Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology has been substantially revised so that the VERs better align with designated features of the relevant protected areas in the area (e.g. Annex I sandbanks has been included as a VER)</p> <p>3: Further detail from the Marine Processes assessment (Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 1: Marine Processes), supporting the conclusion that material will not be lost from the sandwave system of the North Norfolk Sandbanks and Saturn Reef SAC, has been presented in paragraph 2.11.1.40 of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology.</p> <p>4: Further detail from Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 1: Marine Processes concerning the deposition of sands into areas of different seabed type (e.g. areas of slightly coarser seabed in some sandwave troughs), has been presented in paragraph 2.11.1.14 of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology.</p> <p>5: When presenting proportions of Annex I Sandbank habitat affected in volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology, 100% of the habitat within the SAC has been assumed to be Annex I sandbank habitat.</p> <p>6: The Hornsea Three offshore cable corridor re-route means that cable installation works will not result in direct impacts to subtidal chalk reef or peat and clay exposures.</p> <p>7: Volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology has been updated so that the MarESA pressure benchmarks are referenced in each impact assessment.</p> <p>8: Round 1 offshore wind farms, while smaller, will involve the same types of impacts (e.g. cable burial, jack up operations, anchor placement).</p> <p>9: The Andrulowicz et al. (2003) paper has been reviewed and a minor text clarification made in paragraph 2.11.1.29 of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology to state that the paper references gravelly sediments (e.g. sandy gravels).</p> <p>10: Permanent habitat loss due to cable/scour protection potentially being left in situ following decommissioning is acknowledged in Table 2.14 and assessed in section 2.11.3 of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology.</p> <p>11: We agree that Habitats A - C should be valued as National value where they comprise qualifying features within the boundary of an MCZ. The amendments to the VERs to better align with designated features of the relevant protected areas in the area also reflects this. We do not, however, consider that these habitats outside a designated site are of National value and deem that a valuation of Regional is more appropriate. With respect to Arctica islandica, while present, the Hornsea Three benthic ecology study area is not a core area for this species, so consider that a valuation of National within the Hornsea Three study area is more appropriate than international.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>15</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Natural England	<p>2.2.13 Vol. 2 Chapter 1 2.11.1.52 Construction – temporary increases in suspended sediment. The comparability of Hitchcock and Bell (2004), Pearce et al. (2007) and Tyler-Walters and Sabatini (2017) in this situation is unclear, but we do suggest referring also to Last et al. (2011) and putting quantities of sediment from which Sabellaria spinulosa is recoverable in the context of the volume and depth of sediment expected to be released in these operations.</p>	I	<p>The assessment of increased SSC and sediment deposition in the Environmental Statement in section 2.11.1 of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology has been updated and the applicability of all references checked. Reference to Last et al. (2011) was previously included (see paragraph 2.11.1.113 of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology) together with a comparison of the depths from which S. spinulosa is recoverable from to the depths of deposition predicted from Hornsea Three.</p>



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>15</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Natural England	<p>2.2.14 Vol. 2 Chapter 1 2.11.2.3 We advise that the following amendments and clarifications are included in the assessment of 'Long term loss of seabed habitat through presence of foundations, scour protection and cable protection, resulting in potential effects on benthic receptors':</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- It is currently unclear how this phase of long-term habitat loss coincides with footprints of temporary habitat loss from construction work. This needs to be detailed to allow best understanding of total impact. For example, it is noted in 2.11.2.3 that habitats E and F will not be affected by long term habitat loss during the operational phase. This is inaccurate as the habitats will be affected by long term habitat loss through the operational phase resulting from the construction phase. It would help the PEIR impact assessment considerably to assess impacts across stages of development to allow more realistic impact forecasts to be considered.</li> <li>- It is also unclear due to the use of VERs what designated features are being impacted during temporary and long-term habitat loss.</li> <li>- VER E should be included in Table 2.18, Table 2.19 and following discussion as a designated feature of the NNSSR cSAC/SCI.</li> <li>- Impact in 2.11.2.9 and 2.11.2.10 appears to have missed out impact on Annex I sandbanks and simply discusses Annex I reefs. This must be amended.</li> <li>- We refer DONG Energy and your consultants to site documents for the NNSSR cSAC/SCI to provide the correct explanation as to why the whole site is considered Annex I sandbanks.</li> <li>- We note in 2.11.2.9, it is considered that there is potential for cable protection to be used within the cSAC/SCI. We question how this matches up with previous discussion of 10% of cables needing protection.</li> <li>- Long-term loss for Habitat F is not discussed in 2.11.2.3, as it is inferred in 2.11.2.9. Prediction of no long term habitat loss should be evidenced fully. We advise that the impact does not need to weaken regional ecosystem functions to be significant.</li> <li>- 2.11.2.12 should include impacts on Annex I sandbanks.</li> </ul>	I	<p>1: In the Environmental Statement, text has been added to paragraph 2.11.1.9 of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology to clarify that, with respect to seabed preparation, the habitat loss associated with the deposition of seabed preparation material has been included within the numbers and assessment presented for temporary habitat loss/disturbance. This is because, the area of long term habitat loss associated with the footprint of the turbine foundations and associated scour protection, and considered in paragraph 2.11.2.3 et seq., is greater than, and therefore completely encompasses, the area impacted by the seabed preparation activity itself.</p> <p>2: See the full response to Natural England comments in previous response above. Volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology has been substantially revised so that the VERs better align with designated features of the relevant protected areas. Each assessment section has also been amended to include separate sections for the consideration of impacts to the features of designated sites.</p> <p>3/4: Long term loss of qualifying Annex I sandbanks habitat within the NNSSR SAC is fully assessed in paragraphs 2.11.2.13 et seq. and Table 2.27 of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology.</p> <p>5: When presenting proportions of Annex I Sandbank habitat affected in volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology, 100% of the habitat within the SAC has been assumed to be Annex I sandbank habitat as recommended by Natural England.</p> <p>6: An assessment of the potential long term habitat loss during the operation and maintenance phase within the NNSSR SAC is now presented in paragraphs 2.11.2.13 et seq. and the assumptions presented in Table 2.27 of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology. It is assumed that up to a maximum of 10% of the cables within the SAC may require cable protection.</p> <p>7. Direct impacts to Annex I reefs are not predicted as no Annex I reef was recorded within the section of the offshore cable corridor that coincides with the NNSSR SAC. As outlined in Table 2.18 of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology, should Annex I reef habitat be identified during pre-construction surveys of the Hornsea Three offshore cable corridor, appropriate measures will be discussed with statutory consultees to avoid direct impacts to these features, where possible, on the basis of the extents of these reefs at the time of construction. However, in order to address uncertainties in the assessment with regard to the potential for direct impacts on potential future for <i>S. spinulosa</i> reefs (i.e. where avoidance is not possible in areas where reef has developed), a precautionary assessment of the effects to potential future Annex I reef has been included in volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology.</p> <p>8. An assessment of the potential long term habitat loss during the operation and maintenance phase within The Wash and North Norfolk SAC is now presented in paragraphs 2.11.2.22 of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology. It is assumed that up to a maximum of 10% of the cables within the SAC may require cable protection.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>15</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Natural England	2.2.15 Vol. 2 Chapter 2 2.11.2.24 Natural England advises that the introduction of hard substrata in soft sediment environments should be avoided and in particular within designated sites as is could hinder the conservation objectives for the site.	I	As described in the Environmental Statement in Table 2.14 of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology, the maximum design scenario for cable protection within designated sites, is that cable protection is only anticipated to be required for up to 10% of the length of cables within the site. The implications for qualifying habitats of designated sites is fully assessed in paragraphs 2.11.2.13 et seq. of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology during the operation and maintenance phase (i.e. long term habitat loss) and in paragraphs 2.11.3.44 et seq. of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology during the decommissioning phase (i.e. permanent habitat loss from presence of cable and scour protection).  The exact nature of the cable protection requirements for Hornsea Three offshore cable corridor will be detailed in the Cable Specification and Installation Plan that will be agreed in consultation with statutory consultees. This document will detail the technical specification of the offshore electrical system, including a cable burial risk assessment or similar, cable protection specification and installation risk mitigation measures
Natural England	2.2.16 Vol. 2 Chapter 2 2.11.2.39 It would be useful to have a section listing the precautions that will be taken to limit the spread of INNS (e.g. will rock armouring material be checked for INNS before it is dumped, check clean dry of sampling equipment, etc.).	I	In the Environmental Statement, text has been added to Table 2.18 of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology of designed in mitigation measures referencing the Biosecurity Plan and outlining some generic measures that could be adopted.
Natural England	2.2.17 Vol. 2 Chapter 2 2.11.2.41 Statement that <i>Didemnum vexillum</i> is currently restricted to artificial surfaces in the UK may be out of date and needs to be confirmed.	I	This statement has been checked and in the Environmental Statement, volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology amended to reflect the fact that <i>Didemnum vexillum</i> has been recorded on subtidal sediments off the Kent coast.
Natural England	2.2.18 Vol. 2 Chapter 2 2.11.2.80 Natural England disagrees that no additional impact will result from O&M as the habitat loss would have occurred during construction. Vessel anchoring and spud leg placement may create further disturbance/loss of habitat along the cable route as it will not be technically feasible to anchor in exact same locations.	I	This comment relates to the impact of maintenance operations on subtidal chalk reef and peat and clay exposures. The implications of the export cable re-route in the nearshore within the MCZ are that direct impacts to these features of the MCZ will not occur as a result of cable installation.
Natural England	2.2.19 Vol. 2 Chapter 2 2.12.1.2 Tier 2 should also include not just ongoing operational impacts, but where impacts to designated sites have occurred and not yet been demonstrated to have fully recovered.	I	The approach to tiering projects in the cumulative assessment has been revised for the Environmental Statement. The revised approach to tiering is outlined in volume 1, chapter 5: Environmental Impact Assessment Methodology and summarised in section 2.12 of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology.
Natural England	2.2.20 Vol. 2 Chapter 2 Table 2.20 Table 2.20 should include Oil and Gas decommissioning (export cable) and Bacton Gas pipelines (on-going impact to MCZ).	I	Oil and Gas decommissioning activities have been added as Tier 1 projects in the benthic ecology CEA (see the Environmental Statement, Table 2.32 of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology) and the Bacton Gas Terminal Coastal Defence Scheme has been included as a Tier 3 project. It should be noted that only a Scoping Report is currently available for the Bacton Gas Terminal Coastal Defence Scheme project.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>15</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Natural England	2.2.21 Vol. 2 Chapter 1 2.16.1.1 Natural England is unable to agree at this time with statement made that with proposed mitigation measures in place, all impacts will result in effects of either negligible or minor adverse significance. This is especially not the case for chalk and peat and clay habitats within Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ.	I	The impact assessment and consequently the overall conclusion of the benthic assessment (see the Environmental Statement, volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology) has been updated in line with the offshore cable re-route which now avoids direct impacts to chalk and peat and clay habitats within Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ.
Natural England	2.2.22 Vol. 5 Annex 2.1 Figure 1.1 Please note the North Norfolk Coast SSSI labelling is confusing as it appears to be inside the area for the MCZ.	I	Labelling of protected areas in the Environmental Statement in volume 5, annex 2.1: Ecology Technical Report has been amended to ensure clarity.
Natural England	2.2.23 Vol. 5 Annex 2.1 3.1.3.19 Please note JNCC may hold more up to date data for the sandbank PSA. It is important that the best available evidence is used in the final application.	I	Comment acknowledged. Following clarification from Natural England on this point, Hornsea Three is content that the best evidence available (i.e. 2013 survey data) has been used in the characterisation. 2015 survey data is not yet available.
Natural England	2.2.24 Vol. 5 Annex 2.1 3.1.3.31 Please note the North Norfolk Coast SPA/Ramsar should be included.	I	The SPA/Ramsar has no benthic ecology features and therefore has not been included in this figure.
Natural England	2.2.25 Vol. 5 Annex 2.1 3.1.3.42 Please note miss-spelling of Holkham (reads Holkam in the document) – this should be checked and corrected throughout the report.	I	Spelling amended throughout volume 5, annex 2.1: Benthic Ecology Technical Report in the Environmental Statement.
Natural England	2.2.26 Vol. 5 Annex 2.1 Table 3.2 Please note that infralittoral rock has been confirmed as present at the site, however there is only limited point data for it (so it is not possible to calculate the spatial extent). Perhaps spatial extent not available' would be a more suitable comment than 'not confirmed present'.	I	In the Environmental Statement, Volume 5, annex 2.1: Benthic Ecology Technical Report has been updated to clarify the position on infralittoral rock. This was not confirmed as present by the Site Assessment Document.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>15</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Natural England	<p>2.2.27 Vol. 5 Annex 2.1 Table 4.2 We are unclear as to the evidence underlying determination of biotopes and are unsure whether the biotope descriptions are meant to be JNCC defined biotopes or biotopes altered to fit particular Hornsea Three survey results. This should be made clear as a number of biotopes seems considerably different from the biotope descriptions on the JNCC website. For example, the biotope SS.SBR.PoR.SspiMx (A5.611) reads in Table 4.2 (Bold is column title and text following the colon is info in cell below):</p> <p>Hornsea Three Biotope Description : This biotope occurred on mixed sediments and was characterised by high abundances of the tube-building polychaete Sabellaria spinulosa and a diverse community of infaunal polychaetes including Polycirrus spp., Scalibregma inflatum, Mediomastus fragilis and Pholoe baltica together with the bivalve mollusc Abra alba. Characterising species accounting for up to 75% of cumulative similarity (SIMPER): Amphiura filiformis, Kurtiella bidentata, Pholoe baltica, Glycera alba, Goniada maculata, Notomastus spp., Nemertea spp., Mediomastus fragilis, Lumbrineris gracilis, Upogebia deltaura, Corbula gibba, Phoronis, Magelona alleni, Cylichna cylindracea, Gattyana cirrhosa, Owenia, Atherospio guillei, Callianassa subterranean.</p> <p>Of these, only Mediomastus fragilis is included in the characterising species list within the JNCC biotope description. We would expect to see characterisation to involve species we consider to be important in the biotope, in this case, Sabellaria spinulosa, Flustra foliacea, Alcyonidium diaphanum and Pagurus bernhardus. This mismatch is also seen in the biotope description in Table 4.2 with the description given by JNCC. We advise that these considerable discrepancies should be addressed.</p>	I	<p>Descriptions of biotopes has been revisited, including re-examination of the underlying analyses, since the PEIR and errors in the Environmental Statement in Table 4.2 of volume 5, annex 2.1: Benthic Ecology Technical Report were found and have now been corrected.</p>
Natural England	<p>1.7 Natural England advises that seabed levelling is minimised within designated sites and that the Deemed Marine Licences include a condition to provide a post consent seabed levelling plan for the array and export cable. (Volume 1, chapter 3, 3.6.4.27)</p>	I	<p>Quantification of the temporary habitat loss/disturbance associated with sandwave clearance within designated sites is provided in The Environmental Statement in Tables 2.19 (North Norfolk Sandbanks and Saturn Reef SAC), Table 2.22 (The Wash and North Norfolk Coast SAC), Table 2.23 Cromer Shoal MCZ) and Table 2.24 (Markham's Triangle rMCZ) and fully assessed in the accompanying text of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology.</p>
Natural England	<p>2.2.28 Vol. 5 Annex 2.1 4.1.4.83 – 4.1.4.85 When further data sets are collected, reefiness assessment of Sabellaria spinulosa reef should be updated as should the assessment of the chalk reef.</p>	I	<p>Comment acknowledged. The Annex I reef assessment has been updated to take into account further data collected during 2017. This has included both S. spinulosa Annex I reef assessments and assessment of potential rocky reefs, including chalk reefs. These are presented in the Environmental Statement in section 4.1.4 of volume 5, annex 2.1: Benthic Ecology Technical Report.</p>



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>15</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Natural England	<p>2.2.29 Vol. 5 Annex 2.1 Appendix I Sabellaria spinulosa reefiness We appreciate DONG Energy's efforts to provide a comprehensive Sabellaria spinulosa reefiness assessment, provided in Appendix I. However, we require further clarification before we can accept the conclusions provided. Overall, we would like to understand how the stages of assessment lead into each other. It is currently not clear whether only certain sections of Drop Down Video (DDV) footage are taken forward into stage two, then stage three.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Stage one <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Please provide evidence that moribund tubes is an appropriate category for assessment by DDV.</li> <li>o How can crusts be distinguished from deeper layers of Sabellaria spinulosa using DDV?</li> <li>o What is the difference between clumps and potential reef?</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Stage two <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Stage two contains descriptions of the reef. However, in each of the cases highlighted in Appendix I, the areas in question are defined as clumps and crusts, and not as potential reef. This would seem to question the efficacy of the system used here.</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Stage three <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o We would like clarification on whether Stage three is a consolidation of the information in Stages one and two. This is currently unclear.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>To allow consistent evaluation of Sabellaria spinulosa, we suggest that DONG Energy considers using the approach laid out in <a href="http://jncc.defra.gov.uk/pdf/Cefas_JNCC_No.7_v2_web.pdf">http://jncc.defra.gov.uk/pdf/Cefas_JNCC_No.7_v2_web.pdf</a>. Table 2 in that report sets out our reefiness criteria as used in JNCC/Cefas surveys and is reproduced below. This would simplify assessment and provide comparable results, which will be particularly important in the benthic assessment of the offshore cable corridor. See comment 2.2.19 of NE PIER response suggested table for reefiness criteria. We also note the proviso contained in the appendix, which is that the assessment is provisional, and should consider added expert opinion. We suggest that this may be appropriate for ECR02, where patchiness is over 70%.</p>	I	<p>Comments are acknowledged noted. The Annex I reef methodology presented in the Environmental Statement in volume 5, annex 2.1: Benthic Ecology Technical Report has been reviewed in line with Natural England's comments, particularly in relation to the potential reef assessed at ECR02. This is presented in section 4.1.4 of volume 5, annex 2.1: Benthic Ecology Technical Report in the Environmental Statement.</p> <p>Hornsea Three has not committed significant resources into undertaking detailed mapping of the extents of potential Annex I S. spinulosa reefs or potential cobble reefs at this stage in the development programme. This detailed assessment will be undertaken during the pre-construction phase to inform appropriate measures which will be taken to minimise direct impacts on these reef habitats, should these be present at the time of construction.</p>
Natural England	<p>2.2.30 Vol. 5 Annex 2.1 Appendices O-P DDV / trawl / grab abundances We would like clarification on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- How taxa marked with a ? (e.g. Corystes cassivelaunus, Tubularia) were considered in analysis</li> </ul> <p>We would like to see evidence for the identification of the following from DDV, and comment on whether DONG Energy considers potential misidentification of any/all of them could cause significant changes in analytical results:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Arachnidium fibrosum</li> <li>- Clytia hemisphaerica</li> <li>- Edwardsiidae</li> <li>- Escharella immersa</li> <li>- Campanulinoidea</li> <li>- Pedicellina spp.</li> <li>- Alcyonidium parasiticum</li> <li>- Triticella spp</li> </ul>	I	<p>Most species marked with a "?" were not included in the statistical analysis, those that were included were unlikely to have had a significant influence on the statistical analyses, as where they were recorded, they were single individuals across the dataset of &gt;400 grabs and &gt;800 species.</p> <p>The taxa listed here occurred in very low numbers, were not major contributing taxa to biotopes or were considered under higher ranks of the taxonomic hierarchy. Therefore the potential misidentification would not result in significant changes to the assignment of biotopes nor affect the final conclusions.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>15</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Natural England	<p>Section 2.3 Key concerns: Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ</p> <p>Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds is a designated MCZ, part of a network of Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) that are designated under both European and National legislation. MCZs are protected under Section 126 of the Marine and Coastal Access Act (2009), which sets a requirement of meeting the conservation objectives of the site. Therefore, when assessing potential impacts on features of the MCZ, it is not sufficient to rely solely on the EIA process, which is undertaken for the wider marine environment to determine significance of impact.</p>	I	<p>As agreed through the MCZ Working Group, Hornsea Three has amended the MCZ Assessment methodology to remove reference to the EIA process. In the Environmental Statement in Volume 5, annex 2.3: MCZ Assessment presents an assessment which is based on feedback from members of the MCZ Working Group and the draft Conservation Advice Package for Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ, as provided by Natural England in May 2017.</p>
Natural England	<p>Section 2.3 Key concerns: Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ</p> <p>As with all designated sites there will be conservation advice packages which will include conservation objectives/targets for the management of the sites and against which to measure impacts to determine significance.</p>	I	<p>In the Environmental Statement, Volume 5, annex 2.3: MCZ Assessment presents an assessment which is based on the draft Conservation Advice Package for Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ, as provided by Natural England in May 2017.</p>
Natural England	<p>Section 2.3 Key concerns: Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ</p> <p>Due to complex management issues in relation to the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ, Natural England has prioritised the drafting of the conservation advice package for this site and have shared supplementary advice on the conservation objectives with key stakeholders including DONG Energy in June 2017. It was hoped that sharing this information would aid DONG Energy in developing your assessments (The draft conservation objectives will be formally consulted on in September 2017).</p>	I	<p>In the Environmental Statement, Volume 5, annex 2.3: MCZ Assessment presents an assessment which is based on feedback from members of the MCZ Working Group and the draft Conservation Advice Package for Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ, as provided by Natural England in May 2017.</p>
Natural England	<p>Section 2.3 Key concerns: Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ</p> <p>We acknowledge that the final conservation advice package is not yet available for this site, no site specific survey data and limited information on the method, scale and extent of any impacts arising from the proposed cable installation. However, based on our experience of previous cable installations and our understanding of the sensitivity of the MCZ features (Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ interest features : Moderate energy infralittoral rock, High energy infralittoral rock, Moderate energy circalittoral rock, High energy circalittoral rock, Subtidal chalk, Subtidal coarse sediment, Subtidal mixed sediments, Subtidal sand, Peat and clay exposures, and North Norfolk Coast (subtidal geological feature)) , Natural England is presently of the view, that Hornsea Three export cable installation will have a significant impact on the interest features of the site (This advice is provided on the information currently available and does not preclude due process being followed and/or changes in SNCB advice when there is more certainty in relation to project design.). This is because the cable installation is likely to cause direct loss of habitat and loss in the quality of the surrounding habitat, thus hindering the conservation objectives for the site. Therefore, we advise that the MCZ report on the potential impacts will need to be completed in full prior to project submission. To aid with this Natural England is in the process of developing a Chalk reefiness criteria using similar principles to that of Gubbay (2007) for Sabellaria spinulosa reef. We are also reviewing the MCZ designation criteria to better inform the significance of any impact to this site and consider alternative Measures of Equivalent Environmental Benefit (MEEB) options.</p>	I	<p>In the Environmental Statement, Volume 5, annex 2.3: MCZ Assessment presents a complete Stage 1 assessment of the effects of Hornsea Three on the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ, which is based on feedback from members of the MCZ Working Group and the draft Conservation Advice Package for Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ, as provided by Natural England in May 2017. This has also considered the draft chalk "reefiness" criteria provided by Natural England in November 2017 (section 4.2 of volume 5, annex 2.3: MCZ Assessment).</p> <p>On the basis of the Hornsea Three offshore cable corridor re-route presented in the Environmental Statement, direct impacts to subtidal chalk habitats and peat and clay habitats, such as may arise from cable burial, are no longer predicted to occur as these habitats were not recorded within the offshore cable corridor. The only designated feature of the MCZ now present within the offshore cable corridor, and therefore has the potential to be directly impacted by cable installation activities, is Subtidal sand. Discussions on the effects of Hornsea Three on the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ is presented in full within volume 5, annex 2.3: MCZ Assessment.</p> <p>Volume 5, annex 2.1: Benthic Ecology Technical Report and volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology have been updated to include the results of the analysis of the DDV transects undertaken in the area of subcropping rock in the nearshore area. Detailed stony reef assessments were not undertaken on the DDV footage, due to the minimum elevation and patchiness criteria for stony reefs and subtidal chalk reefs (using the qualitative reefiness descriptions for subtidal chalk reef as provided by Natural England, though the EWG) not being met.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>15</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Natural England	Section 2.3 Key concerns: Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ Natural England welcomes DONG Energy's commitment to following due process and working through the MCZ stages with all interested parties to identify possible mitigation measures during the pre-application phase of the project. It is important that the Evidence Plan working group explores all other means of delivering the project which would create a substantially lower risk of hindering the achievement of the conservation objectives of the site, as set out in Stage 1 assessment. Due to the accelerated timeframes for the project, Natural England is mindful of the limited time available to consider the stages both in full and sequentially. We recognise that the identification of appropriate mitigation measures to reduce the impacts on the features of the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ, to an acceptable level will be challenging and therefore we advise that consideration of MEEB as set out in Stage 2 should also be considered as soon as possible and in parallel to following due process. Natural England would be happy to explore options further with DONG Energy.	Y	Due to the re-reroute of the offshore cable corridor in the nearshore environment, effects on the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ are considerably reduced from those presented in the PEIR, with no direct impact from cable installation on the Subtidal Chalk or Peat and Clay Exposures features (see the Environmental Statement, volume 5, annex 2.3: MCZ Assessment). As outlined in section 5.1 of volume 5, annex 2.3: MCZ Assessment, this presents a substantially lower risk of hindering the achievement of conservation objectives of this site. Hornsea Three therefore believe that the potential impacts on the site have been managed through Stage 1 of the MCZ Assessment process and that there is no need to progress to Stage 2.  Hornsea Three continue to discuss the effects of cable installation on the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ with Natural England and other stakeholders in the MCZ Working Group.
Natural England	Section 2.3 Key concerns: Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ As discussed during the MCZ workshops, we have limited information on the impacts on the MCZ features and their ability to recover following the export cable installation for both Dudgeon and Sheringham Shoal offshore windfarms (OWFs). It would therefore be highly beneficial if DONG Energy could collect multibeam/geophysical and video data along these OWF cable routes to provide more confidence for the decision making process and identification of mitigation measures. Therefore until more information is known about the habitats that will be impacted and the method, scale and extent of any impacts arising from the proposed cable installation Natural England is unable to provide our full nature conservation advice on the MCZ assessment and/or support any of the conclusions include in the Stage 1 assessment on the significance of any impact.	I	During Hornsea Three site specific surveys (see the Environmental Statement, section 4.2 of volume 5, annex 2.3: MCZ Assessment), attempts were made to collect video footage over the export cables for these other offshore wind farms, although due to fishing conflicts these attempts were unsuccessful.
Natural England	Section 2.3 Key concerns: Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ Natural England is concerned about the WCS of 25% of each cable running through the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ requiring cable protection in addition to that required for cable/pipeline crossings. If this is case then the conservation objectives for particular interest features for the site will be permanently hindered by the proposals because based on experience from other projects the protection will not be removed at the time of decommissioning and the material used will alter the seabed characteristics. A larger area of the MCZ interest features may also be impacted if the linear protection interrupts/disrupts wave action and/or sediment bedload transport. Therefore, we advise that a Stage two assessment is required.	Y	As outlined in the Environmental Statement in paragraph 2.11.2.31 of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology, the maximum design scenario for long term habitat loss within the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ assumes that cable protection is placed over up to 10% of the up to 6 km of export cables within the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ (i.e. up to six cables each up to 1 km in length). This has been reduced from the values at PEIR based on stakeholder feedback  A full assessment of the effects of cable protection (i.e. long term and permanent habitat loss) on features of the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds is presented in the Environmental Statement in section 5.1 of volume 5, annex 2.3: MCZ Assessment. This includes consideration of the potential effects on sediment transport and wave action, as attributes of the site's broadscale habitat features and the feature of geological interest.
Natural England	1.8 The description of seabed preparation for gravity base foundations is lacking any mention of new material introduction onto the seabed, such as gravel or rock dumping into the 'cleared' area to ensure foundation stability. (Volume 1, chapter 3, paragraph 3.6.4.36)	I	With respect to the benthic ecology assessment, all habitat directly within the footprint of the turbine and associated scour protection has been assessed as long term habitat loss in the Environmental Statement in paragraphs 2.11.2.3 of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology.
Natural England	Section 2.3 Key concerns: Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ It is considered that whilst impacts from Sheringham Shoal and Dudgeon OWFs should not be considered a plan or project unless they are a new activity, an MCZ Assessment for a Hornsea Three should consider their implications to the conservation objective attributes of the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ.	I	The export cables from these two offshore wind farm projects were installed prior to Hornsea Three site specific surveys being completed and therefore they are considered to be part of the existing baseline for the project (see the Environmental Statement, section 5.1 of volume 5, annex 2.3: MCZ Assessment). The potential for cumulative effects due to maintenance activities were investigated, although no information is currently available on these at the time of writing (if they are required at all).

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>15</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Natural England	Section 2.3 Key concerns: Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ Whilst the Supplementary Advice on Conservation Objectives (SACO) currently state 'maintain' as the objective target for most of the attributes, this is because currently we have no evidence from the windfarms to state otherwise. However, based on the worst case scenario presented for this project we believe impacts from previous projects are influencing the ability of the site to be restored to a more natural state; we need to have greater certainty that Hornsea Three, alone and in-combination will not further hinder recovery. A less precautionary approach to our advice may be taken if and when there is sufficient level of confidence that the site remains in favourable conservation status.	I	In the Environmental Statement, Volume 5, annex 2.3: MCZ Assessment has been completed based on the information provided by Natural England in the SACO (i.e. conservation objective of "maintain"). The export cables from these two offshore wind farm projects were installed prior to Hornsea Three site specific surveys being completed and therefore they are considered to be part of the existing baseline for the project (see volume 5, annex 2.3: MCZ Assessment). The potential for cumulative effects due to maintenance activities were investigated, although no information is currently available on these at the time of writing (if they are required at all).
Natural England	Section 2.3 Key concerns: Markham's triangle rMCZ We do not believe that the PEIR provides enough evidence for, or assessment of, impact to protected features or site integrity for Markham's Triangle recommended MCZ. DONG Energy has used a 'maintain' GMA for the rMCZ on which to base their assessment. JNCC current recommendation provided to Defra is to consider the features to be in need of restoration, therefore DONG Energy should reconsider the assessment of the features and the site in light of this. As such, we currently cannot agree that the project will not hinder the conservation objectives of the site features. We expect the final application to include the following: - Assessment based on restore objective; - Assessment comprising all potential features, including subtidal mixed sediments. We note that worst case scenario represents 2.49% temporary loss of subtidal coarse sediments or 11.78% of subtidal sandy sediments. We expect inclusion of worst case scenario for mixed sediments before providing any further comments. We are content that the impact on the subtidal mud feature is not assessed as there is no overlap of activity as currently proposed and the mud feature.	I	In the Environmental Statement, Volume 5, annex 2.3: MCZ Assessment has been updated to take into account the comments on Markham's Triangle rMCZ. This includes consideration of the "recover to favourable condition" conservation objective for the site and consideration of all potential features of the rMCZ, i.e. including Subtidal Mixed Sediments and Subtidal Mud. Further evidence has also been presented in section 5.2 of volume 5, annex 2.3: MCZ Assessment as discussed and agreed with the MCZ Working Group  The benthic ecology assessment of impacts to designated features of the Markham's Triangle rMCZ has also been updated to also include consideration of Mixed sediments (see Table 2.11 of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology). Numbers for temporary and long terms habitat loss of this feature are now presented in section 2.11.1 and 2.11.2, respectively of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology.
Natural England	2.3.1 Vol. 1 Chapter 2 Table 3.36 The total maximum length of all the export cables is estimated at 1,038 km. In light of this number we would like some clarification of why DONG Energy considers a diversion of around 1.5 km to avoid the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds Marine Conservation Zone (MCZ) to be significant in terms of cost?	Y	The offshore cable corridor in the nearshore environment has now been rerouted to avoid direct impact from cable installation on the Subtidal Chalk feature of the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ (see volume 5, annex 2.3: MCZ Assessment).
Natural England	2.3.2 Vol. 1 Chapter 2 – Project Description Table 3.44 The Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD) exit pit dimensions are given at 30 x 50 x 4 m. The section does not explain whether any additional area of seabed would be disturbed or require clearance during preparation works for exit pit excavation. Impacts on both subtidal and intertidal should be considered.	I	HDD has been discussed as a potential construction activity within the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ in the benthic ecology chapter (see the Environmental Statement, volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology), although as discussed in Table 2.14 the maximum design scenario is for open cut trenching rather than HDD and, as such, numbers for temporary habitat loss associated with this activity are not presented within the chapter.  Impacts of HDD exit pits on features of the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ are considered in the Environmental Statement, section 5.1 of volume 5, annex 2.3: MCZ Assessment.
Natural England	2.3.3 Vol. 5 Annex 2.3 – MCZ Assessment 1.2.1.2 'It should be noted that although the structure and presentation of information in the Shadow MCZ Assessment will change for the final application, the information underpinning the assessment presented in this report provides a robust assessment on the relevant protected features of the MCZ and is considered appropriate for informing the Section 42 consultation process.' We disagree with the statement above as it is expected that site-specific benthic data will form part of the MCZ assessment. Please also note that the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ advice on the conservation objectives sent to DONG Energy in June 2017 should be used over the Thanet Coast MCZ objectives, as the supplementary information will form the basis for the consultation on the draft conservation objectives for the site which will be consulted on in September 2017.	I	In the Environmental Statement, Volume 5, annex 2.3: MCZ Assessment presents a complete assessment, including site specific and desktop data to characterise the baseline environment (as agreed with the MCZ Working Group) and based on the draft Conservation Advice Package for Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ, as provided by Natural England in May 2017.



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>15</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Natural England	<p>2.3.4 Vol. 5 Annex 2.3 – MCZ Assessment</p> <p>2.4.3 Natural England refers DONG Energy to supplementary conservation advice provided in June 2017, that considers the vulnerability of each of the features. It is hoped that over the next 6 months the work we are currently doing to develop a chalk reefiness criteria can be used in conjunction with site specific survey data to undertake a more quantitative assessment to understand the scale of the scale of the impacts.</p>	I	<p>In the Environmental Statement, Volume 5, annex 2.3: MCZ Assessment presents a complete Stage 1 assessment of the effects of Hornsea Three on the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ, which is based on feedback from members of the MCZ Working Group and the draft Conservation Advice Package for Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ, as provided by Natural England in June 2017. This has also considered the draft chalk "reefiness" criteria provided by Natural England in November 2017 (section 4.2 of volume 5, annex 2.3: MCZ Assessment).</p> <p>In the Environmental Statement, Volume 5, annex 2.1: Benthic Ecology Technical Report and volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology chapter have been updated to include the results of the analysis of the DDV transects undertaken in the area of subcropping rock in the nearshore area. Detailed stony reef assessments were not undertaken on the DDV footage, due to the minimum elevation and patchiness criteria for stony reefs and subtidal chalk reefs (using the qualitative reefiness descriptions for subtidal chalk reef as provided by Natural England, though the EWG) not being met.</p>
Natural England	<p>2.3.5 Vol. 5 Annex 2.3 – MCZ Assessment</p> <p>3.3 The permanent change to the structure of the interest features of the site has not been included in the assessment and should be as currently there is no evidence/mitigation measure presented to demonstrate that impacts from the construction of jointing bays etc. will not have a significant impact. O&amp;M disturbance was screened out as deemed insignificant in Benthic Ecology assessment. This should be included in the MCZ assessment. Associated infrastructure such as anchors, spud cans, geotechnical investigations and /or permanent geological impacts should also be included in the assessment.</p>	I	<p>In the Environmental Statement, Volume 5, annex 2.3: MCZ Assessment presents a complete assessment, including consideration of effects of cable protection (and long term/permanent effects of these), HDD exit pits, potential maintenance activities (including cable repair or remedial reburial) and anchor/jack up barge placement on features of the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ.</p> <p>The assessments of temporary habitat disturbance to designated features of the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ and Markham's Triangle rMCZ during the operation and maintenance phase have also been updated and are presented in the Environmental Statement in paragraphs 2.11.2.145 of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology.</p>
Natural England	<p>2.3.6 Vol. 5 Annex 2.3 – MCZ Assessment</p> <p>3.3.1.1 Long term has not been defined – one would argue that long term for the life time of the project infers that the impact will be removed at the time of decommissioning and that there would be full recovery to pre-construction status. Natural England is aware from other projects including Oil and Gas that the removal of rock protection cable project at the time of decommissioning is not feasible and therefore the impacts from cable protection are considered permanent.</p>	I	<p>In the Environmental Statement, Section 5.1 of volume 5, annex 2.3: MCZ Assessment presents a complete assessment of the effects of cable protection on features of the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ. This includes long term habitat loss (i.e. during the lifetime of the project) and permanent habitat loss (i.e. beyond the decommissioning phase, assuming cable protection is not removed).</p>
Natural England	<p>1.9 The use of permanent rock placement around structures should be minimised as much as possible in soft sediment environments. (Volume 1, chapter 3, paragraph 3.6.4.56)</p>	I	<p>The maximum design scenario for scour protection and cable protection is presented in Table 2.14 of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology in the Environmental Statement. Cable protection requirements for Hornsea Three offshore cable corridor will be detailed in the Cable Specification and Installation Plan that will be agreed in consultation with statutory consultees. This document will detail the technical specification of the offshore electrical system, including a cable burial risk assessment or similar, cable protection specification and installation risk mitigation measures.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>15</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Natural England	2.3.7 Vol. 5 Annex 2.3 – MCZ Assessment Fig. 4.1 Natural England does not agree with the use of Valued Ecological Receptors (VERs) for this particular site especially when site specific data is lacking. Biotope mapping should be considered in more detail once the survey data is available.	I	The biotope map for the nearshore area (Figure 2.5 of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology in the Environmental Statement) has also been updated on the basis of the site specific surveys.  As agreed with Natural England, volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology in the Environmental Statement has been substantially revised to address Natural England's comments on VERs. This has included revisions to the VERs to better align with designated features of the relevant protected areas in the area (e.g. Annex I sandbanks has been included as a VER). Each assessment section has also been amended to include separate sections for the consideration of impacts to the features of designated sites and, as requested by Natural England, further information on the sensitivity, recoverability etc. of the component biotopes of the designated features (as mapped during the site-specific surveys) has been provided. In the Environmental Statement, Volume 5, annex 2.3: MCZ Assessment has also been updated to remove reference to VERs as agreed with the MCZ Working Group. Instead, sensitivity is discussed in relation to the MCZ/rMCZ features and the communities/biotopes recorded within the MCZ/rMCZ during site specific surveys.
Natural England	2.3.8 Vol. 5 Annex 2.3 – MCZ Assessment 5.1.2 Natural England does not agree with how definitions of how temporary/long term/permanent have been applied for this site and is not consistent with the conservation objectives of the site.	I	In the Environmental Statement, Volume 5, annex 2.3: MCZ Assessment has been updated based on feedback from members of the MCZ Working Group and the draft Conservation Advice Package for Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ, as provided by Natural England in May 2017.
Natural England	2.3.9 Vol. 5 Annex 2.3 – MCZ Assessment 5.1.2.3 Sediments are expected to infill the trench naturally, however, Natural England would like to understand how a scenario whereby infilling does not occur and/or maximum cable burial depth is not achieved. Re-colonisation also needs to be considered. 'It should also be noted that the predicted habitat loss/disturbance is likely to be intermittent throughout the duration of the construction phase, with cables being laid within the MCZ over a maximum of three phases, with only a proportion of the total habitat loss/disturbance predicted to occur at any one time and recovery of associated communities commencing immediately after cable installation.' Contrary to what is implied above, impacts stretched over 11 years (as indicated in the worst case scenario) are potentially worse than a single construction event.	I	Hornsea Three may be constructed over up to two phases, however following cable installation, there will be no potential for repeat direct physical disturbance to the footprint of seabed previously impacted by cable burial as this would pose a risk to the integrity of the cable. The potential for repeat habitat disturbance would, therefore, be limited to that associated with the deposition of fine sediments from cable installation works in adjacent areas (see the assessment of temporary habitat loss in the Environmental Statement in section 2.11.1 of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology). Further, Volume 5, annex 2.3: MCZ Assessment presents a complete Stage 1 assessment, including consideration of potential residual depressions on the seabed where cables have been installed and repeat disturbance over the construction phase (accounting for phasing).
Natural England	2.3.10 Vol. 5 Annex 2.3 – MCZ Assessment 5.1.2.4 The quality of the chalk and recoverability should also be taken into consideration.	Y	Due to the re-reroute of the offshore cable corridor in the nearshore environment, there will be no direct impact from cable installation on the Subtidal Chalk feature of the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ (see the Environmental Statement, volume 5, annex 2.3: MCZ Assessment).
Natural England	2.3.11 Vol. 5 Annex 2.3 – MCZ Assessment 5.1.2.6-5.1.2.7 Under the conservation objectives for the site Natural England does not believe that any permanent impact to the interest features of the site can be considered to be minor.	I	In the Environmental Statement, Section 5.1 of volume 5, annex 2.3: MCZ Assessment considers the implications of cable protection (and consequently long term/permanent habitat loss) on the conservation objectives for Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>15</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Natural England	2.3.12 Vol. 5 Annex 2.3 – MCZ Assessment 5.1.2.12 'The subtidal coarse sediment, subtidal mixed sediment and subtidal sand features of the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ are considered to be of low to high vulnerability, high recoverability and national importance and therefore were considered to have a medium sensitivity to this impact.' Assigned medium sensitivity to the sediment feature MCZ, which is an 'average' for all three different features. Features should be assigned their own sensitivity and assessed individually.	I	Each assessment section in the Environmental Statement in volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology has been updated to include separate sections for the consideration of impacts to the features of designated sites and, as requested by Natural England, further information on the sensitivity, recoverability etc. of the component biotopes of the designated features (as mapped during the site-specific surveys) has been provided.  Volume 5, annex 2.3: MCZ Assessment has also been updated to remove reference to VERs as agreed with the MCZ Working Group. Instead, sensitivity is discussed in relation to the MCZ/rMCZ features and the communities/biotopes recorded within the MCZ/rMCZ during site specific surveys, using MarESA definitions to ensure consistency with Natural England Conservation Advice.
Natural England	2.3.13 Vol. 5 Annex 2.3 – MCZ Assessment 5.1.2.15 'Hornsea Three is currently investigating the feasibility of avoiding these features and will seek to use this to mitigate these potential impacts, where possible, as the project evolves.' – Natural England has fundamental concerns in relation to whether or not HDD is considered to be suitable mitigation measure as the technique may be damaging in its right, due to impacts on the interest features from the yet undefined exit pit works.	I	HDD operations have been discussed within the Environmental Statement in volume 5, annex 2.3: Marine Conservation Zone Assessment, although this method of cable installation will not represent an effective mitigation for effects on the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ.
Natural England	2.3.14 Vol. 5 Annex 2.3 – MCZ Assessment 5.1.2.16 In the final MCZ assessment we will be looking for evidence for all the attributes of all the features, not just extent and structures and functions, quality and composition of characteristic biological communities. Here supporting evidence is suggested to come from the aggregates industry. However, not all of the habitats that are present in the MCZ are typical dredged habitats in the aggregates industry.	I	In the Environmental Statement in Volume 5, annex 2.3: MCZ Assessment presents a complete Stage 1 assessment of the effects of Hornsea Three on the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ, which is based on feedback from members of the MCZ Working Group and the draft Conservation Advice Package for Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ, as provided by Natural England in May 2017. This includes discussion of the attributes and targets for each of the MCZ/rMCZ features.
Natural England	2.3.15 Vol. 5 Annex 2.3 – MCZ Assessment 5.1.2.17 Natural England is concerned that any mitigation measures that involve the creation of exit pits in areas of mixed sediment will also have permanent impacts. Along the Humber Gateway OWF export cable route it was predicted that there would be a total loss of habitat (sediment and species) where the inter-array and export cable went through the stony reef/mixed sediment. It was concluded that other than avoiding these areas there were no mitigation and/or restoration measures available. Post-consent monitoring is showing there are clear scars where the cable installation has occurred and the remaining sediment is more uniform which has changed the distribution and abundance of epifauna in the area. It is not believed that the impacted areas will ever fully recover.	I	HDD operations have been discussed in the Environmental Statement within volume 5, annex 2.3: Marine Conservation Zone Assessment, although this method of cable installation will not represent an effective mitigation for effects on the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ. The baseline environment of the Holderness coast is quite different to that of the North Norfolk coast. Humber Gateway is characterised by cobble and boulder reef habitat, while no such reef habitats have been recorded during Hornsea Three site specific surveys. Where boulders/cobbles were recorded (e.g. in the inshore part of the offshore cable corridor), these were generally scattered across small patches and did not represent reef habitat (see section 5.1.2 of volume 5, annex 2.3: Marine Conservation Zone Assessment).
Natural England	2.3.16 Vol. 5 Annex 2.3 – MCZ Assessment 5.1.2.21 Natural England would like to see an assessment of the impacts of drilling/cutting chalk. We advise this because fine chalk particles have high potential of being suspended in the water column leading to increased turbidity (for example the Lincs and Lynn and Inner Dowsing OWF installation).	I	The assessment of temporary increases in SSC and sediment deposition (see the Environmental Statement, section 2.11.1 of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology) has been updated to include the assessment in volume 2, chapter 1: Marine Processes relating to the installation of cables in nearshore areas of the Hornsea Three offshore cable corridor in areas of seabed where chalk is present at or very close to the surface.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>15</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Natural England	2.3.17 Vol. 5 Annex 2.3 – MCZ Assessment Table 5.2 Even if no additional cable protection is allowed, cable crossing protection alone would lead to an estimated loss of 117 600 m <sup>2</sup> , which may be considered as significant depending on the results of the survey data and location of the crossing points.	Y	Due to the re-reroute of the offshore cable corridor in the nearshore environment, there will be no cable/pipeline crossings in either the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ nor the Wash and North Norfolk Coast SAC.
Natural England	2.3.18 Vol. 5 Annex 2.3 – MCZ Assessment 5.1.3.7 We believe that the loss of habitat impact is irreversible and will continue beyond the lifetime of the project.	I	In the Environmental Statement, Section 5.1 of volume 5, annex 2.3: MCZ Assessment considers both the effects on Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ during the lifetime of Hornsea Three and following decommissioning (i.e. assuming all cable protection is left in situ).
Natural England	2.3.19 Vol. 5 Annex 2.3 – MCZ Assessment 5.1.3.13 The text here contradicts the 25% cable protection quoted in 5.1.3.1. Therefore, it would be helpful to have clarity on this. Also, refer to the comment above to Fig. 4.1 in relation to VERs.	I	The assessment in the Environmental Statement in section 5.1 volume 5, annex 2.3: MCZ Assessment assumes cable protection may be installed over up to 10% of export cables within the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ.
Natural England	2.3.20 Vol. 5 Annex 2.3 – MCZ Assessment A.1.1.4 Natural England reiterates that until the method, scale and extent of any impacts arising from the proposed cable installation is known we do not support the assumption that the impacts will only be temporary.	I	In the Environmental Statement, Volume 5, annex 2.3: MCZ Assessment presents a complete assessment of the effects of Hornsea Three on the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ and Markham's Triangle rMCZ, based on feedback from members of the MCZ Working Group and the draft Conservation Advice Package for Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ, as provided by Natural England in May 2017. This includes further justification for the conclusions made, as discussed and agreed with the MCZ Working Group.
Natural England	2.3.21 Vol. 5 Annex 2.3 – MCZ Assessment Tables A.1 and A.2 As set out in the comment to section 5.1.2.17 above, the impacts to coarse and mixed sediment are unlikely to be temporary and/or reversible and therefore the assessment should be amended to reflect experience from other OWFs.	I	In the Environmental Statement in Volume 5, annex 2.3: MCZ Assessment presents a complete assessment of the effects of Hornsea Three on the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ and Markham's Triangle rMCZ, based on feedback from members of the MCZ Working Group and the draft Conservation Advice Package for Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ, as provided by Natural England in May 2017. This includes further justification for the conclusions made, including sensitivity information on the affected broadscale habitat features affected, as discussed and agreed with the MCZ Working Group.
Natural England	2.3.22 Vol. 5 Annex 2.3 – MCZ Assessment Table A.4 As set out in the comment to section 2.4.3 above, the significance of any impact to subtidal chalk will depend on the quality of the chalk and not just based on the extent of the impact.	I	Due to the re-reroute of the offshore cable corridor in the nearshore environment, there will be no direct impact from cable installation on the Subtidal Chalk feature of the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ (see the Environmental Statement, volume 5, annex 2.3: MCZ Assessment).
Natural England	2.3.23 Vol. 5 Annex 2.3 – MCZ Assessment Table A.7 As set out in 2.4.4.4 of the shadow MCZ assessment there should be no significant risk of the activity hindering the achievement of the conservation objectives stated for the site. For the geomorphological features the conservation target is to 'maintain' therefore as part of the Evidence Plan process further consideration will need to be given to any cable installation proposals as this may not be achievable for chalk and clay features.	I	In the Environmental Statement, Section 5.1 of volume 5, annex 2.3: MCZ Assessment considers fully the effects of cable installation and operation on the geomorphological feature of the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ. Due to the re-reroute of the offshore cable corridor in the nearshore environment, there will be no direct impact from cable installation on the Subtidal Chalk feature of the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ).



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>15</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Natural England	1.11 Natural England supports sandwave clearance outside of designated sites, because this is preferential to cable burial remedial works involving additional rock placement. A requirement for a sandwave levelling plan should be included in the Deemed Marine Licences or included as part of the bed levelling plan. Full details should also be provided on the disposal of dredged material. (Volume 1, chapter 3, paragraph 3.6.5.9)	I	Details of sandwave clearance would be included in the Cable Specification and Installation Plan that is secured within the DMLs (Application document reference A3.1). Details of the disposal of this material are provided in the Environmental Statement Volume 4, Annex 3.2: Dredging and Disposal (Site Characterisation). It should be noted that it is important for this activity to also be conducted in designated sites as it will increase the chances of successful burial which is understood to be preferential to cable protection.
Natural England	Annex 1 Key concerns We note that DONG Energy is considering a number of locations for the HVAC Substation. We do not consider it appropriate to be considering locations that would result in an impact to a protected site when other locations are available outside the protected sites. As such, we would expect the final application to narrow down the HVAC search area to locations outside the border of the North Norfolk Sandbanks and Saturn Reef (NNSSR) cSAC/SCI.	Y	This comment was considered and taken on board during the further refinements to the offshore HVAC booster station search area. As such this no longer overlaps with the North Norfolk Sandbanks and Saturn Reef SAC.
Natural England	Annex 1 Key concerns Natural England has a particular interest in the 1 535 001 m2 included for scour prevention as this could have significant environmental impacts depending on the amount and location. Natural England would expect a Scour prevention/Cable protection plan(s) to be provided as part of the application. We would also expect the Deemed Marine Licences to include a requirement to submit a finalised cable installation plan based on or as part of the Cable Burial Risk Assessment Plan prior to the commencement of offshore construction, which should be linked to the Scour prevention/Cable protection plan(s).	I	Environmental Statement in Volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology has been updated with revised project description details for scour and cable protection; the full breakdown of these numbers is presented in the Table 2.14 for long term habitat loss during the operation and maintenance phase, and assessed in paragraphs 2.11.2.3 et seq.  A Scour Protection Management Plan (SPMP) detailing the need, type, sources, quantity, location and installation methods for scour protection will be produced and submitted to the MMO prior to construction.  Cable protection requirements will be detailed in the Cable Specification and Installation Plan which will be produced prior to construction and agreed in consultation with statutory consultees. This document will detail the technical specification of the offshore electrical system, including a cable burial risk assessment or similar, cable protection specification and installation risk mitigation measures.  A Cable Specification and Installation Plan (detailing the technical specification of the offshore electrical system, including a cable burial risk assessment, cable protection specification and installation risk mitigation measures) will be developed prior to construction.  A Scour Protection Management Plan detailing the need, type, sources, quantity, location and installation methods for scour protection and cable armoring will be developed prior to construction.
Natural England	1.32 Temporary or long term loss or alteration of benthic habitats: the table states the habitats are expected to recover within 5 years, however the assessment does not appear to consider phased build as well as continued disturbance from maintenance activities. Such repeated and prolonged impacts on an area of benthic habitat may result in an impact being long-term rather than temporary. Seabed disturbance from maintenance operations impact should therefore be assessed together with other activities that may cause seabed disturbance. (Volume 2, chapter 12, Table 12.6)	I	Further consideration of the potential effects of repeat disturbance throughout the construction phase, to benthic habitats, has been included in the assessment of temporary habitat loss/disturbance in section 2.11.1 of Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology. Project lifetime effects, including the scope for effects associated with temporary habitat loss to interact across project phases (i.e. construction, and operation and maintenance) have been considered in Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 12: Inter-related Effects.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>15</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Natural England	<p>1.33 'Based on current understanding, and expert knowledge, the greatest potential for inter-related impacts is predicted to arise through the following: i. the interaction of direct (both temporary and permanent) habitat loss /disturbance from foundation installation/jacking-up/anchor placement/scour, indirect habitat disturbance due to sediment deposition and indirect effects of changes in physical processes due to the operational wind farm &lt;...&gt;'. 'these individual impacts were assigned a significance of minor adverse as standalone impacts and although potential combined impacts may arise (i.e. spatial and temporal overlap of direct habitat disturbance), it is predicted that this will not be any more significant than the individual impacts in isolation. &lt;...&gt; As such, these interactions are predicted to be no greater than the individual effects assessed in isolation.' The justification presented in the table does not provide evidence from survey and/or literature to support the above conclusions. Contrary to the worst case scenario approach, the 'lower' significance of residual effect of standalone impacts is considered for receptor-led interactions (for example, the impact 'Temporary or long term loss or alteration of benthic habitats' may produce a minor to moderate residual effect, however this is not acknowledged). (Volume 2, chapter 12, Table 12.6)</p>	I	Project lifetime effects, including the scope for effects associated with temporary habitat loss to interact across project phases (i.e. construction, and operation and maintenance) have been considered in the Environmental Statement in volume 2, chapter 12: Inter-related Effects. Further consideration of the potential effects of repeat disturbance throughout the construction phase, to benthic habitats, has been included in the assessment of temporary habitat loss/disturbance in the Environmental Statement in volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology. Project lifetime effects, including the scope for effects associated with temporary habitat loss to interact across project phases (i.e. construction, and operation and maintenance) have been considered in Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 12: Inter-related Effects.
Natural England	<p>Annex 1 Key concern Natural England advises that the application should include a thorough consideration of O&amp;M activities, especially in relation to offshore cable replacement and reburial. This would be consistent with other OWF applications.</p>	I	The maximum design scenario presented in Table 2.14 of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology has been updated with revised project description details regarding cable maintenance during the operation and maintenance phase. The updated assessment is presented in paragraphs 2.11.2.143 of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology.
Natural England	<p>1.39 Vol. 4 Annex 3.2 Fig. 1.1 The Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ is excluded from the proposed disposal site area, however, HDD pit excavation will involve placement of material on the seabed. Although this is described as a temporary measure, this could be in place for several years and as such should potentially be considered as disposal site. To minimise the loss of sediment from the offshore sandbank system it is important that disposal of dredged material occurs in the vicinity allowing it to be re-distributed throughout the local environment. Currently the proposed disposal site boundary follows that of the offshore cable corridor. Disposal of material restricted to that area may result in the net loss of material from the NNSSR cSAC/SCI as the sediment is brought outside site boundary by prevailing north-easterly sediment transport. The application should consider disposal of material further south outside the present cable corridor boundary to ensure the loss of sediment from the sandbank system is minimised.</p>	I	<p>In the Environmental Statement, paragraph 2.11.1.86 of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology outlines that material arising from sandwave clearance activities within the MCZ will be deposited within the boundary of the project and at a location that takes into account the net direction of sediment transport in the region to ensure that sediment will not be lost from the sandbank system. This will also be the case for all designated sites where With regards to Marine Processes, It is proposed to extend the disposal site to include the nearshore area and include material placed as part of HDD exit pit excavation. Hornsea Three appreciates the principal of maintaining sediment within the sandbank system. However, our understanding is that it would not be necessary to extend the disposal site in the way suggested in order to achieve this aim. Hornsea Three is happy to discuss this further with Natural England. Dredging and disposal is also considered within Environmental Statement volume 4, annex 3.2: Dredging and Disposal (Site Characterisation)</p>
Natural England	<p>1.42 Vol. 4 Annex 3.2 Table 5.1 A number of impacts listed does not refer directly to the proposed activity of 'disposal of spoil'. The table needs to be re-written to make sure the impacts identified refer to this activity. For example, 'Marine Processes – Removal of sandwaves impacting sandbank systems within proximity to the Hornsea Three array area and offshore cable corridor.' The above impact would not result from disposal of spoil but from bed preparation activities. The potential impact from disposal could include: loss/input of sediment into a sandbank system as a result of disposal activities. 'Subtidal Benthic Ecology – Temporary habitat loss/disturbance due to cable laying operations (including anchor placements), spud-can leg impacts from jack-up operations and seabed preparation works for GBFs, may affect benthic ecology.' The above impact is unlikely to result from disposal activities, unless the hopper barge needs to anchor in the area of disposal.</p>	I	As described in the Environmental Statement in volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology, due to the depth of sediment deposition associated with disposal activities (e.g. GBS seabed preparation and sandwave clearance) this has been considered temporary habitat loss as many benthic species will most likely suffer mortality beneath these areas.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>15</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Natural England	<p>1.3 It would be useful if the table explained how the numbers were derived, i.e. '342 turbines with gravity bases of X m2 area + Y m2 area of associated bed preparation'. Natural England has a particular interest in the 1 535 001 m2 included for scour prevention as this could have significant environmental impacts depending on the amount and location. Natural England advises that an indicative scour prevention and cable protection plan/s is provided as part of the application. (Volume 1, chapter 3, paragraph )</p>	I	<p>In the Environmental Statement, Table 2.14 of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology has been updated to include a breakdown of the habitat loss (temporary and long term) numbers. A Scour Protection Management Plan (SPMP) detailing the need, type, sources, quantity, location and installation methods for scour protection will be produced and submitted to the MMO prior to construction.</p> <p>Cable protection requirements will be detailed in the Cable Specification and Installation Plan which will be produced prior to construction and agreed in consultation with statutory consultees. This document will detail the technical specification of the offshore electrical system, including a cable burial risk assessment or similar, cable protection specification and installation risk mitigation measures.</p>
Natural England	<p>Section 2.2 Key concerns: Vol. 2 Chapter 2 Benthic Ecology Based on the information presented in the Benthic Ecology chapter and the technical annexes the SNCBs cannot currently provide an evidence-based opinion on the scale of the potential impacts to the Annex I Sabellaria spinulosa Reef feature of the NNSR cSAC/SCI. In order for us to form this opinion, DONG Energy will need to provide the following as part of the application:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Locations of ECR02 and ECR04 clearly marked on a map, showing their relationship to cable corridor and Sabellaria spinulosa reef. The maps in Fig. 2.2 and 2.3 (referenced in 2.7.1.9 Benthic Ecology chapter) as showing these survey stations do not currently show them;</li> <li>- Sabellaria spinulosa locations in offshore cable corridor and zone. These seem not to be fully outlined in Fig 2.5 (Benthic Ecology chapter).</li> <li>- Delineation of the extent of Sabellaria spinulosa at ECR04. Patchiness is an inherent quality of Sabellaria reef, and should not be a barrier to delineation of extent.</li> </ul> <p>JNCC has advised that any areas of Sabellaria spinulosa reef within the NNSR cSAC/SCI are at least 500 m away from any proposed operations. This does not appear to be the case in at least one area of the export cable corridor.</p> <p>We agree with the PEIR that the Saturn Reef Sabellaria spinulosa reef has moved in location, and that it is unknown whether this is due to movement of the original reef, or recolonization of a nearby area.</p> <p>JNCC is updating their Annex I reefs layer, which is currently with other conservation bodies for comment. It is anticipated that the full product will be available before 2018. Please see Appendix 2A (see NE Hornsea Three response p.30) at the end of this section that provides screenshots of the new layer for your convenience before the full product is available. The appendix also provides recommendations on the reefiness assessment.</p>	I	<p>A new figure, Figure 2.6, has been included within the Environmental Statement in volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology to show the location of the stations assessed for Annex I reef potential. Station ECR04, located within the North Norfolk Sandbanks and Saturn Reef SAC but outside the Hornsea Three offshore cable corridor, was assessed as 'low reef'. Station ECR02, located to the north of the North Norfolk Sandbanks and Saturn Reef SAC, was assessed as overall 'medium reef'. To reflect the potential S. spinulosa reef (outside an SAC/SCI) at ECR02 a new VER (Habitat E) has been added to the assessment (see Table 2.13 of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology). To confirm, no Annex I reef was recorded within the part of the Hornsea Three offshore cable corridor that coincides with the SAC, including in any areas that overlap with reefs identified by JNCC.</p> <p>As outlined in Table 2.18 of Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology, direct effects on this habitat will be controlled by mitigation informed by pre-construction surveys. Therefore, although the current extent of this feature has been mapped as far as possible, this information would be updated with pre-construction survey data such that the avoidance of Annex I reefs, where possible, will be on the basis of the extents of these reefs at the time of construction.</p> <p>However, in order to address uncertainties in the assessment with regard to the potential for direct impacts on potential future for S. spinulosa reefs (i.e. where avoidance is not possible in areas where reef has developed), a precautionary assessment of the effects to potential future Annex I reef has been included in volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology.</p>
Natural England	<p>Section 2.2 Key concerns: Vol. 2 Chapter 2 Benthic Ecology The sandbanks feature of the NNSR cSAC/SCI has not been assessed in many parts of the PEIR. As such, the SNCBs currently cannot provide any agreement on the impact from the proposed operations. We would need full assessment of the feature – beyond occasional discussion of VER A – within the impact assessment section of the benthic chapter.</p> <p>We recommend the application includes discussion on the structure of the sandbanks, informing whether particle size is different at the base of the proposed trenches to the surface particle size.</p>	I	<p>In the Environmental Statement, Volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology has been substantially revised to address Natural England's comments. This has included revisions to the VERs to better align with designated features of the relevant protected areas in the area (e.g. Annex I sandbanks has been included as a VER). Each assessment section has also been amended to include separate sections for the consideration of impacts to the features of designated sites and, as requested by Natural England, further information on the sensitivity, recoverability etc. of the component biotopes of the designated features (as mapped during the site-specific surveys) has been provided.</p> <p>With regards to particle size within the sandwaves, text has been added to the assessment of temporary habitat loss/disturbance (section 2.11.1 of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology) to clarify that, on the basis of sediment transport processes, it is reasonable to assume similarity of sediment particle size with depth. Therefore, the proposed sandwave clearance activities will result in local displacement of the disturbed sediment volume, which will remain the same sediment type as the surrounding seabed and with no loss of seabed sediments from the local area.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>15</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Natural England	Section 2.2 Key concerns: Vol. 2 Chapter 2 Benthic Ecology Phased build – there are elements of the phased build approach that have not been fully explored in the worst case scenario for cable installation as that includes all of the cables being installed at once and the extent of that impact. However, the ability for features to recover may be hindered by repetitive adjacent impacts from the installation and associated infrastructure.	I	Volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology of the Environmental Statement has been amended to clarify that direct repeat habitat disturbance to footprints of seabed previously impacted by cable burial (e.g. in a different construction phase) will not occur due to the risk to the integrity of the previously installed cable. The only potential to repeat disturbance may arise from the deposition of fine material associated with cable installation in future phases of the project but as all VERs have a low sensitivity to this impact, this is not predicted to impede recovery.
Natural England	Section 2.2 Key concerns: Vol. 2 Chapter 2 Benthic Ecology While we understand the clustering of VERs based on statistical analyses in the Technical Report, we question their use as an adequate assessment tool for impact on protected sites, habitats or species. We strongly recommend that DONG Energy uses the biotope level information provided in the Technical Report to assess the impacts within protected sites in order to align with the sites' designated features.	I	Environmental Statement, Volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology has been substantially revised so that the VERs better align with designated features of the relevant protected areas in the area (e.g. Annex I sandbanks has been included as a VER). Each assessment section has also been amended to include separate sections for the consideration of impacts to the features of designated sites and, as requested by Natural England, further information on the sensitivity, recoverability etc. of the component biotopes of the designated features (as mapped during the site-specific surveys) has been provided.
Natural England	Section 2.2 Key concerns: Vol. 2 Chapter 2 Benthic Ecology We do not consider that the magnitude categories currently used by DONG Energy are appropriate or assessable, especially those for Major and Moderate. We suggest that unmodified categories shown in Table 5.3, Vol. 1 Chapter 5, are used throughout the assessment.	I	The magnitude categories presented in the Environmental Statement in Table 2.16 of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology have been updated in line with the categories shown in Table 5.3 of volume 1, chapter 5: Environmental Impact Assessment Methodology.
Natural England	Section 2.2 Key concerns: Vol. 2 Chapter 2 Benthic Ecology Definitions of benthic impacts are too ambiguous to draw any conclusions from. The SNCBs would like to work with DONG Energy and their consultants to agree the definitions going forwards. For example, if an impact is being assessed per 'pressure' per lifetime phase, without noting areas of increased or decreased impact between phase, without using correct implications of impact length, and without using the UK standard ICGC pressures list we would be unable able to support the conclusion.	I	In the Environment Statement, Volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology has been substantially revised to address Natural England's comments. This has included revisions to the VERs to better align with designated features of the relevant protected areas in the area (e.g. Annex I sandbanks has been included as a VER). Each assessment section has also been amended to include separate sections for the consideration of impacts to the features of designated sites and, as requested by Natural England, further information on the sensitivity, recoverability etc. of the component biotopes of the designated features (as mapped during the site-specific surveys) has been provided.  However, as agreed with Natural England, outside the features of designated areas, the overall approach to the impact assessment has not be significantly revised. The impacts presented were identified in the Hornsea Three Scoping Report and the approach taken is consistent with those taken on Hornsea Project One and Hornsea Project Two, which were considered sufficiently detailed and robust to support consent applications for those projects.  The ICGC pressures list has also been reviewed in the redrafting of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology, and the relevant pressures for each impact heading have been identified together with the pressures and benchmarks defined in the MarESA, which have been used to inform the assessment. Impacts over the project lifetime are acknowledged and assessed in volume 2, chapter 12: Inter-related Effects (Offshore), addressing the comments made by Natural England on those sections.
Natural England	Section 2.2 Key concerns: Vol. 2 Chapter 2 Benthic Ecology Impact on both designated features of the NNSR cSAC/SCI should be considered fully in each section. JNCC is currently updating the Conservation Advice for the NNSR cSAC/SCI which is expected to become available in late September 2017. The update should prove helpful as it will provide further detail about assessment against conservation objectives. We expect DONG Energy to update the RIAA accordingly. Conservation objectives should be considered against the total impact, rather than individual impacts split by different sections of the project lifecycle. It is the SNCB position that the impact should be considered against the restore objective of the NNSR cSAC/SCI, as preventing adverse effect from Hornsea Three operations will not return the site into favourable condition.	I	Environmental Statement, Volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology has been substantially revised so that the VERs better align with designated features of the relevant protected areas in the area (e.g. Annex I sandbanks has been included as a VER). Each assessment section has also been amended to include separate sections for the consideration of impacts to the features of designated sites.



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>15</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Natural England	<p>Section 2.2 Key concerns: Vol. 2 Chapter 2 Benthic Ecology</p> <p>We note that the PEIR records both aggregates Area 484 and Area 491 as overlapping operationally with the cable corridor. We would expect considerably more detail on potential issues and licensing considerations created by the overlap. We note that Area 484 has now started dredging (C. Matton, pers. comm.). We also note that Area 483 may become a material consideration during the Hornsea Three application process.</p> <p>We suggest that DONG Energy provides evidence for the 10% loss associated with aggregates cumulative effects. We consider that the values used currently may be overly large.</p>	I	<p>Thank you for your comment. Cumulative effects associated with the Tier 1 project Licenced aggregate extraction area 484 and the Tier 2 project Application aggregate extraction area 483 have been considered with respect to temporary habitat loss in in the Environmental Statement in volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology and in paragraphs 2.13.2.18 et seq. for the North Norfolk Sandbanks and Saturn Reef SAC specifically. Full consideration of the potential for cumulative effects from SSC and sediment deposition from aggregate extraction activities are provided in paragraphs 2.13.2.28 et seq. of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology including a discussion of the plume dispersion modelling results for both projects.</p> <p>The 10% of loss associated with aggregates, as presented in volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology of the PEIR, had been taken from a Crown Estate: The Area Involved Report. This figure has however been updated in line with the latest Crown Estate report for 2016 which states that, in the Humber region, approximately 8% of the licenced areas are dredged.</p>
Natural England	<p>Section 2.2 Key concerns: Vol. 2 Chapter 2 Benthic Ecology</p> <p>Due to the considerable amendments we have advised for this document in our response we have not considered the cumulative assessment in detail.</p>	I	<p>Comment noted and the CEA in the Environmental Statement in volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology has been updated in line with the revisions to the Hornsea Three alone assessment.</p>
Natural England	<p>Section 2.2 Key concerns: Vol. 2 Chapter 2 Benthic Ecology</p> <p>We note that a considerable number of benthic chapter appendices were not provided with the PEIR submission. The appendices (later provided to Natural England on request on 23 August 2017) contain valuable tools for understanding impact, such as reefiness assessments, photo and faunal logs. Natural England and JNCC will need time beyond the PEIR consultation to fully consider any changes to advice based on the contents of the appendices.</p>	N	<p>Acknowledged</p>
Natural England	<p>2.2.1 Vol. 2 Chapter 2 – Benthic Ecology Figure 2.1</p> <p>Please be advised that a number of designated sites are missing from the map – North Norfolk Coast SPA, Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ, Markham’s Triangle rMCZ, despite being referred to multiple times throughout the document. Fig. 1.1 in the Technical Report appears to have a more detailed map, but should still be checked for missing sites and OWFs.</p>	I	<p>Figure 2.1 of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology of the Environmental Statement has been updated to show only those designated sites with qualifying benthic features that are most likely to be affected by Hornsea Three, and have therefore been screened into the assessment. See also section 2.7.3 of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology for a description of this process. The Norfolk Coast SPA has not been included as this is covered in volume 2, chapter 5: Offshore Ornithology.</p>
Natural England	<p>2.2.2 Vol. 2 Chapter 2 Table 2.3</p> <p>Under the biodiversity section of the table it is stated that mitigation has not been deemed necessary during the Hornsea Three assessment. The SNCBs are currently unable to agree with this statement and believe that it is highly probable given the Likely Significant Effects to designated sites that mitigation measures will either need to be embedded in the project design (for which there is limited information to support this assumption) or adopted to reduce the impacts to an acceptable level</p>	I	<p>In the Environmental Statement in Table 2.3 of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology has been updated to sign-post to the designed-in measures outlined in Table 2.18 of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology to reduce impacts to benthic receptors and it is also noted that the need for any further mitigation measures will be informed by future discussions with Natural England.</p>
Natural England	<p>2.2.3 Vol. 2 Chapter 2 2.6.1.4</p> <p>Natural England is presently unable to agree or disagree with a number of conclusions from the benthic chapter due site-specific data not being presented. Is there a contingency plan if the data sets are not collected and analysed in time for the ES?</p>	I	<p>In the Environmental Statement, Volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology has been updated to include the results of the additional site specific surveys (see section 2.7).</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>15</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Natural England	2.2.4 Vol. 2 Chapter 2 2.6.3.3 We advise that it would be useful to have a table of designated sites and their features (relevant to benthic ecology) included here.	I	In the Environmental Statement, Table 2.11 of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology has been inserted summarising the international and national (including proposed) designations considered within the benthic ecology assessment and their associated qualifying habitat features occurring within the Hornsea Three benthic ecology study area.
Natural England	2.2.5 Vol. 2 Chapter 2 2.6.4.1 Please note that the baseline characterisation will need to be updated as more recent data becomes available.	I	In the Environmental Statement in Volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology has been updated to include the results of the additional site specific surveys (see section 2.7).
Natural England	Vol. 2 Chapter 2 2.2.6 Table 2.11 Please be advised that OSPAR threatened and declining habitats or species should be included in Table 2.11 and in assessment of impact. These should be regarded as internationally designated sites.	I	In the Environmental Statement, Table 2.12 and Table 2.13 of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology have been updated to include reference to OSPAR threatened and declining habitats or species, but it should be noted that the valuation of such features is inherent in the assessment.
Natural England	Vol. 2 Chapter 2 2.2.7 Table 2.12 We strongly recommend that the biotope level information provided in the Technical Report is used to assess the impacts within protected sites in order to align with the sites' designated features. Instead of Table 2.12 We advise that it is amended as follows, using Habitats A and B as an example:  See comment 2.2.7 of NE PIER response for example table using suggested approach  This amended table would provide a much clearer understanding of potential impacts on designated features, as required by legislation. We advise that, continued use of Valued Ecological Receptors (VERs) provides only a disordered set of artificially constructed groups that may not have the same, or similar, sensitivities or vulnerabilities to the designated features, and should not be used as proxies for designated features. Of particular importance is the potential for double-counting impact through at least VER A (sandy sediments) being included in VER E (Annex I sandbanks), and conversely, the lack of assessment of VER E (which would not be the same as assessment of VER A).	I	Environmental Statement, Volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology has been substantially revised so that the VERs better align with designated features of the relevant protected areas in the area (e.g. Annex I sandbanks has been included as a VER). Each assessment section has also been amended to include separate sections for the consideration of impacts to the features of designated sites and, as requested by Natural England, further information on the sensitivity, recoverability etc. of the component biotopes of the designated features (as mapped during the site-specific surveys) has been provided. However, outside the features of designated areas, the overall approach to the impact assessment has not be significantly revised.
<b>Section 42: Local Authorities (prescribed under section 43 of the Act)</b>			
No comments were received by the local authorities relating to benthic ecology under Phase 2.A.			
<b>Section 42: Persons with an interest in the land (prescribed under section 44 of the Act)</b>			
No comments were received by landowners or land interests relating to benthic ecology under Phase 2.A..			
<b>Section 47: Duty to consult local community</b>			
Ann Abbott	4. You probably realise that the coral reef that starts at the west of Weybourne ending at Happisburg is a Marine Conservation Zone called the Cromer Shoal. Cables should not interfere with the coral reef.	I	A full assessment of the effects of Hornsea Three on benthic ecology, including on features of designated sites, is presented in the Environmental Statement in volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology. Discussions on the effects of Hornsea Three on the qualifying benthic habitats of the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ is also presented in volume 5, annex 2.3: MCZ Assessment.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>15</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Robert J Cumber	<p>2) The impact on marine archeology, wildlife and local fishing interests</p> <p>Having carefully read the non-technical summary of the PEIR I can find no direct reference to the north Norfolk chalk reef. This is of great concern as it seems inevitable that the laying and maintenance of 6 major cables along the seabed towards Weybourne will significantly disrupt the delicate ecology of the area. Reports about the reef such as the Marine Survey by SeaSearch East <a href="http://seasearch.org.uk/downloads/Norfolk%20Chalk%20Reef%20report%202010.pdf">http://seasearch.org.uk/downloads/Norfolk%20Chalk%20Reef%20report%202010.pdf</a> make it clear (section 6.8) that the reef can easily be worn away by the simple movement of the tides on a loose crab pot. Presumably cable laying / untethered cables has the potential to create significant reef damage. It is clear from this report that because of the depth of the seawater and the effect of tidal movement at Weybourne the reef has by no means been adequately surveyed at this point. What steps are proposed to fully survey and evaluate the chalk reef at Weybourne prior to any cable laying being permitted? Whilst the reef itself is an amazing geological feature so too is all the marine life which inhabits it including the fish, crab and lobsters which provide the livelihood for the small but highly important fishing community which launches at Weybourne.</p> <p>In our opinion the whole of the north Norfolk reef should be created a SSSI and no cables permitted to cross it whatsoever. Whilst the local fishermen live alongside and respect the reef industrial cable-laying ships will not.</p>	I	<p>Since PEIR publication, the Hornsea Three offshore cable corridor has been re-routed to avoid reef features within the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ. No direct impacts on chalk reef habitats will therefore occur.</p> <p>A full assessment of the effects of Hornsea Three on benthic ecology, including on features of designated sites, is presented in Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology. Discussions on the effects of Hornsea Three on the qualifying benthic habitats of the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ is also presented in Environmental Statement volume 5, annex 2.3: MCZ Assessment.</p>
Friends of North Norfolk	<p>19. The majority of the North Norfolk Coastline is recognised, both nationally and internationally, for its exceptional landscape and ecological value with a number of overlapping Designations including the Norfolk Coast AONB, the North Norfolk Heritage Coast, many SSSI, SAC, RAMSAR sites and Marine Protection Areas/ MCZs.</p>	I	<p>A full assessment of the effects of Hornsea Three on benthic ecology, including on features of designated sites, is presented in volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology. Conclusions on the effects of Hornsea Three on the conservation objectives of the North Norfolk Coast and Saturn Reef SAC and The Wash and North Norfolk Coast SAC are presented in full within the RIAA for Hornsea Three. Discussions on the effects of Hornsea Three on the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ and the Markham's Triangle rMCZ are presented in full within volume 5, annex 2.3: Marine Conservation Zone Assessment.</p>
William J Horabin	<p>The information provided is simply overwhelming but what it provides in terms of volumes it lacks in terms of real understanding of the values and importance of the cumulative/inter relational impacts of this huge infrastructure project upon the North Norfolk Coast AONB, North Norfolk Heritage Coast, many SSSI, SAC, RAMSAR and Marine Protection Areas/MCZs.</p>	I	<p>A full assessment of the effects of Hornsea Three on benthic ecology, including on features of designated sites, is presented in Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology. Conclusions on the effects of Hornsea Three on the conservation objectives of the North Norfolk Coast and Saturn Reef SAC and The Wash and North Norfolk Coast SAC are presented in full within the Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment for Hornsea Three. Discussions on the effects of Hornsea Three on the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ and the Markham's Triangle rMCZ are presented in full within Environmental Statement volume 5, annex 2.3: Marine Conservation Zone Assessment.</p>
Ian/Celia Howe	<p><b>Landfall Zone Local Matters</b> - The offshore chalk 'reef' which is important for the local fishing industry for crabs and lobster. Flooding of the car park happens at least twice a year in the autumn or spring tides/storms</p>	I	<p>Thank you for your comment. Since the PEIR, the Hornsea Three offshore cable corridor has been rerouted such that it now avoids areas of subtidal chalk within the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ. The assessment of temporary and long term habitat loss/disturbance on benthic features of this site presented in the Environmental Statement in volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology has been updated accordingly.</p> <p>Appropriate mitigation measures have been design-in to Hornsea Three to minimise impacts on drainage and flooding (particularly in relation to runoff). Details are provided in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 2: Hydrology and Flood Risk (see Table 2.17) as well as the outline CoCP which forms part of the DCO application.</p>
Dawn Moore	<p><b>EIA</b> - Not read or heard enough of the potential impact to wildlife at sea and surrounding land areas</p>	I	<p>Impacts on ecological receptors onshore and offshore are the relevant topic chapters of Environmental Statement volumes 2 and 3. Impacts on land uses are addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 6: Land Use and Recreation.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>15</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Pat Floyd	It is sincerely hoped none of this will interfere will the chalk reefs	Y	The Hornsea Three offshore cable corridor has been rerouted such that it now avoids areas of subtidal chalk within the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ. The assessment of temporary and long term habitat loss/disturbance on benthic features of this site presented in the Environmental Statement in volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology has been updated accordingly.
Pat Floyd	<b>PEIR Construction Methods</b> - It is sincerely hoped none of this will interfere will the chalk reefs	Y	Thank you for your comment. Since the PEIR, the Hornsea Three offshore cable corridor has been rerouted such that it now avoids areas of subtidal chalk within the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ. The assessment of temporary and long term habitat loss/disturbance on benthic features of this site presented in the Environmental Statement in volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology has been updated accordingly.
Edward de Feyter	<b>Landfall Zone</b> - How can DONG cross the Marine Conservation Zone, when Vattenfall say it is impossible?	I	Thank you for your comment. Since the PEIR, the Hornsea Three offshore cable corridor has been rerouted such that it now avoids areas of subtidal chalk within the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ. The assessment of temporary and long term habitat loss/disturbance on benthic features of this site presented in the Environmental Statement in volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology has been updated accordingly.
Valerie Stubbs	<b>Export Cable</b> - I am concerned about the impact on the seabed wildlife. This is also an important area for the local fishing industry, especially the crab/lobster boats that fish out of Weybourne, as the fact that this is still a working fishing village gives the village much of its character, as well as providing a living for local people.	I	Thank you for your comment. Please see in the Environmental Statement, volume 2, chapter 6 (Commercial Fisheries) where the impact assessment considers the level of impact to specific fisheries (including crab) activities and fleets.
Christine Walton	<b>Offshore Array</b> - I am concerned about the impact on wildlife, particularly local and migrating birds (getting caught in blades etc.), Also the impact on creatures in the sea - fish and other mammals. Impact of possible pollution in the sea on growing plants/seaweed etc. and therefore impact on the food chain.	I	The final assessment for offshore birds is presented in Environmental Statement Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore Ornithology and the final assessment for Marine Mammals presented in Environmental Statement Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine Mammals with no impacts of major significance identified for either receptors. Measures to manage the risk of any pollution events during the construction and operation of the project are captured within the Development Consent Order (and accompanying Deemed Marine Licences) through the requirement for a Marine Pollution Contingency Plan.
Ruth Bullard	<b>Export Cable</b> - I hope the sea bed will be restored and there is little impact on marine life	I	Noted. See the Environmental Statement where impacts have been assessed for various receptors (such as Benthic Ecology, Fish and Shellfish, Marine Mammals and Ornithology) and mitigation measures proposed where appropriate.
Brian Donovan	<b>Export Cables</b> - Your expert at the Holt consultation justified needing 1.5 km of sea bed because of the inaccuracy of laying cables to that depth, whereas you can lay cables much closer when on the land. Do you expect the marine life you damage over such a wide distance to fully recover after the marine cables are laid?	I	The requirement for a 1.5km corridor width offshore is not associated with inaccuracy of cable laying but rather with the complexity of routing offshore to take into account environmental (e.g. protected reef features) and technical (e.g. outcropping rock or UXO) constraints which may only be fully understood during the detailed design process for the project, which will be undertaken post consent. The actual impacted footprint is linked primarily to the number of export cables and this will remain as assessed within the final application whether the cables are widely or narrowly spaced within the 1.5km corridor. The impacts of the installation of offshore cables are considered in volume 2 of the Environmental Statement and this includes consideration of recovery of habitats and species along the entire export cable route.
<b>Section 48: Duty to publicise</b>			
No comments were received by in response to the public notice issued during Phase 2.A relating to benthic ecology.			



Table 2.4: Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Further Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.B) relating to benthic ecology.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>16</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 42: Prescribed consultees (The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009: Schedule 1))</b>			
Natural England	Natural England is content with the desktop data sources that are proposed to characterise other ecology and conservation topics within the potential offshore alternative routes.	I	Comment noted and the desktop data sources used to characterise the benthic ecology baseline are summarised in section 2.6.2 of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology and outlined in full in volume 5, annex 2.1: Benthic Ecology Technical Report.
Eastern Inshore Fisheries and Conservation Authority	Any activity that disturbs the seabed has the potential to have negative impacts on habitats and biodiversity. The extent of such impacts can be highly dependent on sea bed habitat and the nature of activities. The proposed re-route to the inshore section of the cable route shifts the cable corridor further north and west. It also greatly reduces the section of cable route within the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds Marine Conservation Zone (MCZ), however it increases the proportion that lies within The Wash and North Norfolk Coast Special Area of Conservation (WNNC SAC). This change in route moves activities away from the subtidal chalk features designated within The Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ onto more mobile sediments (subtidal muds and sands) within the WNNC SAC. Whilst these features are also designated within the site, the effects of cable installation on them are considered to be reversible and less significant than those on chalk features, which are irreversible with no potential for recovery. Subtidal chalk provides important biogenic habitat and spawning and nursery areas for a variety of marine species, including important commercial fish and shell fish species. In addition, activities further away from the chalk features will result in less sediment deposition, caused by installation activities and subsequent increased suspended sediment concentrations, on the chalk beds (Young, 2013).	I	A full assessment of the effects of Hornsea Three on benthic ecology, including on features of the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ and of The Wash and North Norfolk Coast SAC, is presented in Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Subtidal and Intertidal Ecology. Conclusions on the effects of Hornsea Three on the conservation objectives of the North Norfolk Sandbanks and Saturn Reef SAC are presented in full within the RIAA for Hornsea Three (document reference number 5.2) and discussions on the effects of Hornsea Three on the qualifying benthic habitats of the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ is presented in Environmental Statement volume 5, annex 2.3: MCZ Assessment.
Eastern Inshore Fisheries and Conservation Authority	Whilst impacts on subtidal mixed, subtidal sand and subtidal mud sediments are generally considered to be less significant and reversible, it is important to note that Eastern IFCA are currently considering management to protect sub-tidal mixed sediments within the WNNC SAC following concerns over shrimp beam trawling activity and the recoverability of this feature following disturbance. In order to meet the conservation objectives of designations, the general management approach for protected features within both sites are to maintain at favorable condition (Defra, 2016; Natural England, 2017) and therefore Eastern IFCA's preferred inshore cable route option is the newly proposed re-route which diverts activities further away from the vulnerable chalk features.	Y	Comments from Eastern IFCA on the proposed alternative near shore cable corridor are noted. Hornsea Three can confirm that the Hornsea Three offshore cable corridor has been amended for the application for Development Consent to include the alternative route (see Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives).
Eastern Inshore Fisheries and Conservation Authority	It is also important to note that Eastern IFCA Byelaws 12 and 15 exclude trawling and dredging respectively, in inshore waters out to three nautical miles within this area of the SAC and the MCZ (EIFCA, 2016). These byelaws were implemented in 1980 and 2008, respectively, to protect habitats and species within these areas and so there will likely be strong opposition from the fishermen to any activities that disturb these currently undisturbed habitats.	I	Information on the mussel seed fishery provided by Eastern IFCA management and Byelaws have informed the baseline characterisation presented in section 6.7 of volume 2, chapter 6: Commercial Fisheries and volume 5, annex 6.1: Commercial Fisheries Technical Report of the Environmental Statement.
Eastern Inshore Fisheries and Conservation Authority	Dredging for seed mussel has occurred in the past outside of the 3nm boundary (Byelaw 15 restricted area) on an ephemeral mussel bed, previously forming a significant fishery of approximately 10,000 tonnes in 2011. Whilst the value of this fishery was not assessed, the current value of seed mussel is around £100 per tonne for sublittoral mussels and £250 per tonne for intertidal mussels. There is currently no dredge fishery in this area but there is potential for this to occur again in the future. When sublittoral mussel beds occur, Eastern IFCA promotes their harvesting in recognition of the high value of this resource to local fisheries. Eastern IFCA authorises such activity with strict conditions to ensure the surrounding seabed habitats (including designated features of marine protected areas) are not adversely affected by the activity.	I	Information on the mussel seed fishery provided within the Section 42 consultation and during subsequent meetings with the Eastern IFCA has informed the baseline section 6.7 of volume 2, chapter 6: Commercial Fisheries and volume 5, annex 6.1: Commercial Fisheries Technical Report of the Environmental Statement.

<sup>16</sup> Y = Yes change made; N = No change made; I = Incorporated into or considered when producing the assessment or landowner voluntary agreement offer; N/A = Not applicable.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>16</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Marine Management Organisation	1.3. The alternative inshore cable route avoiding the Cromer Shoal Chalk Bed MCZ would traverse other chalk outcrops in the inshore area. Extension rock cutting equipment would be required to achieve the proposed cable burial depth, which is likely to create chalk plumes. Due to their low particle size and hence low particle settling velocity, these plumes would have the capacity to travel considerable distances. The size, duration and concentration of such plumes should be assessed in the forthcoming ES. Alternatively, if cable burial is not undertaken, an assessment of the impacts of cable protection measures (e.g. rock dumping, concrete mattresses, etc.) should consider the sediment transport regime along this active and sensitive coastline and its potential impact on the fishing industry.	I	The potential extent, duration and concentration of sediment plumes created during cable burial (including chalk substrates) is assessed in section 1.11.2 of Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 1: Marine Processes. The potential effect of cable protection measures (if and where present) on sediment transport is considered in section 1.11.8.
Marine Management Organisation	1.4. With regard to the proposed offshore alternative export cable route, the MMO were anticipating further re-routing of cables away from the Saturn Reef area within the North Norfolk Sandbanks and Saturn Reef SAC, following discussion at previous Expert Working Groups (EWG) meetings. It is acknowledged that Saturn Reef is not currently as extensive as had previously been recorded, however the area contains habitat suitable for re-establishment of the reef. The MMO requests that further justification is provided regarding the proposed alternative cable route through the Saturn Reef area of the North Norfolk Sandbank and Saturn Reef SAC.	I	The proposed alternative route through the North Norfolk Sandbanks and Saturn Reef SAC has been taken forward in the Environmental Statement. As discussed in the Marine Processes, Benthic Ecology and Fish and Shellfish Ecology EWG on 23 February 2018, in order to address uncertainties in the assessment with regard to the potential for direct impacts on potential future for <i>S. spinulosa</i> reefs (i.e. where avoidance is not possible in areas where reef has developed), a precautionary assessment of the effects to potential future Annex I reef has been included in Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology.
Marine Management Organisation	1.5. The MMO notes that a licensed aggregate extraction site is located in the vicinity of the Saturn Reef. There is no reference to potential interactions with marine aggregate interests, nor any consideration of interactions with marine sand and gravel resources. The MMO suggests that reference is made to the East Inshore and Offshore Marine Plans and associated marine plans policies relating to present and future aggregate extraction.	I	The final results of the EIA are presented in the Environmental Statement, which includes an assessment of the refined Hornsea Three offshore cable corridor in relation to existing aggregate interests (licensed/application/optioned). Figure 11.4 within Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 11: Infrastructure and Other Users presents the aggregate extraction sites in the vicinity of Hornsea Three, together with the defined areas of high potential aggregate resource identified within Policy AGG3 of the East (Inshore and Offshore) Marine Plans. As the Hornsea Three offshore cable corridor only occupies an area of 1.5% of the optimal aggregate resource, Hornsea Three is considered not to preclude any potential future aggregate extraction from this area (see section 11.7.8 within Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 11: Infrastructure and Other Users).
Marine Management Organisation	2.2. Further benthic survey work was undertaken within the North Norfolk Sandbank & Saturn Reef SAC by the Centre for Environment, Fisheries and Aquaculture Science (Cefas), the JNCC and Natural England in 2016. The applicant is advised to consult with the JNCC on the availability of the associated data since the report has yet to be released.	I	Hornsea Three is aware of the 2016 survey undertaken by Cefas and JNCC (McIlwaine et al., 2017) within the North Norfolk Sandbank and Saturn Reef SAC, however the results of the survey, which are anticipated to include an updated JNCC reefs layer, have not been made publicly available in time for inclusion in the final DCO application.
Marine Management Organisation	2.3. The MMO advises that the Environment Agency's East Anglian Inshore swath bathymetry survey may provide a useful additional data source. The survey was intended to fill the gap between terrestrial surveys (LIDAR, airborne imagery and beach surveys) and offshore bathymetry surveys undertaken by the UK Hydrographic Office (UKHO) for conservation assessment.	I	A small tile of swath data (1 x 1 km), dated 2015, was found on the Environment Agency data portal. Whilst potentially informative (for that small area at the time it was collected), it is considered that sufficient data is already available and has been used to inform the assessment of marine processes impacts in this nearshore area (see Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 1: Marine Processes). The conservative desktop approach taken does not rely on detailed local bathymetry in any particular area or for any particular timeframe, and the outcome of the assessment would not be affected by the inclusion of more data.  Hornsea Three assumes the MMO refer to swath bathymetry surveys done as part of the Anglian Coastal Monitoring programme. The aims of this programme have been reviewed and, as the outputs of the survey are not understood to be benthic data per se. (i.e. don't contain infaunal data or information on sediment type), they are deemed to be of limited use in the characterisation of the benthic ecology baseline presented in section 2.3 of Environmental Statement volume 5, annex 2.1: Benthic Ecology Technical Report.
Marine Management Organisation	2.4 The MMO welcomes that the results of site specific benthic samples collected along the potential offshore alternative routes will be analysed for herring spawning potential and sandeel habitat classification and incorporated into the forthcoming ES (ref to Supporting Information)	I	The benthic samples referred to have been analysed for herring spawning potential and sandeel habitat classification and have been incorporated into Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 3: Fish and Shellfish Ecology and Environmental Statement volume 5, annex 2.1: Fish and Shellfish Technical Report.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>16</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Marine Management Organisation	2.6. The use of Marine Conservation Society SeaSearch data is recommended as an additional source of marine species and habitat data for inshore areas of the export cable corridor.	I	Data from Marine Recorder, including SeaSearch dive surveys within the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ and the Wash and North Norfolk Coast SAC, have been used to characterise the baseline environment of the Hornsea Three offshore cable corridor (see section 2.3 of Environmental Statement volume 5, annex 2.1: Benthic Ecology Technical Report).
<b>Section 42: Local Authorities (prescribed under section 43 of the Act)</b>			
No comments were received by local authorities relating to benthic ecology under Phase 2.B.			
<b>Section 42: Persons with an interest in the land (prescribed under section 44 of the Act)</b>			
No comments were received by landowners or land interests relating to benthic ecology under Phase 2.B.			
<b>Section 47: Duty to consult local community</b>			
No comments were received by the local community relating to benthic ecology under Phase 2.B.			
<b>Section 48: Duty to publicise</b>			
No comments were received by in response to the public notice issued during Phase 2.B relating to benthic ecology.			

## 2.3 Fish and Shellfish Ecology

Table 2.5: Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.A) relating to fish and shellfish ecology.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>17</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 42: Prescribed consultees (The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009: Schedule 1))</b>			
Norfolk Vanguard	To enable a robust cumulative assessment, we would like to have sight of and share information as soon as possible in relation to the baseline data that is currently being collected and ongoing assessment work pending completion, namely Chapter 3 (Fish and Shellfish Ecology), Chapter 4 (Marine Mammals), Chapter 5 (Offshore Ornithology), Chapter 6 (Commercial Fisheries) and Chapter 8 (Aviation, Military and Communication). We would welcome sight of the HRA Appropriate Assessment and discussions with the project team on the approach being taken, prior to the submission of the DCO application.	N	Hornsea Three has been in regular dialogue with the Vattenfall Vanguard project throughout the pre-application stage for each project.
Eastern Inshore Fisheries and Conservation Authority	Policy FISH 2 Many coastal habitats, particularly biogenic habitats, provide important spawning and nursery areas for a variety of marine species. Therefore, any disturbance to these habitats has the potential to have negative effects of these populations. The inshore sections of the offshore cable corridor are known to provide spawning and nursery areas for important pelagic and demersal fish species, such as herring and whiting, and elasmobranch species, such as thornback ray (Ellis et al., 2013). As previously discussed, effects on biological communities found in soft sediments with the offshore cable corridor, were considered in the PEIR documentation as temporary, reversible and non-significant in EIA terms. Whilst, EIFCA generally agree with this, where disturbance or habitat removal occurs within sub-tidal chalk and rock features, habitats are unlikely to recover, resulting in a permanent loss of these spawning and nursery areas posing a more significant, long-term impact. It is again advised that to reduce adverse environmental effects, such features are avoided when determining the offshore export cable route. Eastern IFCA also consider that effects of offshore wind farm construction on fish and shellfish spawning and nursery grounds should be considered at a regional scale. Although the best available information (Ellis et al 2013) shows extensive spawning grounds for many species, Eastern IFCA is concerned about the scale of offshore activities (particularly aggregate extraction and offshore wind farm construction) in the Southern North Sea because of cumulative effects on seabed habitats. Whilst we appreciate the difficulty in studying potential wide-scale impacts, we consider the issue does warrant further consideration.	I	Full consideration of habitat loss effects on fish and shellfish receptors, including coastal and nearshore species, is presented in the Environmental Statement in section 3.11 of volume 2, chapter 3: Fish and Shellfish Ecology.  The cumulative effects assessment for fish and shellfish ecology is presented in Section 3.13 of volume 2, chapter 3: Fish and Shellfish Ecology. This includes appropriate description of the predicted impacts at an ecologically relevant scale.
Marine Management Organisation	6. Fish and Shellfish Ecology 6.1. The potential for cumulative and transboundary fishery impacts to occur is acknowledged. The MMO recommends that an assessment of cumulative and transboundary impacts on fish ecology and commercial fisheries is included in the ES.	I	A cumulative effects assessment on fish and shellfish ecology has been presented in Section 3.13 of Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 3: Fish and Shellfish Ecology. A transboundary assessment is presented in Section 3.14 of Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 3: Fish and Shellfish Ecology.
Marine Management Organisation	6.2. Herring and sandeel have been correctly identified as species of high vulnerability within the southern North Sea fish and shellfish study area. Given the nature of their ecology and habitat requirements, the MMO recommends that separate consideration is given to impacts on herring and sandeel species in the ES.	I	Specific consideration of herring and sandeel has been presented in the relevant impact assessments in Section 3.11 (for Hornsea Three alone) and Section 3.13 (for Cumulative Effects) of Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 3: Fish and Shellfish Ecology.

<sup>17</sup> Y = Yes change made; N = No change made; I = Incorporated into or considered when producing the assessment or landowner voluntary agreement offer; N/A = Not applicable.



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>17</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Marine Management Organisation	6.3. In terms of characterising the array area for suitability to support sandeel habitat, the MMO considers that the proposed potential sandeel habitat assessment methodology is appropriate (paragraph 3.6.1.3, Volume 2, Chapter 3 – Fish and Shellfish Ecology). The MMO suggests that the ES should, however acknowledge the disparity in the determination of suitable sandeel habitat between the site-specific PSA data and the regional seabed sediment data sets (British Geological Survey (BGS), SeaZone Hydrospatial and 2016 geophysical survey interpretation). MMO advice on this issue was provided to DONG Energy following the Benthic Ecology, Fish and Shellfish Expert Working Group meeting on 17 November 2016.	I	The suitability of sandeel habitats within the Hornsea Three array area and offshore cable corridor is fully discussed in Section 3.2.4 of Environmental Statement volume 5, annex 3.1: Fish and Shellfish Technical Report, including discussion of disparity between datasets.
Marine Management Organisation	6.4. The MMO recommends that the limitations and caveats associated with the Latto et al. (2013) assessment are acknowledged in the ES if the heat mapping approach is used to support the potential sandeel habitat assessment (paragraph 3.7.1.6, Volume 2, Chapter 3 – Fish and Shellfish Ecology).	I	Heat mapping has not been used to support the sandeel habitat assessment presented in Section 3.2.4 of Environmental Statement volume 5, annex 3.1: Fish and Shellfish Technical Report, and therefore it is not necessary to present the relevant caveats associated with this approach.
Marine Management Organisation	6.5. The PEIR predicts that, as the key spawning habitats for herring are located approximately 80 km to the west of the Project area, adult spawning herring will not be affected by construction-related underwater noise (Table 3.9, Volume 2, Chapter 3 – Fish and Shellfish Ecology). The MMO notes that the turbine layout has yet to be finalised and the size and number of piles required will be determined by turbine and substation design. Potential impacts on adult spawning herring will be informed by the underwater noise modelling expected in the ES and cannot be evaluated by the MMO until such data has been supplied. The MMO suggests that a map is provided in the ES, displaying noise attenuation contours from piling in relation to distance to herring spawning grounds.	I	The approach to assessing effects of underwater noise on fish and shellfish receptors was discussed with the Marine Processes, Benthic Ecology and Fish and Shellfish Ecology EWG following receipt of Section 42 consultation responses (5 December 2017), with the full impact assessment presented, with accompanying maps, in Environmental Statement Section 3.11 of volume 2, chapter 3: Fish and Shellfish Ecology.
Marine Management Organisation	6.6. The MMO notes that the description of Table 3.9 (Volume 2, Chapter 3 - Fish and Shellfish Ecology) implies that the table covers fish and shellfish spawning and nursery areas. No shellfish data is, however represented within the table. It is recommended that data on shellfish spawning and nursery areas is included within this section of the ES.	I	Table 3.9 of Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 3: Fish and Shellfish Ecology has been updated to include shellfish spawning, where this information is available.
Marine Management Organisation	6.7. The shellfish Valued Ecological Receptors (VERs) are considered to be appropriate, with the exception of <i>Nephrops norvegicus</i> which should be valued as of 'regional to international' importance. The species is fished by both UK and international vessels (Table 3.10, Volume 2, Chapter 3 - Fish and Shellfish Ecology).	I	As described in Table 4.1 of Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 3: Fish and Shellfish Ecology, species that are VERs of international importance are those that are protected under international law (i.e. Annex II species listed as features of SACs). <i>Nephrops</i> , whilst important for fisheries, is valued as a VER of Regional importance following the definition in Table 4.1 which states that a Regional value VER is "Species that are of commercial value to the fisheries which operate within the southern North Sea fish and shellfish study area".
Marine Management Organisation	6.8. When calculating the percentage of habitat loss in terms of fish and shellfish ecology along the inshore section of the corridor, the MMO recommends that the loss of habitat is calculated in the context of the North Norfolk chalk reef area, which extends approximately 10 km offshore and supports commercially important <i>Cancer pagurus</i> (brown crab) and <i>Homarus gammarus</i> (lobster) populations. The PEIR calculates the percentage of habitat loss as a percentage of the total southern North Sea fish and shellfish study area (paragraph 3.11.2.12, Volume 2, Chapter 3 – Fish and Shellfish Ecology), which underestimates the significance of the impact on the local fishing industry. Cable burial could result in a long-term loss of habitat and therefore a loss of established fishing grounds along the cable corridor out to approximately 10 km from the shoreline. The MMO recommends that the potential magnitude of habitat loss is reassessed in the ES.	I	The approach to the assessment of effects of temporary habitat loss on brown crab and lobster has been amended and habitat loss areas have been presented as proportion of crab/lobster fishing grounds as mapped by EIFCA (see Section 3.11 of Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 3: Fish and Shellfish Ecology).

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>17</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Marine Management Organisation	<p>1.6. Where the significance of a predicted impact is calculated as "Minor or Moderate", the MMO recommends that the significance is assessed as "Moderate" in accordance with the 'worst case scenario' principle of the 'Rochdale Envelope' appraisal. Such impacts would therefore be significant in terms of the subsequent analysis required under the appropriate Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) regulations, according to the matrix rules used by DONG Energy in the PEIR (paragraph 2.9.1.9, Volume 2, Chapter 2 – Benthic Subtidal and Intertidal Ecology and replicated in subsequent 'Offshore' chapters).</p>	I	<p>Regarding Benthic Ecology, In the Environmental Statement, Paragraph 2.9.2.5 of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Subtidal and Intertidal Ecology clarifies that, in cases where a range is suggested for the significance of effect, there remains the possibility that this may span the significance threshold (i.e. the range is given as minor to moderate). In such cases the final significance is based upon the expert's professional judgement as to which outcome delineates the most likely effect, with an explanation as to why this is the case. Additional explanatory text has been inserted into the relevant assessments in sections 2.11.1 to 2.11.3 of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology to clarify why, in instances where there is a choice in the matrix table, an effect has been considered as minor rather than moderate.</p> <p>For Ornithology, the process used to determine the significance of impacts upon relevant receptors is presented in Section 5.9.4 of Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore Ornithology. Where the significance value falls between two categories (e.g. minor or moderate significance) expert judgement is used to determine the significance value</p> <p>For Marine Mammals the magnitude and sensitivity matrix has been updated and all updates have been communicated to the relevant key stakeholders through the EWG.</p> <p>As discussed in the Marine Processes, Benthic Ecology and Fish and Shellfish EWG meeting of 5 December 2017, impact assessment conclusions have been amended to provide further justification for why a significance of minor (i.e. not significant) has been concluded for species of medium to high sensitivity. These are presented in the relevant impact assessments in Section 3.11 (for Hornsea Three alone) and Section 3.13 (for Cumulative Effects) of volume 2, chapter 3: Fish and Shellfish Ecology.</p>
Marine Management Organisation	<p>6.9. The MMO considers that DONG Energy have carried out appropriate consultation with UK and foreign fishing industry to date. DONG Energy have acknowledged that "During the construction process vessels with pots set along the offshore cable corridor will be required to move [their] pots and cease fishing activities at particular construction locations" (paragraph 6.11.1.30, Volume 2, Chapter 6 – Commercial Fisheries). The MMO advises that a reduction in access to or exclusion from potting grounds is likely to involve compensation payments to fishers as mitigation for construction activities within the proposed cable corridor, in accordance with the current FLOWW Best Practice Guidance for Offshore Renewables Developments (January 2014) referenced in the report. The MMO strongly encourages open communication with commercial fishing interests throughout the Project planning and development process.</p>	I	<p>Hornsea Three acknowledge this. No action required.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>17</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Marine Management Organisation	1.7. The MMO recommends re-examination of the requirements for pre-construction, construction and post-construction monitoring following re-assessment of the magnitude and significance of the potential impacts of the proposed Project. The MMO advises that verification of the impact predictions as set out in the PEIR can, in many cases, only be provided by future monitoring of the relevant receptors. This important consideration should be taken into account when future monitoring requirements are detailed in the 'Offshore' chapters of the PEIR.	I	<p>Consideration of the potential need for monitoring has been considered throughout the offshore chapters of the Environmental Statement. The proposed approach to monitoring for offshore elements of the project is discussed in the In Principle Monitoring Plan that accompanies the application for Development Consent.</p> <p>Explanatory text has been inserted into the relevant assessment sections in the Environmental Statement of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology to clarify why, in instances where there is a choice in the matrix table, an effect has been considered as minor rather than moderate. There are, however, no instances of effects being considered to be of moderate adverse significance. The proposals for future monitoring are outlined in the Environmental Statement in Table 2.25 of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology.</p> <p>The proposed approach to monitoring for offshore ornithology and marine mammals is discussed in the In Principle Monitoring Plan.</p> <p>Monitoring has not been proposed for fish and shellfish ecology, due to the lack of significant effects on fish ecology and the high level of confidence in the assessment presented.</p>
RSPB	Volume 2: Chapter 5 – Offshore Ornithology The RSPB do not accept the use of the 1% population threshold as criteria for further assessment as although in widespread use it is entirely arbitrary. However, based on the numbers presented we agree with the species list taken forward for further assessment, except for the cases detailed below. However, we note that while herring gull are included in table 5.7 that there is no supporting text.	I	It is noted that the RSPB agree with the suite of species taken through to impact assessment. Supporting information in relation to the inclusion and exclusion of specific species within the assessments can be found in the annexes to Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 5: Offshore Ornithology.
Natural England	2.4.1 Vol. 2 Chapter 3 – Fish and Shellfish Ecology General comment Species of importance and concern – sandeel and herring: We note the reported temporary nature of the habitat loss and disturbance of the seabed within the assessment resulting in minor adverse impacts (not significant in EIA terms), however, we have concerns that the impacts to sandeel and herring may be greater than assessed.	I	The approach to assessing effects of construction (e.g. habitat loss and increases in suspended sediments and sediment deposition) on sandeel and herring was discussed with the Marine Processes, Benthic Ecology and Fish and Shellfish EWG following receipt of Section 42 consultation responses (5 December 2017). The impact assessment has provided further justification, where necessary, for significance conclusions made: see Sections 3.11.1 (construction phase), 3.11.2 (operational phase) and 3.11.3 (decommissioning phase) of Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 3: Fish and Shellfish Ecology.
Natural England	2.4.2 Vol. 2 Chapter 3 – Fish and Shellfish Ecology 3.11.1.3-3.11.1.22 Temporary habitat loss/ disturbance from construction activities: there appears to be no modelling of the disposal mounds winnowing away. Although the total temporary habitat loss is estimated and it is stated that any species will recolonise and the sediment from the mounds will redistribute and winnow away, there is no indication as to how long this process will take and the impacts to the epifauna during this process. The inclusion of a disposal mound characterisation including but not limited to: predicted sediment composition, initial size, and temporal/ topographical spread/ changes; within the disposal site characterisation document would be helpful to confirm that the impacts will be no greater than the temporary effects currently predicted.	I	Further detail on the fate of disposal mounds has been presented in Section 3.11 of Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 3: Fish and Shellfish Ecology. Any mounds of granular material will erode over time and displaced material will re-join the natural sedimentary environment, gradually reducing the size of the mounds.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>17</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Natural England	<p>2.4.3 Vol. 2 Chapter 3 – Fish and Shellfish Ecology 3.11.1.23- 3.11.1.40 Temporary increases in suspended sediment concentrations (SSC) and associated sediment deposition: similarly, to the above, there have been no sediment plume outputs/modelling provided in relation to potential impacts on fish and shellfish ecology. The information included in other chapters should be used to inform this assessment. Natural England is not satisfied that the assessment of impacts to fish eggs and larvae is based on the worst case scenario as the full spatial and temporal exposure has not been considered. The potential for (a) sediment to drift in the currents at similar rates to the fish eggs and (b) for sediment particles to become attached to the eggs of species (such as herring and sandeel) causing development retardation and mortality regardless of the duration the eggs are within the sediment plume; is not described within the assessment. Further information should be presented to support the conclusion that the magnitude of effect is minor adverse and to remain in line with OSPAR regulations in maintaining seabed characteristics.</p>	I	The impact assessment has provided further justification, where necessary, for significance conclusions made with respect to increases in SSC and associated deposition (see Section 3.11 of Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 3: Fish and Shellfish Ecology).
Natural England	<p>2.4.4 Vol. 2 Chapter 3 – Fish and Shellfish Ecology 3.11.1.41 We note that the subtidal sediment contamination data is currently unavailable and therefore it is not possible to assess this impact in the current report and data from a site specific survey will be included in the final EIA report.</p>	I	Effects of resuspension of sediment bound contaminants on fish and shellfish ecology were scoped out of the impact assessment (see Table 3.12 of Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 3: Fish and Shellfish Ecology).
Natural England	<p>2.4.5 Vol. 2 Chapter 3 – Fish and Shellfish Ecology 3.11.1.72 - 3.11.1.85 It would be helpful to have a reference to a Marine Pollution Contingency Plan (MPCP), and again at 3.11.2.72; 3.11.3.40.</p>	I	The Marine Pollution Contingency Plan has been referred to, where appropriate, in Section 3.11 of Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 3: Fish and Shellfish Ecology.
Natural England	<p>2.4.6 Vol. 2 Chapter 3 – Fish and Shellfish Ecology 3.11.3.31-3.11.3.39 Permanent Habitat Loss: it is reported that at the time of decommissioning, foundations and subsea cables will be removed and cable protection and scour prevention will be left in situ. We note that DONG Energy consider this to be a highly precautionary approach and that further advice and guidance will be required to discuss the need and requirement for removing cable protection and scour prevention in sensitive areas. However, we disagree that this approach is highly precautionary as previous discussions with other OWF project engineers has made us aware that it is considered almost impossible to recover such scour prevention and cable protection at the time of decommissioning. We note that this impact is scoped out and not included in Table 5.1 (of Vol. 4 Annex 3.2 – Disposal Site Characterisation) and advise that cable protection and scour prevention remaining in situ should be assessed as a permanent habitat change and should be considered a realistic worst case scenario (therefore not dismissed as over-precautionary).</p>	I	The comment is acknowledged and for the purposes of the assessment of effects of decommissioning on fish and shellfish ecology (Section 3.11.3 of Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 3: Fish and Shellfish Ecology), it is assumed that scour and cable protection is left in situ. The precaution is in relation to the volumes of cable protection assumed to be left in situ, which is the maximum adverse scenario.
Natural England	<p>2.4.7 Vol. 2 Chapter 3 – Fish and Shellfish Ecology 3.11.3.31-3.11.3.39 We would welcome further information and/or discussions to minimise the use of cable protection and scour prevention in sensitive areas such as the rMCZ Markham's Triangle which is (designated for two broadscale habitats: subtidal coarse sediment and subtidal sand with the latter being considered suitable habitat for sandeels). As above Natural England is not confident that scour prevention and cable protection could be removed at the time of decommissioning and thus the introduction of hard substrate in an otherwise predominantly sandy environment would therefore cause a permanent change of habitat (impacting notably sandeel and herring).</p>	I	The fish and shellfish ecology assessment includes specific consideration of effects of long term/permanent habitat loss on sandeels (as well as Nephrops, which are known to occur in the Hornsea Three array area); see Section 3.11.2 and 3.11.3 of Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 3: Fish and Shellfish Ecology).



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>17</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Natural England	2.4.8 Vol. 2 Chapter 3 – Fish and Shellfish Ecology Table 3.20 List of other plans and projects: Lincs OWF should be included in the Tier 1 operational OWFs. In addition, Norfolk Boreas should be included in the Tier 2 proposed OWFs as it is proposed to be only one year behind Norfolk Vanguard and have undertaken their scoping report. But we do recognise that there may be insufficient data available to undertake a cumulative assessment at this time	I	The fish and shellfish ecology CEA screening table (Table 3.22 of Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 3: Fish and Shellfish Ecology) has been updated with the latest information on the projects considered. Norfolk Boreas has not been considered as there is not currently sufficient information to assess this project cumulatively. Norfolk Vanguard has been assessed as a Tier 3 project. Lincs has been operational for a number of years and has therefore been considered as part of the baseline.
Natural England	2.4.9 Vol. 2 Chapter 3 – Fish and Shellfish Ecology Table 3.25 The consideration of cumulative introduction of hard substrate includes the number of turbines. It is unclear whether the total amount of habitat creation in relation to the turbines includes scour/secondary scour prevention around turbines. In addition, under the total cables and pipelines section it is unclear whether cable protection is included here?	I	Section 13.3.2 of Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 3: Fish and Shellfish Ecology presents an updated assessment of the cumulative effects of long term habitat loss on fish and shellfish receptors. This includes clarification on the assumptions made with regard to scour and cable protection.
Natural England	2.4.10 Vol. 5 Annex 3.1 – Fish and Shellfish Technical Report 2.2.1.7 We note that additional site specific survey data as part of the benthic ecology survey will be incorporated into the baseline characterisation assessment for the ES at the time of DCO submission and that due to the timing of this survey it has not yet been included. We look forward to reviewing the additional data in due course including (1) grab sample data to characterise the suitability of sediments as sandeel/herring spawning habitats; and (2) epibenthic beam trawl data to provide specific data on fish communities.	I	Both grab sample data and epibenthic beam trawl data have been incorporated into the Hornsea Three fish and shellfish ecology baseline characterisation presented in Environmental Statement volume 5, annex 3.1: Fish and Shellfish Ecology Technical Report.
Natural England	2.4.11 Vol. 5 Annex 3.1 – Fish and Shellfish Technical Report 3.2.4.24 - 3.2.4.30 Low intensity sandeel spawning and nursery grounds coincide with the Hornsea Three fish and shellfish study area, with a high intensity sandeel spawning habitat to the north of the Hornsea Three array area, broadly reflecting the patterns of sandeel abundance throughout the Hornsea Three fish and shellfish study area. Given that sandeel are an important prey species for fish, birds and marine mammals; a commercially important species, a UK BAP species and a nationally important marine feature in addition to the fact that rMCZ Markham's Triangle located in the north east of the array area has suitable habitat for sandeels (MCZ designated for two broadscale habitats: subtidal coarse sediment and subtidal sand with the latter being considered suitable habitat for sandeels) we remain concerned that impacts from habitat disturbance and suspended sediment concentrations may be greater than assessed (see comments below for impact pathways of concern).	I	The approach to assessing effects of construction (e.g. habitat loss and increases in suspended sediments and sediment deposition) on sandeels was discussed with the Marine Processes, Benthic Ecology and Fish and Shellfish EWG following receipt of Section 42 consultation responses (5 December 2017). The fish and shellfish ecology impact assessment has provided further justification, where necessary, for the significance conclusions made: see Sections 3.11.1 (construction phase), 3.11.2 (operational phase) and 3.11.3 (decommissioning phase) of Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 3: Fish and Shellfish Ecology.
Natural England	2.4.12 Vol. 5 Annex 3.1 – Fish and Shellfish Technical Report Fig. 3.17, Tables 3.4 and 4.2 The Hornsea Three array area coincides with low intensity nursery habitat for herring, with some discrete spawning habitats also shown in Figure 3.17. As per Table 3.4 an Autumn spawning (September to October) habitat is located to the west of the Hornsea Three array area, with a spring (April) spawning population in the Wash. Low intensity nursery habitat also coincides with Hornsea Three (array and offshore cable corridor), with high intensity nursery habitat further west in the Wash (Table 4.2). Given that herring are also an important prey species for birds and marine mammals; a commercially important species, a UK BAP species and a nationally important marine feature we again remained concerned that impacts from habitat disturbance and suspended sediment concentrations may be greater than assessed (see comments below for impact pathways of concern).	I	The approach to assessing effects of construction (e.g. habitat loss and increases in suspended sediments and sediment deposition) on herring was discussed with the Marine Processes, Benthic Ecology and Fish and Shellfish EWG following receipt of Section 42 consultation responses (5 December 2017). The impact assessment has provided further justification, where necessary, for the significance conclusions made: see Sections 3.11.1 (construction phase), 3.11.2 (operational phase) and 3.11.3 (decommissioning phase) of Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 3: Fish and Shellfish Ecology.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>17</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Natural England	<p>2.4.13 Vol. 5 Annex 3.1 – Fish and Shellfish Technical Report 3.2.7. We note the presence of a number of migratory fish, in particular twaite shad, allis shad, European eel (Markham's Triangle MCZ – present but not a designated feature) and smelt (Cromer Shoal MCZ - present but not a designated feature). We acknowledge that abundance of these fish is generally low with there being more potential of these species to be present along the inshore area of the cable corridor. Given that (a) there is a low abundance, (b) the fact that they are mobile species (therefore have the ability to avoid noise and habitat disturbance) and (c) the construction and operational works will not cause a barrier to migration; we are content with the conclusion that the significance of effects will be no greater than minor adverse (and therefore not significant in EIA terms). Twaite shad (<i>Alosa fallax</i>) and allis shad (<i>Alosa alosa</i>): we acknowledge that a single twaite shad was recorded at trawl location 26, in the west of Hornsea Three during the autumn survey. We note the Humber Estuary, acknowledging that this is outside the Hornsea Three zone, is known to support a number of key migratory species including allis and twaite shad. Allis shad and twaite shad are listed in Schedule 5 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981. The onus is on the applicant to ensure that they are legally compliant with the legislation.</p>	I	Comment is acknowledged; Sections 3.11 (Hornsea Three alone) and 3.13 (CEA) of Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 3: Fish and Shellfish Ecology presents the impact assessments on migratory fish species.
Natural England	<p>1.34 Also mentioned in a comment to 3.11.1.23-3.11.1.40 of the Fish and Shellfish Ecology chapter, the following effects of suspended sediment concentrations (SSC) have not been considered: - potential for sediment to drift in the currents at similar rates to the fish eggs; and - potential for sediment particles to become attached to the eggs of species (such as herring and sandeel) causing development retardation and mortality regardless of the duration the eggs are within the sediment plume. (Volume 2, chapter 12, Table 12.7)</p>	I	Effects increases in SSC on fish eggs and larvae, including consideration of sensitivity of these life stages to this impact, are considered in section 3.11.1 of volume 2, chapter 3: Fish and Shellfish Ecology of the Environmental Statement. The duration of any impact is predicted to be short term, with most sediments falling out of suspension over a relatively short timeframe (i.e. minutes for coarse sediments). The area affected will also be spatially limited (i.e. within hundreds of metres), with SSC quickly returning to levels which are broadly reflective of the baseline environment.
<b>Section 42: Local Authorities (prescribed under section 43 of the Act)</b>			
No comments were received by the local authorities relating to fish and shellfish ecology under Phase 2.A.			
<b>Section 42: Persons with an interest in the land (prescribed under section 44 of the Act)</b>			
No comments were received by landowners or land interests relating to fish and shellfish under Phase 2.A..			
<b>Section 47: Duty to consult local community</b>			
Robert J Cumber	<p>2) The impact on marine archeology, wildlife and local fishing interests Having carefully read the non-technical summary of the PEIR I can find no direct reference to the north Norfolk chalk reef. This is of great concern as it seems inevitable that the laying and maintenance of 6 major cables along the seabed towards Weybourne will significantly disrupt the delicate ecology of the area. Reports about the reef such as the Marine Survey by SeaSearch East <a href="http://seasearch.org.uk/downloads/Norfolk%20Chalk%20Reef%20report%202010.pdf">http://seasearch.org.uk/downloads/Norfolk%20Chalk%20Reef%20report%202010.pdf</a> make it clear (section 6.8) that the reef can easily be worn away by the simple movement of the tides on a loose crab pot. Presumably cable laying / untethered cables has the potential to create significant reef damage. It is clear from this report that because of the depth of the seawater and the effect of tidal movement at Weybourne the reef has by no means been adequately surveyed at this point. What steps are proposed to fully survey and evaluate the chalk reef at Weybourne prior to any cable laying being permitted? Whilst the reef itself is an amazing geological feature so too is all the marine life which inhabits it including the fish, crab and lobsters which provide the livelihood for the small but highly important fishing community which launches at Weybourne. In our opinion the whole of the north Norfolk reef should be created a SSSI and no cables permitted to cross it whatsoever. Whilst the local fishermen live alongside and respect the reef industrial cable-laying ships will not.</p>	I	<p>Since PEIR publication, the Hornsea Three offshore cable corridor has been re-routed to avoid reef features within the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ. No direct impacts on chalk reef habitats will therefore occur.</p> <p>A full assessment of the effects of Hornsea Three on benthic ecology, including on features of designated sites, is presented in Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology. Discussions on the effects of Hornsea Three on the qualifying benthic habitats of the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ is also presented in Environmental Statement volume 5, annex 2.3: MCZ Assessment.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>17</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Friends of North Norfolk	19. The majority of the North Norfolk Coastline is recognised, both nationally and internationally, for its exceptional landscape and ecological value with a number of overlapping Designations including the Norfolk Coast AONB, the North Norfolk Heritage Coast, many SSSI, SAC, RAMSAR sites and Marine Protection Areas/ MCZs.	I	A full assessment of the effects of Hornsea Three on benthic ecology, including on features of designated sites, is presented in volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology. Conclusions on the effects of Hornsea Three on the conservation objectives of the North Norfolk Coast and Saturn Reef SAC and The Wash and North Norfolk Coast SAC are presented in full within the RIAA for Hornsea Three. Discussions on the effects of Hornsea Three on the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ and the Markham's Triangle rMCZ are presented in full within volume 5, annex 2.3: Marine Conservation Zone Assessment.
Ian/Celia Howe	<b>Landfall Zone Local Matters</b> - The offshore chalk 'reef' which is important for the local fishing industry for crabs and lobster. Flooding of the car park happens at least twice a year in the autumn or spring tides/storms	I	Thank you for your comment. Since the PEIR, the Hornsea Three offshore cable corridor has been rerouted such that it now avoids areas of subtidal chalk within the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ. The assessment of temporary and long term habitat loss/disturbance on benthic features of this site presented in the Environmental Statement in volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology has been updated accordingly.  Appropriate mitigation measures have been design-in to Hornsea Three to minimise impacts on drainage and flooding (particularly in relation to runoff). Details are provided in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 2: Hydrology and Flood Risk (see Table 2.17) as well as the outline CoCP which forms part of the DCO application.
Dawn Moore	<b>EIA</b> - Not read or heard enough of the potential impact to wildlife at sea and surrounding land areas	I	Impacts on ecological receptors onshore and offshore are the relevant topic chapters of Environmental Statement volumes 2 and 3. Impacts on land uses are addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 6: Land Use and Recreation.
Valerie Stubbs	<b>Export Cable</b> - I am concerned about the impact on the seabed wildlife. This is also an important area for the local fishing industry, especially the crab/lobster boats that fish out of Weybourne, as the fact that this is still a working fishing village gives the village much of its character, as well as providing a living for local people.	I	Thank you for your comment. Please see in the Environmental Statement, volume 2, chapter 6 (Commercial Fisheries) where the impact assessment considers the level of impact to specific fisheries (including crab) activities and fleets.
Christine Walton	<b>Offshore Array</b> - I am concerned about the impact on wildlife, particularly local and migrating birds (getting caught in blades etc.), Also the impact on creatures in the sea - fish and other mammals. Impact of possible pollution in the sea on growing plants/seaweed etc. and therefore impact on the food chain.	I	The final assessment for offshore birds is presented in Environmental Statement Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore Ornithology and the final assessment for Marine Mammals presented in Environmental Statement Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine Mammals with no impacts of major significance identified for either receptors. Measures to manage the risk of any pollution events during the construction and operation of the project are captured within the Development Consent Order (and accompanying Deemed Marine Licences) through the requirement for a Marine Pollution Contingency Plan.
Ruth Bullard	<b>Export Cable</b> - I hope the sea bed will be restored and there is little impact on marine life	I	Noted. See the Environmental Statement where impacts have been assessed for various receptors (such as Benthic Ecology, Fish and Shellfish, Marine Mammals and Ornithology) and mitigation measures proposed where appropriate.
Brian Donovan	<b>Export Cables</b> - Your expert at the Holt consultation justified needing 1.5 km of sea bed because of the inaccuracy of laying cables to that depth, whereas you can lay cables much closer when on the land. Do you expect the marine life you damage over such a wide distance to fully recover after the marine cables are laid?	I	The requirement for a 1.5 km corridor width offshore is not associated with inaccuracy of cable laying but rather with the complexity of routing offshore to take into account environmental (e.g. protected reef features) and technical (e.g. outcropping rock or UXO) constraints which may only be fully understood during the detailed design process for the project, which will be undertaken post consent. The actual impacted footprint is linked primarily to the number of export cables and this will remain as assessed within the final application whether the cables are widely or narrowly spaced within the 1.5 km corridor. The impacts of the installation of offshore cables are considered in volume 2 of the Environmental Statement and this includes consideration of recovery of habitats and species along the entire export cable route.
Simon Clarke	<b>Offshore Export Cable Corridor</b> - I am worried about the impact on marine life, especially the local crab fishing industry	I	Thank you for your comment. Please see in the Environmental Statement, section 6.11 of volume 2, chapter 6 (Commercial Fisheries) where the impact assessment considers the level of impact to specific fisheries (including crab) activities and fleets

Table 2.6: Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Further Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.B) relating to fish and shellfish ecology.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>18</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 42: Prescribed consultees (The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009: Schedule 1))</b>			
Natural England	Natural England is content with the desktop data sources that are proposed to characterise other ecology and conservation topics within the potential offshore alternative routes.	I	Comment noted and the desktop data sources used to characterise the benthic ecology baseline are summarised in section 2.6.2 of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology and outlined in full in volume 5, annex 2.1: Benthic Ecology Technical Report.
Marine Management Organisation	1.2. Previous the MMO advice expressed concerns over the permanent damage and loss to the chalk reef should the export cable buried. Chalk reef provides a valuable habitat for foraging and protection of brown crab ( <i>Cancer pagurus</i> ) and European lobster ( <i>Homarus gammarus</i> ). The proposed alternative inshore cable route would potentially avoid such habitat loss within Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds Marine Conservation Zone (MCZ) and therefore also has the potential to reduce adverse effects on local shellfish stocks. Whilst the alternative inshore route would pass through a Special Area of Conservation (SAC), according to the Joint Nature Conservation Committee (JNCC) there are no shellfish species which have contributed to its designation.	I	Due to the re-reroute of the Hornsea Three offshore cable corridor in the nearshore environment, there will be no direct impact from cable installation on the Subtidal Chalk feature of the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ. A full assessment of the effects of Hornsea Three on benthic ecology, including on features of designated sites, is presented in Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Subtidal and Intertidal Ecology and on fish ecology in Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 3: Fish and Shellfish Ecology. Discussions on the effects of Hornsea Three on the qualifying benthic habitats of the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ is presented in Environmental Statement volume 5, annex 2.3: MCZ Assessment. Conclusions on the effects of Hornsea Three on the conservation objectives of The Wash and North Norfolk Coast SAC are presented in full within the RIAA for Hornsea Three.
Marine Management Organisation	<b>2. Are there any additional baseline data sources available that could be used to inform the EIA?</b> 2.1 Key desktop data sources have been identified to characterise fish ecology and commercial fisheries within the potential offshore alternative routes (Table 2.1, 'Section 42 Consultation: Potential Offshore Alternative Routes - Supporting Information'). Table 2.1 references the PEIR fish ecology and commercial fisheries chapters which present sources including survey data collected from Hornsea One and Two projects, in addition to publicly available data sources. They are considered to be sufficient to characterise fish ecology and commercial fisheries within the potential alternative routes.	I	Comments from the MMO are acknowledged.
Marine Management Organisation	2.6. The use of Marine Conservation Society SeaSearch data is recommended as an additional source of marine species and habitat data for inshore areas of the export cable corridor.	I	Data from Marine Recorder, including SeaSearch dive surveys within the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ and the Wash and North Norfolk Coast SAC, have been used to characterise the baseline environment of the Hornsea Three offshore cable corridor (see section 2.3 of Environmental Statement volume 5, annex 2.1: Benthic Ecology Technical Report).
Marine Management Organisation	3.2. Attention is drawn to previous MMO advice that should the heat mapping approach be used to support the potential sandeel habitat assessment, the limitations and caveats associated with the proposed Latta et al. (2013) assessment should be acknowledged in the ES.	N	Hornsea Three acknowledges these caveats/limitations however heat mapping was not carried out.
<b>Section 42: Local Authorities (prescribed under section 43 of the Act)</b>			
No comments were received by local authorities relating to fish and shellfish ecology under Phase 2.B.			
<b>Section 42: Persons with an interest in the land (prescribed under section 44 of the Act)</b>			
No comments were received by landowners or land interests relating to fish and shellfish ecology under Phase 2.B.			
<b>Section 47: Duty to consult local community</b>			
No comments were received by the local community relating to fish and shellfish under Phase 2.B.			
<b>Section 48: Duty to publicise</b>			
No comments were received in response to the public notice issued during Phase 2.B relating to fish and shellfish ecology			

<sup>18</sup> Y = Yes change made; N = No change made; I = Incorporated into or considered when producing the assessment or landowner voluntary agreement offer; N/A = Not applicable.



## 2.4 Marine Mammals

Table 2.7: Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.A) relating to marine mammals.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>19</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 42: Prescribed consultees (The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009: Schedule 1))</b>			
Norfolk and Norwich Naturalists' Society	Offshore: The cables will cross the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds, recently designated a Marine Conservation Zone. Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ is Europe's longest known area of chalk reef, the Cromer Shoal Chalk reef runs east from Cley to Trimmingham. Ranging between 0-20 metres in depth, marine wildlife is exceptionally diverse here due to its unique structure of boulders, gullies, stacks and arches and should not be disturbed in any way. The area is well known for its communities of crabs and lobsters, but also hosts more than 30 different species of colourful sea slugs, as well as burrowing piddocks, sea squirts, anemones and sponges some of which are unique to the area. The reef and the sea beyond are used by Harbour Porpoise and are as such vulnerable to disturbance from both construction noise and ongoing operational acoustic activity.	I	Thank you for your feedback. A full assessment of the effects of Hornsea Three on benthic ecology, including on features of designated sites, is presented in the Environmental Statement in volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology. Discussions on the effects of Hornsea Three on the qualifying benthic habitats of the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ is also presented in volume 5, annex 2.3: MCZ Assessment.
Ministry of Infrastructure and the Environment, Dutch Government	Nr. 40 is designated to protect sandbanks (HD type 1110), harbour porpoise, harbor seal and grey seal, and as a bird protection area two species of divers and little gull.	I	Acknowledged
Ministry of Infrastructure and the Environment, Dutch Government	Nr. 44 is the southwestern part of mainland Jutland with islands where marshland mixes with several other plant communities on the habitat directives Annex 1 and many species including mammals, birds and fish.	I	Acknowledged
Ministry of Infrastructure and the Environment, Dutch Government	The Danish Environmental Protection Agency find it unlikely that a significant effect on Danish nature sites will be observed due to the construction of Hornsea Three Offshore Wind Farm - especially with reference to the substantial distance. In the HRA report - section 6 - NIRAS reach the same conclusion,	I	Acknowledged
ScottishPower Renewables (UK) Limited	Our intention is to register as an interested party due to the potential for cumulative and in-combination habitats issues to arise with Hornsea Project Three and SPR's East Anglia projects, specifically East Anglia TWO and ONE North Offshore Windfarms for which scoping requests will be submitted to the Planning Inspectorate in November of this year. At this stage our specific interest is in relation to the potential for offshore ornithological and marine mammal impacts and therefore cumulative and in-combination impacts upon European protected sites and species.	N	Noted
ScottishPower Renewables (UK) Limited	Whilst we have submitted this response as an early indication of our intention to participate in the Hornsea Three DCO pre-application process and subsequent examination, our intention is to work constructively with DONG Energy and other Southern North Sea Offshore wind applicants to resolve cumulative/in-combination issues, for the benefit of the offshore wind industry ensuring significant MWs are realised in the most appropriate locations. Should you wish to discuss this response in any further detail, please contact [REDACTED], ScottishPower Renewables [REDACTED], tel: [REDACTED].	N	Noted

<sup>19</sup> Y = Yes change made; N = No change made; I = Incorporated into or considered when producing the assessment or landowner voluntary agreement offer; N/A = Not applicable.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>19</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Whale & Dolphin Conservation	WDC welcome being invited to comment on the PEIR for Hornsea 3 offshore wind farm. We understand that there is a Marine Mammal Expert Working Group (EWG) to discuss issues of marine mammals and the Hornsea 3 offshore wind farm development. Unfortunately, WDC was not part of that group, although we sit on marine mammals EWG for other offshore wind farm developments, therefore this is our first opportunity to give feedback on this development.	N	WDC were added to the list of recipients of the EWG meeting minutes and the project has met face to face with WDC to keep them up-to-date. Further detail of these meetings and the points raised, where pertinent to the assessments, are detailed within Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 4: Marine Mammals.
Whale & Dolphin Conservation	SCANS Data Section 3.3 details how SCANS II surveys have been used to assist with assessing marine mammal populations, and potential impacts on marine mammals. However, the SCANS surveys are only one seasonal snapshot in time, with a 10 year gap between datasets. It is not therefore appropriate to be used for estimates of density and finer-scale information is required where such data are not available (Green et al., 2012). We also note that the recent SCANS III data has not been included; this was made available in May 2017 and should be included for the purpose of this assessment.	I	The limitations with individual baseline datasets are recognised (see paragraph 4.7.2.35 in Section 4.7 of Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 4: Marine Mammals) and these are reflective of the nature of surveying in the marine environment for a mobile species. In order to account for these limitations, the full suite of data sets have been used to establish density ranges within the Study Area (rather than adopt a single density from any one data set).
Whale & Dolphin Conservation	Potential impacts Volume 1 Chapter 3 of the PEIR 'Project Description' describes the various foundation types being considered for Hornsea 3. We are pleased to see that a number of options are open for consideration. However, we are concerned to see that foundations requiring piling are included, in particular monopiles. Pile driving, even with the use of pin piles, has the potential to cause physical harm, as well as displacement. Reactions to the pile driving process for wind development have been recorded at distances up to 15 km from the piling site (Carstensen et al., 2006). Thomsen et al. (2006) found that the noise generated by the construction of offshore wind farms was loud enough to be audible by harbour porpoises beyond 80 km from the source and could mask communication at 30 – 40 km. Bottlenose dolphins could exhibit behavioural responses at distances of up to 40 km from pile driving locations (Bailey et al., 2010). A paper analysing foraging rates in harbour porpoise found that they feed almost continuously to meet energy needs and are therefore highly sensitive to disturbance (Wisniewska et al., 2016). Given the importance of the Hornsea 3 area and the cSAC for harbour porpoise, most likely as prime foraging areas, displacement from the area could be very significant. Due to the sensitivity of harbour porpoises to noise disturbance, the location of Hornsea 3 to the Southern North Sea cSAC and that alternative foundations are available that have significantly less noise impact, we strongly recommend that foundations requiring piling are removed as an option for Hornsea 3.	I	The Applicant notes the WDC position on use of monopile foundations, and recognises that it is a position they adopt industry wide and therefore, not unique to Hornsea Three. As WDC are aware there is a balance that needs to be struck between adopting a restricted design envelope and retaining technical and commercial flexibility. Based on the outcomes of this assessment the Applicant does not consider such stringent envelope refinement (which could fundamentally affect the project's viability) is merited. The Applicant points the WDC to those embedded measures that it has committed to (as presented in Section 4.10 of Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 4: Marine Mammals) to reduce the potential underwater noise effects on marine mammals.
Whale & Dolphin Conservation	Section 4.11.1.45 of the marine mammals chapter, details piling scenario for Hornsea 3. It states that temporally piling 'could occur up to 604.8 days over a 2.5 year, two phase piling period'. This is a significant period of time in a harbour porpoise life span. Harbour porpoise are reported to live up to 23 years, but rarely live over 12 years of age. They reach sexual maturity at 3-4 years and calving occurs every 2 years. Therefore, the potential impact of pile-driving for Hornsea 3 on the harbour porpoise population is high, covering the lifespan of a porpoise and potentially affecting breeding and feeding activity. The impact of this piling activity is as acknowledged in section 4.11.1.45 of the marine mammals chapter of the EIA, where it states piling activity could "potentially lead to reproductive failure over up to a maximum of four breeding cycles". For harbour porpoise population this is a significant period of time. We are interested in the implications of this in relation to harbour porpoise population numbers within the Management Unit and the impacts on the cSAC.	I	The updated piling schedule (maximum design scenario) is presented in Table 4.15 of Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 4: Marine Mammals. The assessment (as presented in section 4.11 of Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 4: Marine Mammals) has given due regard to the consequence of disturbance over this time period.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>19</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Whale & Dolphin Conservation	<p>In-combination effects</p> <p>Annex 1: HRA Screening Report, and the marine mammals chapter details the in-combination assessment for Hornsea 3 offshore wind farm. We note that the assessment only incorporates offshore wind farms, and does not list other offshore developments that have the possibility to have an in-combination effect, such as oil and gas developments, shipping, navigation and shipping. These other activities need to be included to ensure an effective assessment is undertaken. East Anglia One North, East Anglia Two and Norfolk Boreas also should be screened into the in-combination assessment, currently these have been left out of the list. Guidelines for in-combination assessment state that other developments, including cross boundary developments must be taken into account when undertaking the assessment. Any conclusion based on an incomplete assessment will be unreliable. Therefore, the conclusion of the in-combination assessment, which is also highlighted in 6.5.1.7 of the PEIR non-technical summary, that there is likely to only be minor adverse significance from in combination is unreliable. It is acknowledged in Annex 1:HRA Screening Report that due to changes in the project design that the impacts on marine mammals will be re-assessed in the Environmental Statement, this assessment should take into account the combined effects of these developments with other industries operating in the marine environment, such as other marine renewable developments, shipping and oil and gas exploration, including outside of UK waters. Cumulative effects from across marine boundaries need to be considered to consider all potential transient impacts across such boundaries, especially considering the mobile nature of cetaceans.</p>	I	<p>The in-combination assessment has incorporated projects and plans other than solely offshore wind farms. Oil and Gas seismic surveys have been incorporated into the assessment. Shipping however is considered part of the baseline and is not included within the in-combination assessment.</p> <p>Cross boundary developments have been taken into account within the in-combination assessment (see volume 4, annex 5.3: Cumulative Effects Screening Matrix). Each project on the CEA long list has been considered on a case by case basis for scoping in or out of this chapter's assessment based upon data confidence, effect-receptor pathways and the spatial/temporal scales involved.</p>
Whale & Dolphin Conservation	<p>Mitigation methods</p> <p>In section 6.5, the marine mammal chapter of the Non-technical summary, mitigation measures are discussed to reduce the impacts of Hornsea 3 on marine mammals. Although the mitigation measures described are part of JNCC's guidance, we disagree that these are appropriate mitigation methods.</p> <p>The measures of a 500 m exclusion zone around any piling, along with a soft start, cannot be relied upon to reduce the impact on cetaceans. Soft-starts of pile driving have not been proven as an effective mitigation measure. Soft starts are only a reduction in sound source at the initiation of a piling event. Consideration of real-time mitigation measures should include acoustic barrier methods and other techniques that are identified and proven in recent studies to reduce noise impacts that may result in injury and/or disturbance (for example, Wilke 2012 and Diederichs et al., 2013).</p>	I	<p>The mitigation measures adopted to reduce the risk of injurious effects on marine mammals will be detailed within the Marine Mammal Mitigation Protocol (MMMP) that will be developed using best practice techniques in consultation with the statutory nature conservation body (SNCB) and approved by the MMO prior to the commencement of offshore works.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>19</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Whale & Dolphin Conservation	<p>Acoustic Deterrent Devices (ADDs) are also included as a mitigation method, however ADDs add more noise into the environment, and are also not a proven mitigation measure. In addition, they should be included in the assessment for noise as it is another noise source during the time of construction.</p> <p>A recent study analysing the assessed the benefits of noise reduction to harbour porpoise during offshore wind construction found that if wind farms inside the Southern North Sea cSAC reduced their noise levels by the equivalent of around 8dB, the risk of a 1% annual decline in the North Sea porpoise population can be reduced by up to 66% (WWF, 2016). Such an approach is the only way to reduce the far reaching avoidance distances for cetaceans.</p> <p>Shut down of the source should be a requirement should marine mammals enter within a predetermined radius of pile driving activities.</p> <p>6.5.1.4 of the PEIR Non-technical summary states MMMP will bring effects into negligible or minor adverse, this cannot be concluded until details of MMP known. WDC request to be involved in the design of the MMP to ensure that is sufficient, as we have been for other MMMPs for offshore windfarm developments.</p> <p>We also have concerns over the approach to monitoring impacts of piling on harbour porpoises during construction. To fully understand the impacts of piling on the cSAC and harbour porpoise, the monitoring should be robust enough to demonstrate the responses of harbour porpoise to piling activities. Monitoring should be undertaken throughout the construction period, and into the operational phase, across the Hornsea 3 site to fully assess the impacts of piling.</p>	I	The Applicant has committed to a Plan for Marine Mammal Monitoring that will be developed in consultation with the SNCB and approved by the MMO prior to the commencement of offshore works. The Plan will be developed in line with the principles set out in the In-Principle Monitoring Plan that accompanies the application (application document reference A8.8).
Whale & Dolphin Conservation	<p>Due to the impacts of climate change on cetaceans<sup>1</sup>, WDC supports the development of well-considered marine renewable energy. However, we have serious concerns about the potential impacts these developments, both individually and cumulatively, have on cetaceans. These concerns are detailed in our report "Marine Renewable Energy: A Global Review of the Extent of Marine Renewable Energy Developments, the Developing Technologies and Possible Conservation Implications for Cetaceans" available at <a href="http://uk.whales.org/sites/default/files/wdc-marine-renewable-energy-report.pdf">http://uk.whales.org/sites/default/files/wdc-marine-renewable-energy-report.pdf</a></p>	I	The applicant has sought to use best available evidence to inform the assessment of potential impacts on marine mammal receptors (as identified throughout Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 4: Marine Mammals and its associated annex). If WDC have any specific points from the two reports cited in relation to how the Hornsea Three project is being proposed then we would welcome discussion on those points accordingly. The assessment has considered the impacts from Hornsea Project Three both individually and in-combination with other plans and projects.
Whale & Dolphin Conservation	<p>We would also like to draw your attention to this recent report identifying the potential for region wide impacts resulting from noise pollution across the North Sea (Heinis and de Jong, 2015).</p>	I	We're aware of this report and the process and findings are similar to the work by Booth et al (2016)
Whale & Dolphin Conservation	<p>We recognise the effort to undertake a quantitative assessment of impacts, to include sensitivity of species and their Favourable Conservation Status. Although beyond the scope of this piece of work, the FCS status provided by the UK does not always tally with that of the European Topic Centre. WDC has raised this issue elsewhere (Dolman et al., 2013).</p>	N	Noted



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>19</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Whale & Dolphin Conservation	<p>Below are WDCs comments specifically on Volume 2: Chapter 4: Marine Mammals, unless stated otherwise.</p> <p>Southern North Sea Candidate Special Area of Conservation (cSAC)</p> <p>WDC are glad to see that Volume 2: Chapter 4: Marine Mammals of the PEIR recognises the importance of the Hornsea Zone for cetaceans, in particular harbour porpoises as Hornsea 3 lies in very close proximity to the cSAC, with the cable corridor going through the cSAC.</p> <p>As a cSAC the Southern North Sea is a strictly protected site, designated under the EC Habitats Directive, with a specific Conservation Objective of "To avoid deterioration of the habitats of the harbour porpoise or significant disturbance to the harbour porpoise, thus ensuring that the integrity of the site is maintained and the site makes an appropriate contribution to maintaining Favourable Conservation Status for the UK harbour porpoise." (JNCC, 2017).</p> <p>Although Hornsea 3 does not lie directly within the cSAC, it's very close proximity means that the wind farm construction will impact the cSAC both alone and in-combination. Therefore, the assessment of impacts on cetaceans and harbour porpoise in particular, must be undertaken not only against the North Sea management unit, but a HRA must be undertaken for the cSAC to ensure there is no likely significant effect (LSE) from the development.</p>	I	Noted. Impacts on the Southern North Sea cSAC are considered at both a project alone and cumulative level within the Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment
Whale & Dolphin Conservation	<p>We are glad to see the Draft Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment Annex 1: HRA Screening Report (RIAA) included in the PEIR, and that trans-boundary sites for marine mammals are included. However, throughout this chapter the Southern North Sea cSAC is detailed as a Potential Special Area of Conservation (pSAC), despite the site being designated as a cSAC seven months before the PEIR was written. We are also concerned by the incorrect statement in 6.2.21 of the above chapter "The main aim of the designation is to support the maintenance of harbour porpoise populations throughout UK waters". The purpose of the designation is to protect a site that has key habitat areas and significant population of harbour porpoise; and any assessment of the impacts of Hornsea 3 must consider the correct designation and the reason for that designation. As noted above, the site is a designated cSAC which offers strict protection, therefore the HRA must consider not only the project independently, but also cumulatively taking into account other plans and projects that will impact the harbour porpoise at the site. Site based protection cannot be met by assessing the whole North Sea population, but only by assessing the impacts for the number of individuals that are supported by the site (Rees et al., 2015).</p> <p>WDC strongly disagrees with the conclusion in the RIAA in 7.5.2.46 that "there is no indication that the potential for lethality/ injury and hearing impairment effects associated with underwater noise on the harbour porpoise qualifying feature of this site would lead to a reduction in the viability of the species or adversely impact the supporting habitats and processes relevant to this species and their prey from being maintained". We therefore believe that proven mitigation should be used to reduce impacts.</p> <p>Proven mitigation methods are also required as the maximum worst case disturbance scenarios from piling exceed the thresholds set by JNCC. The RIAA states a maximum worst case scenario of 37.13% for sequential piling and 46.97% for concurrent piling for summer component of cSAC. Also, the assessment states that there is potential for up to 14.09% on the North Sea Management Unit to be affected by disturbance impacts.</p> <p>WDC request to be included on discussions of mitigation options, to ensure that proven and effective methods are used.</p>	I	<p>The RIAA correctly references the cSAC and includes the CO's as stated within the site selection documentation. JNCC advice is to consider the wider MU population within the HRA assessment. Effects in-combination with other plans and project have been assessed.</p> <p>The assessment on effects of lethality injury has been updated on the basis of updated noise modelling results.</p> <p>The cumulative effects assessment list of projects, and tiering of projects, has been updated. Therefore, the disturbance assessment for harbour porpoise and the percentage overlap of the SNS cSAC has also been updated.</p> <p>The EIA/HRA outline mitigation measures where it is considered necessary.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>19</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Whale & Dolphin Conservation	<p>Survey methodologies WDC is pleased to see that a number of site surveys have been undertaken to understand the use of the area by marine mammals, and provide a baseline upon which to assess the impacts of the development. However, WDC has some very serious concerns regarding the methodology used, which are detailed below.</p> <p>The site based surveys that have been undertaken have shown the area to be incredibly important for harbour porpoise, with densities significantly higher than the surrounding area and wider North Sea. Due to our concerns over the methodology used, as noted below, it is highly likely that the data under-represent the numbers of marine mammals in the area – which is acknowledged in a number of places in the PEIR, and Annex 1: HRA Screening Report - and their use of the area. Therefore, we have concerns over the accuracy of the baseline data and the resulting analyses.</p>	I	<p>The limitations with individual baseline datasets are recognised (see paragraph 4.7.2.35 in Section 4.7 of Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 4: Marine Mammals) and these are reflective of the nature of surveying in the marine environment for a mobile species. In order to account for these limitations, the full suite of data sets have been used to establish density ranges within the Study Area (rather than adopt a single density from any one data set).</p>
Whale & Dolphin Conservation	<p>Boat-based Surveys Section 2.4.2.1 details the visual boat-based surveys that were undertaken for marine mammals at Hornsea 3 site, and that these were undertaken at the time surveys were conducted for Hornsea 1 and Hornsea 2. Although WDC is pleased to see that three years of data were collected including a 10km buffer from the former Hornsea Zone, we raised our concerns over the methodology used in these surveys when Hornsea 2 was being developed. Our concerns remain the same that the methodology for boat based surveys used was not adequate for assessing marine mammal numbers.</p> <p>The methodology that was used is designed for ornithology surveys. Marine mammal surveys that are developed as an add-on to boat based bird surveys are inadequately designed monitoring programmes that cannot provide a sufficient baseline to characterise the environment. This is acknowledged in Section 2.6.1.1, however despite this the issue has not been addressed. We are very concerned to see that in the last four years that additional dedicated marine mammal surveys have not been undertaken to, using scientists to ensure that the research design is robust, to address these concerns and provide scientifically up-to-date, robust marine mammal data on which accurate assessment can be undertaken. Again, the fact the data are old and potentially do not reflect the use of the area by marine mammals is acknowledged in Section 2.3.6.1, this makes it inappropriate to use in assessing the area for marine mammals and assessing any impacts.</p> <p>Section 2.4.3 on the acoustic surveys undertaken states that Passive Acoustic Monitoring (PAM) was used, and we are pleased to see that 2 years surveys was undertaken. We note that in section 2.6.2.3 that the area planned to be surveyed had to be adjusted, and this has led to holes in the dataset. We would like to know how this will be addressed.</p>	I	<p>The limitations with individual baseline datasets are recognised (see paragraph 4.7.2.35 in Section 4.7 of volume 2, chapter 4: Marine Mammals) and these are reflective of the nature of surveying in the marine environment for a mobile species. In order to account for these limitations, the full suite of data sets have been used to establish density ranges within the Study Area (rather than adopt a single density from any one data set).</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>19</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Whale & Dolphin Conservation	<p>Aerial Surveys</p> <p>Section 2.4.4 details the methodology used in aerial surveys for marine mammals, whilst WDC agrees that high definition aerial surveys are suitable for surveying for marine mammals, we have serious concerns over the methodologies used in the surveys for Hornsea 3 offshore wind farm. Section 2.4.4.3, and table titled 'Minimum acceptable weather' describes how surveys are conducted in up to sea state 6, and states that 'Although sea state 6 is defined as a maximum, in practice this was rarely experienced, with the majority of surveys conducted in sea states of 4 or less'. Sea state 3 and above make it very difficult to see cetaceans especially harbour porpoise which are small and spend very little time at the surface. It is well known and accepted that surveying for cetaceans from aerial surveys is not conducted in sea states above 3 and this is the methodology used by companies undertaking high definition aerial surveys for other offshore wind farm developments. Section 4.3.3 of the Annex 1: HRA Screening Report also acknowledges the harbour porpoises and dolphins may not have been recorded due to poor sea state. Undertaking aerial surveys in sea states higher than 3 will give misleading and inaccurate results, and underestimate the use of the area by cetaceans, therefore leading to incorrect conclusions. For the high definition aerial surveys to be scientifically robust they need to be undertaken in appropriate conditions, and for a minimum duration of 2 years, not just the 18 months as described in 2.4.4.1 Figure 2.3 also demonstrates how only a buffer of 4 km around Hornsea 3 was used when undertaking the surveys, we feel this is inadequate to assess the numbers of marine mammals that could be impacted by the development, given the distances at which construction noises can disturb porpoises, these distances are highlighted below.</p>	I	The limitations with individual baseline datasets are recognised (see paragraph 4.7.2.35 in Section 4.7 of Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 4: Marine Mammals) and these are reflective of the nature of surveying in the marine environment for a mobile species. In order to account for these limitations, the full suite of data sets have been used to establish density ranges within the Study Area (rather than adopt a single density from any one data set).
Dutch Ministry of Infrastructure and Environment	<p>Sea mammals:</p> <p>1. We miss the habitat density maps produced by Gilles et al 2016 of the harbour porpoise amongst the data sources.</p>	I	The maps were not included in the baseline as the underlying data for the UK North Sea region are those collected during the SCANS II surveys which are now out of date. The regions for which effort was greatest and model prediction most confident from this study were from the Dutch and German North Sea regions out with the area of potential impact from Hornsea Three activities.
Dutch Ministry of Infrastructure and Environment	<p>3. There is not yet a magnitude evaluation for the harbour porpoise for reasons explained. We are looking forward to more information on this in the Environmental Statement</p>	I	All assessments (except TTS) now have a magnitude evaluation for all species.
Dutch Ministry of Infrastructure and Environment	<p>We also note that the impact of wind parks in the Netherlands, Belgium and Germany are not taken into consideration. For bird populations which have an international habitat as the area of the southern part of the North Sea, an international approach to accumulation would be required. Within the international cooperation of North Sea countries as a follow-up of the Political declaration on Energy Cooperation (also signed by the UK) such an approach is looked into and developed further.</p> <p>The proposed next steps look good. Some remarks though:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The accumulation study for the winter period mixes up different populations/ A more coherent international approach would be appreciated</li> <li>• Attention could also be paid to possible mitigating measures to reduce the impacts, disregard if this is a significant effect or not.</li> </ul>	I	The quantitative approach taken in cumulative and in-combination assessments means that it is not possible to incorporate projects in Dutch, Belgian and German waters as these projects do not quantify impacts as part of EIA consistent to that conducted by projects in UK waters. Environmental Statement Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore Ornithology includes consideration of transboundary effects (Section 5.14)
Norfolk Vanguard	<p>To enable a robust cumulative assessment, we would like to have sight of and share information as soon as possible in relation to the baseline data that is currently being collected and ongoing assessment work pending completion, namely Chapter 3 (Fish and Shellfish Ecology), Chapter 4 (Marine Mammals), Chapter 5 (Offshore Ornithology), Chapter 6 (Commercial Fisheries) and Chapter 8 (Aviation, Military and Communication). We would welcome sight of the HRA Appropriate Assessment and discussions with the project team on the approach being taken, prior to the submission of the DCO application.</p>	N	Hornsea Three has been in regular dialogue with the Vattenfall Vanguard project throughout the pre-application stage for each project.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>19</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
The Wildlife Trust (joint response from Norfolk WT and TWT)	3.1.1. Marine mammal EIA assessment: Harbour porpoise <i>Phocoena phocoena</i> Section 4.11.1.4 states that "There is uncertainty in the application of new noise impact assessment criteria (NMF, 2016)". We would like to suggest at this stage that both the NOAA guidance (NMFS, 2016) and the Southall et al (2007) is used as part of the assessment, to reduce uncertainty, allow for comparison and to test the effectiveness of the new guidance.	I	The Applicant has based the updated underwater noise modelling on the NOAA guidance (NMFS, 2016) as instructed by the SNCB and agreed through the EWG process with full meeting minutes presented within the Evidence Plan (Consultation Report Annex 1 Evidence Plan).
The Wildlife Trust (joint response from Norfolk WT and TWT)	We appreciate that, due to the need to refine the assessment criteria, the marine mammals EIA assessment is not complete and we look forward to working with the Hornsea 3 project team on refining the assessment criteria. However, we have some concerns regarding both the injury and disturbance impact assessment results. As highlighted in 4.11.1.72 for PTS impacts "In the absence of mitigation, there is potential for a small number of individuals to experience auditory injury (PTS) up to the maximum hammer energies .... Auditory injury (PTS) is likely to lead to permanent effects on marine mammals." The disturbance figures highlighted in 4.11.1.77 show that up to 14.09% of the NS MU population could be affected from concurrent piling and 8.53% from single location piling. Harbour porpoise are a European Protected Species (EPS) which are afforded strict protection under Article 12 of the Habitats Directive, transposed into UK law by The Offshore Marine Conservation (Natural Habitats, &c.) Regulations 2007 (as amended in 2009 and 2010). The Regulations prohibit the deliberate capture, injury, killing or disturbance of EPS. TWT suggests, due to the strict protect afforded to harbour porpoise, the assessment results for injury and disturbance and that "Hornsea 3 marine mammal study area is important to harbour porpoise due to the high densities found here" (4.11.1.81), that mitigation is required. We would welcome a discussion regarding this at this early stage of assessment.	I	An updated assessment of effects from underwater noise is presented in Section 4.11.1. Embedded measures that capture mitigation committed to as part of the Project's design are presented in Section 4.10 of Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 4: Marine Mammals.
The Wildlife Trust (joint response from Norfolk WT and TWT)	We are also concerned regarding the temporal impact of the piling work, which as highlighted in 4.11.1.45 of the EIA marine mammals chapter, could occur up to 604.8 days of a 2.5 year, two phase piling period. This is a significant period of time in a harbour porpoise life history which as highlighted could "potentially lead to reproductive failure over up to a maximum of four breeding cycles". For a species, which has an average life expectancy of 20 years in UK waters (Learmonth et al (2014)), this is a significant period of time. We are interested in the implications of this in relation to harbour porpoise population numbers within the Management Unit and the effect on the functioning of the Management Unit. We also suggest caution in suggesting that "there is likely to be no long-term significant effects at the population-level for harbour porpoise" (4.11.1.86) based on the results from modelling as part of the DEPONS project. The modelled results should be considered as illustrative at present as to how modelling could be used to predict population consequences. Data validation and ground truthing is required before modelling can be realistically used to test population impacts.	I	The updated assessment of underwater noise effects (as presented in Section 4.11.1 of Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 4: Marine Mammals) has due regard to maximum temporal piling duration, and considers these effects at the population level.
The Wildlife Trust (joint response from Norfolk WT and TWT)	3.1.2. Marine mammal Cumulative Impact assessment We do not believe oil and gas projects, shipping and navigation, and commercial fisheries should be screened out of the cumulative assessment. TWT believe the noise levels of all activities should be assessed against a baseline noise level.	I	The cumulative assessment of underwater noise disturbance considers all relevant (known) plans, projects and or proposals (including oil and gas projects) that may come forward at the same time as Hornsea Project Three. The increase in shipping activity from the Project has been assessed in sections 4.11 and 4.13 of volume 2, chapter 4: Marine Mammals.
The Wildlife Trust (joint response from Norfolk WT and TWT)	TWT suggest that East Anglia One North, East Anglia Two and Norfolk Boreas should be screened into the cumulative assessment. We expect that more information will be available on these developments before the planning application is entered for Hornsea 3, and therefore would expect these developments to be included in the cumulative assessment.	I	The cumulative assessment of underwater noise disturbance considers all relevant (known) plans, projects and or proposals that may come forward at the same time as Hornsea Project Three.



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>19</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
The Wildlife Trust (joint response from Norfolk WT and TWT)	Although beyond the control of this development, TWT believe that cumulative assessments should be taken at a strategic level. This is because, as highlighted in 4.13.1.7 “different approaches to assessment taken by other offshore developers, different noise criteria and thresholds used, and differing levels of detail presented in associated Environmental Statements”. A strategic approach would ensure consistency, produce more realistic outcomes and provide industry with more certainty on mitigation requirements. This especially important due to the fact that a quantitative cumulative impact assessment has not been possible for cumulative disturbance effects.	N	This comment is noted. However, it is not in the gift of Hornsea Three to undertake such strategic assessments and the Applicant considers that this is a matter for TWT to raise in the appropriate sector-wide forums.
The Wildlife Trust (joint response from Norfolk WT and TWT)	We suggest that, based on the statements made in 4.14.1.36, 4.13.1.45, 4.13.1.47 and 4.14.1.50 for the cumulative assessment for harbour porpoise, further investigation is undertaken. We suggest that mitigation is likely to be required for cumulative impacts, especially in relation to EPS.	I	An updated assessment of effects from underwater noise is presented in Section 4.11.1 of volume 2, chapter 4: Marine Mammals. Embedded measures that capture mitigation committed to as part of the Project’s design are presented in Section 4.10 of volume 2, chapter 4: Marine Mammals.
The Wildlife Trust (joint response from Norfolk WT and TWT)	3.2. Report to Inform the Appropriate Assessment (RIAA): Southern North Sea cSAC Table 3.2 indicates that floating turbines are being considered as part of the design envelope. An assessment against entanglement should be undertaken for the Southern North Sea cSAC and also be included in the EIA marine mammals chapter. It is stated in 3.4.4.26 that if floating turbines are used, anchors to secure mooring lines could be secured by piles. Please could figures be provided on the potential hammer energy required for installing anchor piles for floating turbines.	Y	Floating turbines are no longer within the design envelope and therefore, this comment is no longer relevant.
The Wildlife Trust (joint response from Norfolk WT and TWT)	In addition to the in-combination disturbance effects, the EIA alone assessment outlines that there is potential for up to 14.09% on the NS MU to be affected by disturbance impacts. As identified in 4.11.1.81 of the marine mammals chapter “Hornsea 3 marine mammal study area is important to harbour porpoise due to the high densities found here”. As harbour porpoise are a mobile species, areas such as these could be important to cSAC functioning.	I	An updated assessment of effects from underwater noise is presented in Section 4.11.1 of Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 4: Marine Mammals. Matters relating to the cSAC are presented in the Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment.
The Wildlife Trust (joint response from Norfolk WT and TWT)	3.3. Marine Mammal Mitigation Protocol (MMMP): Chapter 3: Marine Mammals chapter and Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment We are concerned that the current 15% ramp up level at 750kJ (to reach a maximum hammer energy of 5000kJ) results in a PTS radius of 1500m, thus defining the mitigation zone at this distance. TWT believes a mitigation zone of 1500m is too high. We also have concerns that animals may be present within the PTS zone as ramp up increases (as outlined in table 4.23 of the marine mammals chapter). We would like to open discussions with the Hornsea Three project team on potential mitigation options to reduce PTS impacts. We suggest that Acoustic Deterrent Devices (ADDs) should be included in the noise assessment methodology to take account of additional noise produced as part of the MMMP.	I	PTS effects will be controlled through the implementation of a MMMP that will be developed using best practice techniques in consultation with the statutory nature conservation body (SNCB) and approved by the MMO prior to the commencement of offshore works. The Project will not be able to proceed until the MMO is satisfied that the Project has a protocol that adequately mitigates the risk of PTS.
The Wildlife Trust (joint response from Norfolk WT and TWT)	3.4. Vessel movement: cumulative/in-combination impacts Current vessel activity in the Hornsea 3 marine mammal study area is 12,775 (4.11.2.19). It is predicted that increased vessel movements from Hornsea 3 during construction will be 11,776 (7.7.3.1 RIAA). When adding the increased vessel movements over the cumulative assessment period (table 7.30 in RIAA), there will be over 70,000 increased vessel movements. We suggest that the cumulative effects of vessel movements are investigated in more detail in relation to marine mammals, and the Southern North Sea cSAC in particular.	Y	The updated design envelope has seen a revision to the number of projected vessels associated with the construction and operation of the project. The maximum figures are presented in Table 4.15 of volume 2, chapter 4: Marine Mammals and these have been used to inform the subsequent assessment.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>19</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
The Wildlife Trust (joint response from Norfolk WT and TWT)	3.5. Habituation and return times TWT has some concerns regarding the assumptions made with regards to habituation and return times in both the marine mammals chapter and the RIAA. For example, 4.11.1.65 in the marine mammals chapter highlights that the North Sea has the highest noise levels compared to other UK seas and "This suggests that marine mammals in the North Sea are likely to be acclimatised to certain level of noise in the same spectrum that is predicted to arise from piling". We suggest that this assumption cannot be made as we do not know enough about the impacts from current baseline noise levels on the functioning of marine mammal populations within the North Sea.	I	The assessment of the impact of piling noise on harbour porpoise does not explicitly consider return times in a quantitative way because of the lack of data on individual movement patterns in relation to responses to piling noise. The assumption adopted in the assessment is that the predicted level of disturbance to harbour porpoises occurs throughout the whole period of piling activity and does not distinguish between these two scenarios (a smaller number of individuals being repeatedly disturbed or a larger number of individuals being disturbed only once).
The Wildlife Trust (joint response from Norfolk WT and TWT)	TWT suggests caution in the consideration of return time, as discussed in 4.11.1.78 of the EIA marine mammals chapter and 7.5.2.72-75 of the RIAA. There is not enough evidence to understand the true nature of harbour porpoise return behaviour following piling activity. Previous studies do highlight differing return times but we have no certainty if these are the same animals returning or new animals visiting the site. We do not know how much site fidelity relates to return times e.g. quicker return times due to good foraging areas (Brandt et al, 2016) which could result in risking overall fitness due to potential multiple flight activity from multiple piling events (Dahne et al 2013).	I	The assessment of the impact of piling noise on harbour porpoise does not explicitly consider return times in a quantitative way because of the lack of data on individual movement patterns in relation to responses to piling noise. The assumption adopted in the assessment is that the predicted level of disturbance to harbour porpoises occurs throughout the whole period of piling activity and does not distinguish between these two scenarios (a smaller number of individuals being repeatedly disturbed or a larger number of individuals being disturbed only once).
The Wildlife Trust (joint response from Norfolk WT and TWT)	There is also the consideration of other noise producing activities which take place during the construction period that can affect return times. Brandt et al (2016) suggest that "effects lasting beyond the piling time may not only be a result of piling activities, but also of other construction activities resuming after the end of piling, such as demounting noise mitigation systems and the increased shipping activity that goes with it. One factor that points towards this is that detection rates were already decreased for some time before piling."	I	The assessment of the impact of piling noise on harbour porpoise does not explicitly consider return times in a quantitative way because of the lack of data on individual movement patterns in relation to responses to piling noise. The assumption adopted in the assessment is that the predicted level of disturbance to harbour porpoises occurs throughout the whole period of piling activity and does not distinguish between these two scenarios (a smaller number of individuals being repeatedly disturbed or a larger number of individuals being disturbed only once).
The Wildlife Trust (joint response from Norfolk WT and TWT)	3.6. Minke Whale Balaenoptera acutorostrata The maximum displacement figure for behavioural effects for minke whale is shown in paragraph 4.11.1.56 of the marine mammals chapter to be up to 19,427km <sup>2</sup> in area. This is larger than the predicted behavioural impact area for harbour porpoise and possible avoidance may affect up to 1.2% of the MU population (4.11.1.99). We are interested in how any mitigation used to protect harbour porpoise may also benefit minke whales.	I	The embedded mitigation proposed (in the form of piling and UXO specific MMMPs – see Table 4.19 of Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 4: Marine Mammals) will be designed to cover all cetacean species under their status as EPS and therefore minke whales will benefit directly.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>19</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Marine Management Organisation	1.6. Where the significance of a predicted impact is calculated as "Minor or Moderate", the MMO recommends that the significance is assessed as "Moderate" in accordance with the 'worst case scenario' principle of the 'Rochdale Envelope' appraisal. Such impacts would therefore be significant in terms of the subsequent analysis required under the appropriate Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) regulations, according to the matrix rules used by DONG Energy in the PEIR (paragraph 2.9.1.9, Volume 2, Chapter 2 – Benthic Subtidal and Intertidal Ecology and replicated in subsequent 'Offshore' chapters).	I	Regarding Benthic Ecology, In the Environmental Statement, Paragraph 2.9.2.5 of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Subtidal and Intertidal Ecology clarifies that, in cases where a range is suggested for the significance of effect, there remains the possibility that this may span the significance threshold (i.e. the range is given as minor to moderate). In such cases the final significance is based upon the expert's professional judgement as to which outcome delineates the most likely effect, with an explanation as to why this is the case. Additional explanatory text has been inserted into the relevant assessments in sections 2.11.1 to 2.11.3 of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology to clarify why, in instances where there is a choice in the matrix table, an effect has been considered as minor rather than moderate.  For Ornithology, the process used to determine the significance of impacts upon relevant receptors is presented in Section 5.9.4 of Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore Ornithology. Where the significance value falls between two categories (e.g. minor or moderate significance) expert judgement is used to determine the significance value  For Marine Mammals the magnitude and sensitivity matrix has been updated and all updates have been communicated to the relevant key stakeholders through the EWG.  As discussed in the Marine Processes, Benthic Ecology and Fish and Shellfish EWG meeting of 5 December 2017, impact assessment conclusions have been amended to provide further justification for why a significance of minor (i.e. not significant) has been concluded for species of medium to high sensitivity. These are presented in the relevant impact assessments in Section 3.11 (for Hornsea Three alone) and Section 3.13 (for Cumulative Effects) of volume 2, chapter 3: Fish and Shellfish Ecology.
Marine Management Organisation	7. Marine Mammals and Underwater Noise 7.1. General comment: The MMO reminds DONG Energy that both the peak Sound Pressure Level (SPL) and Sound Exposure Level (SEL) source levels are required to assess impact piling underwater noise thresholds. MMO advice on this issue was provided to DONG Energy on 12 June 2017 in response to the Hornsea Three Noise Modelling and Methodology Approach. The MMO recommends that both SPL and SEL source levels are provided and assessed in the ES.	I	Regarding the concerns around the noise modelling, the source levels are provided and discussed within Environmental Statement volume 4, annex 3.1: Subsea Noise Technical Report. Updated noise modelling and associated Technical Report contains the full justification for the identified noise contours and identifies the data sources used for the modelling.
Marine Management Organisation	7.2. DONG Energy state that "For LF cetaceans, MF cetaceans and pinnipeds in water, the auditory injury (PTS) ranges do not exceed 140 m at either of the maximum energies (2,500 kJ or 5,000 kJ) or at any location modelled (i.e. within the Hornsea Three array area or offshore HVAC booster station search area)." (paragraph 3.11.1.42, Volume 2, Chapter 3 – Fish and Shellfish Ecology). The MMO requests that further evidence is provided to justify the use of the 140 metre range.	I	Updated noise modelling and associated Technical Report (within Environmental Statement volume 4, annex 3.1) contains the full justification for the identified noise contours and identifies the data sources used for the modelling.
Marine Management Organisation	7.3. DONG Energy explain that "Underwater noise from foundation piling and other construction activities (e.g. drilling of piles) within the Hornsea Three array area has the potential to cause injury or disturbance to marine mammals" (Table 4.14, Volume 2, Chapter 4 – Marine Mammals). The MMO advises that the distance between concurrent piling events should be made explicit within the table. The MMO recommends that the 'worst case' scenario in terms of a clearly defined timescale for foundation installation is considered in the ES.	I	Source levels are provided and discussed within Environmental Statement volume 4, annex 3.1: Subsea Noise Technical Report. Updated noise modelling and associated Technical Report contains the full justification for the identified noise contours and identifies the data sources used for the modelling. Cumulative effects from two piling vessels are discussed within the impact assessment within this chapter (paragraph 4.11.1.1).
Marine Management Organisation	7.4. The MMO notes that "at this stage of the project, no magnitude or sensitivity evaluation has been given [on the potential for underwater noise from foundation piling within the Hornsea Three array area to cause injury or disturbance to marine mammals] and therefore no conclusion on the significance of the effect has been made" (paragraph 4.11.1.4, Volume 2, Chapter 4 – Marine Mammals). The MMO recommends that this is addressed in the ES.	I	This Environmental Statement chapter (volume 2, chapter 4) contains a full assessment of the potential impacts of underwater noise from Hornsea Three, with a fully detailed methodology including the appropriate magnitude and sensitivity evaluation. The magnitude and sensitivity ranges have communicated with the relevant key stakeholders through the EWG.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>19</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Marine Management Organisation	7.5. The MMO requests that further information is provided in the ES on the data source for locations in the noise assessment modelling where the greatest sensitivity to marine mammals could occur. Return times should also be included in the assessment (i.e. consideration of the period of time that marine mammals are deterred from the area following displacement due to underwater noise events resulting from piling activities) (paragraph 4.11.1.6, Volume 2, Chapter 4 – Marine Mammals).	I	Regarding the concerns around the noise modelling, the source levels are provided and discussed within Environmental Statement volume 4, annex 3.1: Subsea Noise Technical Report. Updated noise modelling and associated Technical Report contains the full justification for the identified noise contours and identifies the data sources used for the modelling. Cumulative effects from two piling vessels are discussed within the impact assessment within this chapter (paragraph 4.11.1.1).
Marine Management Organisation	7.6. DONG Energy state that “for two vessels located in closer proximity the area of impact [on harbour porpoise] would be considerably reduced” (paragraph 4.11.1.48, Volume 2, Chapter 4 – Marine Mammals). The MMO suggests that consideration of the greater potential for injury to harbour porpoise where noise contours generated by two vessels overlap is included in the ES.	I	The source levels are provided and discussed within Environmental Statement volume 4, annex 3.1: Subsea Noise Technical Report. Updated noise modelling and associated Technical Report contains the full justification for the identified noise contours and identifies the data sources used for the modelling. Cumulative effects from two piling vessels are discussed within the impact assessment within this chapter
Marine Management Organisation	7.7. The MMO requests that further evidence is provided in the ES to support DONG Energy’s assertion that “Disturbance from vessel noise is likely to occur only where increased noise from vessel movements associated with the construction of Hornsea Three is greater than the background ambient noise level. The Greater Wash is a relatively busy shipping area ... and therefore background noise levels are likely to be high.” (paragraph 4.11.1.120, Volume 2, Chapter 4 – Marine Mammals).	I	The background level for shipping movements (not including the Hornsea Zone projects) is described in Environmental Statement volume 2, Chapter 7; Shipping and Navigation and the total vessel movements per day (including the Hornsea Zone project) predicted during construction are described in paragraph 4.11.1.200 of this document. The relative impact of shipping noise is described in detail in Environmental Statement volume 4, annex 3.1: Subsea Noise Technical Report.
Marine Management Organisation	7.8. The MMO recommends that consideration of the potential impacts from UXO detonation are included within the maximum design scenario for the assessment of potential cumulative impacts on marine mammals (Table 4.40, Volume 2, Chapter 4 – Marine Mammals).	I	The impacts from UXO on marine mammals have been considered in paragraph 4.11.1.176 of Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 4: Marine Mammals, with the associated noise modelling based on that undertaken for Hornsea Project One and already provided to the MMO and its advisors as discussed through the EWG and full meeting minutes are presented with the Evidence Plan (Consultation Report Annex 1 Evidence Plan).
Marine Management Organisation	7.9. Further information is requested in the ES regarding the potential for overlapping construction periods with other projects to have an impact on marine mammals in combination with the Project, including data sources for other project timings and information on whether a margin for error has been included to account for potential delays (paragraph 4.13.1.9, Volume 2, Chapter 4 – Marine Mammals).	I	The uncertainty with regard to other project timings is acknowledged, however these public timings typically have a large “error” margin built in so to add to this would create unrealistic assessment scenarios.
Marine Management Organisation	1.7. The MMO recommends re-examination of the requirements for pre-construction, construction and post-construction monitoring following re-assessment of the magnitude and significance of the potential impacts of the proposed Project. The MMO advises that verification of the impact predictions as set out in the PEIR can, in many cases, only be provided by future monitoring of the relevant receptors. This important consideration should be taken into account when future monitoring requirements are detailed in the ‘Offshore’ chapters of the PEIR.	I	<p>Consideration of the potential need for monitoring has been considered throughout the offshore chapters of the Environmental Statement. The proposed approach to monitoring for offshore elements of the project is discussed in the In Principle Monitoring Plan that accompanies the application for Development Consent.</p> <p>Explanatory text has been inserted into the relevant assessment sections in the Environmental Statement of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology to clarify why, in instances where there is a choice in the matrix table, an effect has been considered as minor rather than moderate. There are, however, no instances of effects being considered to be of moderate adverse significance. The proposals for future monitoring are outlined in the Environmental Statement in Table 2.25 of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology.</p> <p>The proposed approach to monitoring for offshore ornithology and marine mammals is discussed in the In Principle Monitoring Plan.</p> <p>Monitoring has not been proposed for fish and shellfish ecology, due to the lack of significant effects on fish ecology and the high level of confidence in the assessment presented.</p>



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>19</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Marine Management Organisation	7.10. DONG Energy state that “a detailed literature review of the potential magnitude of effects of subsea noise from operational turbines on marine mammals is presented in volume 4, annex 3.1: Subsea Noise Technical Report.” (paragraph 4.11.2.8, Volume 2, Chapter 4 – Marine Mammals). The review appears to have since been removed from Annex 3.1, for example the references to Cefas (2010), Madsen et al. (2006) and Brasseur et al. (2010) still appear in the reference list for Annex 3.1 but not in the actual text. The MMO recommends that the literature review is included in the ES.	I	With respect to the other concerns, Environmental Statement volume 4, annex 3.1: Subsea Noise Technical Report has been updated accordingly to provide the literature review focusing on operational noise, including the justification for the predicted source levels and impact ranges of operational noise.
Marine Management Organisation	7.11. Underwater noise modelling for the installation of monopiles and pin piles during construction has been carried out using a combined parabolic equation (PE) method for lower frequencies, and ray tracing method for higher frequency noise. The modelling takes into account “a variety of input parameters including bathymetry, hammer blow energy, frequency content, seabed properties and the speed of sound in water, using dBSea subsea supplemented by Subacoustech’s INSPIRE noise model” (paragraph 1.3.1.2, Volume 4, Annex 3.1 – Subsea Noise Technical Report). The MMO requests that further information is provided on underwater noise modelling, including the equations for the source model, the crossover frequency between the PE and ray tracing models and the environmental parameters used in the models.	I	Regarding the concerns around the noise modelling, the source levels are provided and discussed within Environmental Statement volume 4, annex 3.1: Subsea Noise Technical Report. Updated noise modelling and associated Technical Report contains the full justification for the identified noise contours and identifies the data sources used for the modelling. Cumulative effects from two piling vessels are discussed within the impact assessment within this chapter (paragraph 4.11.1.1).
Marine Management Organisation	7.12. The MMO requests clarification as to whether the frequency spectrum for a pile of 7 metre diameter was used for the monopile modelling because a 15 metre pile model was not available (paragraph 1.5.2.9, Volume 4, Annex 3.1 – Subsea Noise Technical Report).	I	Updated noise modelling and associated Technical Report contains the full justification for the identified noise contours and identifies the data sources used for the modelling.
Marine Management Organisation	7.13. The MMO notes that piling is considered to represent the ‘worst case’ scenario for underwater noise. It is acknowledged that this is appropriate for impacts on marine mammals since they would be most at risk from impulsive noise. The MMO would welcome a discussion on other noise sources (e.g. cable laying or burial, dredging operations, vessel movements), how these may affect fish and whether potential impacts would require inclusion in the ES to obtain a comprehensive picture of potential underwater noise impacts from the Project (paragraph 3.11.1.42, Volume 4, Annex 3.1 – Subsea Noise Technical Report).	I	The effects of underwater noise on fish and shellfish receptors are fully assessed in paragraphs 3.11.1.43 et seq. for the construction phase and paragraphs 3.11.2.16 et seq. for the operation and maintenance phase (including noise from vessels and turbines) in Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 3: Fish and Shellfish Ecology. The construction phase impact assessment focusses primarily on piling noise, as noise from other sources (e.g. cable burial, dredging, vessel movements) are only likely to affect a relatively small area in the immediate vicinity of the activities and are therefore inconsequential in the context of noise from piling operations. While the construction phase impact assessment considers effects on fish and shellfish receptors from a maximum design scenario (e.g. maximum possible hammer energy and maximum piling durations), the assessment also presents less conservative scenarios (e.g. more realistic hammer energies and piling durations) are also discussed to provide a more realistic assessment.
Natural England	2.5 Key Concerns Marine Mammals Natural England considers a broad assessment of Unexploded Ordnance (UXO) is still required. Whilst we appreciate this can be difficult to quantify, other wind farms projects have assessed that up to 40 detonations may be required. Natural England agrees that this can be updated post consent, with a formal marine licence application, but the impact of UXOs should still be assessed within the EIA and HRA rather than scoped out. The agreement to undertake a broad assessment is detailed in the final row of Table 4.4 of the Marine Mammal chapter but should also be reflected in the text.	I	The impacts from UXO on marine mammals have been considered in paragraph 4.11.1.176 of Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 4: Marine Mammals, with the associated evidence based on that from a number of studies, including Hornsea Project One and already provided to the MMO and its advisors as discussed through the EWG and full meeting minutes are presented with the Evidence Plan (consultation Report Annex 1 Evidence Plan).
Natural England	2.5 Key Concerns Marine Mammals Natural England originally requested that the north east England Management Unit (MU) for grey seals was included in the assessment given the distances grey seal can travel. However, the PEIR provides evidence to scope out any site that is outside of the normal foraging range for grey seal (~145 km), which scopes out all haul outs/ sites in the north east England MU. As those north east SACs are scoped out, the overall reference population for that MU should not be used in the assessment. Therefore, Natural England considers that the north east England MU and associated reference population should be removed from the overall assessment.	I	Regarding the use of the north east MU, it was agreed at the Marine Mammals EWG on 20 November 2017 that if the updated telemetry data showed some linkages between the north east MU and the Hornsea Three site then it would still be appropriate to use the north east MU to inform the baseline. The updated telemetry data is presented in Environmental Statement volume 5, annex 4.1: Marine Mammals Technical Report and shows some linkages between the north east MU and the Hornsea Three site and therefore the baseline has retained the north east MU to inform the assessment.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>19</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Natural England	2.5 Key Concerns Marine Mammals Entanglement is scoped out in Table 4.15 of the Marine Mammal chapter, based on a risk assessment methodology by Harnois et al. (2015) and the Project Description. However, the Project Description chapter doesn't provide much detail on the moorings. Evidence suggests that taut lines present the lowest risk of entanglement, while catenary moorings; the highest, with the risk increasing as the line becomes slacker. Figure 3.10 in the project description chapter shows three possible options, with only one having taut moorings (i.e. two have catenary / slack lines). Therefore, Natural England considers entanglement should be scoped in to the assessment at this stage. If floating foundations become a realistic option for the final project design, a thorough assessment will be required. Detail on anchor piling for floating turbines is also required in the Project Description chapter.	Y	Floating turbines have now been removed from the potential options for use within the development and the Environmental Statement Project Description (volume 1, chapter 3) has been updated accordingly, therefore, this concern is now no longer applicable.
Natural England	2.5 Key Concerns Marine Mammals Natural England would welcome the opportunity to discuss how the definitions of magnitude may change in the final Environmental Statement (ES) with DONG Energy as soon as possible (Section 4.9 of the Marine Mammal chapter). Revised definitions should be more specific to marine mammals as the current definitions are difficult to apply, and the text to conclude the magnitude for each impact does not reflect the definitions very well. For example, the final impact of vessel traffic is assessed as minor. During construction there is a significant increase in the number of vessels (~25%) which Natural England would consider to be a moderate to major shift away from the baseline, however this is not mentioned in paragraph 4.11.1.127 assessing the magnitude. Also, a construction period of 11 years is almost the lifetime of a harbour porpoise and therefore at least a medium, if not long term, timeframe in terms of reversibility. However, it is assessed as short to medium in paragraph 4.11.1.127. Paragraph 4.11.1.127 also states that it is a local impact in terms of spatial extent and looks at direct and indirect impact, but neither of these parameters are reflected in the current definition of magnitude.	I	This Environmental Statement chapter contains a full assessment of the potential impacts of underwater noise from Hornsea Three, with a fully detailed methodology including the appropriate magnitude and sensitivity evaluation. The magnitude and sensitivity ranges have been communicated with the relevant key stakeholders through the EWG.
Natural England	2.5 Key Concerns Marine Mammals It is unclear how the definitions of magnitude and sensitivity, and therefore the final significance of the effect take into account International Valued Ecological Receptors (VERs) vs local VERs in the introductory sections.	I	Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 4 Marine Mammals contains a full assessment of the potential impacts of underwater noise from Hornsea Three, with a fully detailed methodology including the appropriate magnitude and sensitivity evaluation. The magnitude and sensitivity ranges have communicated with the relevant key stakeholders through the EWG.
Natural England	2.5 Key Concerns Marine Mammals Table 4.23 of the Marine Mammal chapter – Natural England considers that as harbour porpoise will not travel far enough during the soft start period to be outside any of the injury zones at hammer blow energies above 15%, the length of time of the 15% blow energy should be increased above 7.5 minutes, as per discussions at the EWG meeting on the 10th July 2017. This would allow the Permanent Threshold Shift (PTS) and cumulative Sound Exposure Level (SELcum) distance to be reduced.	I	Piling assumptions (including soft start durations and pile size) have been updated following further engineering optimisation and are detailed in Environmental Statement volume 4, annex 3.1: Subsea Noise Technical Report and additional modelling has also been undertaken on these new assumptions. This modelling includes the PTS range requested by Natural England and is presented in section 4.11.1 and volume 4, annex 3.1: Subsea Noise Technical Report.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>19</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Natural England	<p>2.5 Key Concerns Marine Mammals</p> <p>Natural England considers that the distances for the onset of PTS as a result of cumulative sound exposure using the NOAA SELcum threshold should be presented and considered in the assessment as a potential range of the effect, and to estimate the distance away from the piling at which a porpoise would need to be at the start of the ramp up procedure not to incur the risk of PTS onset from cumulative exposure to noise (Section 4.11.1.36 of the Marine Mammal chapter). Even if the ranges are treated with caution (and NE assumes a more realistic scenario for PTS SELcum will be reported in terms of the 2m depth noise modelling, as well as for other parameters if possible), and caveats are provided (as per 4.11.1.37), the PTS SELcum should still be presented as potential cumulative noise injury ranges. As per paragraph 4.11.1.75, most of the piling noise is low frequency and it is the weighting used within the SEL calculation that helps to assess the impact on each hearing group. Whilst it is crucial for SNCBs to take uncertainty into consideration in our evaluation of risk and to use the upper bounds (worst case) to inform mitigation and residual risk, we need to appraise a realistic scenario. The current assessment is considered in the report as being highly precautionary, but we would treat this interpretation with caution given the uncertainty regarding the effects of noise on porpoise hearing and behaviour. For example, the Southall et al. (2007) criteria were considered precautionary at the time and since then the thresholds for porpoise have been lowered.</p>	I	<p>Updated underwater noise modelling has been undertaken for the refined Environmental Statement Project Description (volume 1, chapter 3) and using a revised model with increased empirical evidence underpinning it. The revised modelling incorporated the refinement to the area of search for the HVAC station. The updated underwater noise modelling is summarised throughout Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 4: Marine Mammals and presented in full in Environmental Statement volume 4, annex 3.1. Piling assumptions (including soft start durations and pile size) have been updated following further engineering optimisation and are detailed in volume 4, annex 3.1: Subsea Noise Technical Report and additional modelling has also been undertaken on these new assumptions. This modelling includes the PTS range requested by Natural England and is presented in Section 4.11.1 and volume 4, annex 3.1: Subsea Noise Technical Report.</p>
Natural England	<p>2.5 Key Concerns Marine Mammals</p> <p>4.12.1.5 – Natural England does not agree with seismic activity from oil and gas projects being screened out as having no impact, due to being part of the baseline. This was discussed at a recent EWG meeting. Natural England would expect either information from the BEIS Oil and Gas strategic HRA to be included in the ES when it becomes available (noting that none of the SNCBs have been involved, so it cannot be said that Natural England will agree with their conclusions), or some assessment of the average number and extent of seismic projects undertaken in the region needs to be made in the absence of the BEIS HRA.</p>	I	<p>Seismic activity has been screened into the EIA and is presented in paragraph 4.13.1.50 et seq. of Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 4: Marine Mammals. The BEIS oil and gas HRA is not currently available and therefore the average number and extent of seismic surveys over the past four years within 10 km of the Southern North Sea cSAC summer area has been used to inform the assessment. The underwater noise Technical Report has sought to undertake bespoke modelling of noise propagation from those activities associated with the project for which the application relates (namely percussive piling for Hornsea Three). Information related to seismic activity (from Oil &amp; Gas activity) will be considered based on the information sources noted above.</p>
Natural England	<p>2.5 Key Concerns Marine Mammals</p> <p>Natural England would welcome the opportunity to discuss possible mitigation options for vessel traffic in terms of the disturbance within the Southern North Sea cSAC.</p>	I	<p>The Applicant is of the opinion that any vessel traffic management plan relating to the cSAC would need to be brought forward by Natural England and applied across the cSAC for all vessel traffic and not just be applied to those vessels from a single sector and or individual development. Therefore, whilst the Applicant will engage constructively with Natural England on this matter it does not consider that it should drive this discussion. Notwithstanding the above, the Applicant does highlight two further relevant points; firstly the Applicant has committed to a Code of Conduct for vessel operations, which will include measures to help reduce the likelihood of collision and levels of disturbance to marine mammals, and secondly; the outcome of the assessment for disturbance from vessel traffic will not result in the potential for likely adverse effect and therefore the need for additional mitigation on top of the existing commitments described here is questioned.</p>
Natural England	<p>2.5 Key Concerns Marine Mammals</p> <p>In 2.2.1.1 of the Subsea Noise Technical Report Cheeseman (2016) is referenced for operational underwater noise levels. However, the noise levels reviewed were only for turbines from 3 – 3.6 MW, and the proposed Hornsea Three turbines will be between 7 and 15 MW. Natural England therefore considers monitoring of the noise levels generated by larger operational turbines is required to validate ES predictions provided in the Marine Mammal section 4.11.2.7.</p>	I	<p>Environmental Statement volume 4, annex 3.1: Subsea Noise Technical Report has been updated accordingly to provide the literature review focusing on operational noise, including the justification for the predicted source levels and impact ranges of operational noise.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>19</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Natural England	2.5.1 Vol. 2 Chapter 4 – Marine Mammals Table 4.4, row 3 Natural England disagrees that the scale for CEA was agreed as the MU for the minke whale and white beaked dolphin. Rather the harbour porpoise MU was adopted for both other cetacean species – as per paragraph 4.13.1.56. In addition, the outputs of the JCP Phase III analyses are now available and therefore should be incorporated into the final ES.	I	The CEA search area has been constrained to the scale of the harbour porpoise MU for all cetaceans and the JCP III analyses have been included and are detailed within the Marine Mammals Technical Report (Environmental Statement volume 5, annex 4.1).
Natural England	2.5.2 Vol. 2 Chapter 4 – Marine Mammals Table 4.5 Heinänen and Skov (2015) - The identification of discrete and persistent areas of relatively high harbour porpoise density in the wider UK marine area, as well as IAMMWG (2015) - A Conservation Literature Review for the Harbour Porpoise, should be used as reference information. Available at <a href="http://jncc.defra.gov.uk/default.aspx?page=7059">http://jncc.defra.gov.uk/default.aspx?page=7059</a>	I	Noted, this reference has been used.
Natural England	2.5.3 Vol. 2 Chapter 4 – Marine Mammals Table 4.6 It should be noted here that only 10% of the digital survey data was actually analysed (this being a sufficient percentage for seabirds and harbour porpoise, but not for other marine mammal species). It should be noted that in German waters 100% of data are analysed to inform the results.	I	As part of the EWG it was agreed that 10% was sufficient for harbour porpoises and full meeting minutes are provided within the Evidence Plan (Consultation report Annex 1 Evidence Plan). The Marine Mammals Technical Report (Environmental Statement volume 5, annex 4.1) has been updated and additional data, including further aerial survey data and the SCANS III data, has been incorporated. The baseline section of this chapter has also been updated to reflect the changes to the density estimates for the different marine mammal species where appropriate.
Natural England	2.5.4 Vol. 2 Chapter 4 – Marine Mammals 4.7.1.2 Management Units (MUs) for marine mammals do not just extend to the 12 nm limit, they are transboundary and include other countries waters (as per figure 4.11 in the technical report). UK specific abundances are calculated in addition to MU abundances, but this includes all UK waters, not just territorial seas (i.e. further than 12 nm). The text should be altered to reflect this.	I	Section 4.7.1.2 of Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 4: Marine Mammals has been updated to reflect the transboundary nature of management units for marine mammals and identify that country specific populations are based on the extent of the exclusive economic zone of a nation and not only the territorial waters (i.e. 12 nm).
Natural England	2.5.5 Vol. 2 Chapter 4 – Marine Mammals Table 4.7 Natural England queries if these figures are correct? Visual boat based densities of 1.76 gave an abundance over the Hornsea Three area of 1 232 animals, but a 0.01 increase in density almost doubled the abundance for the aerial video to 2 177 animals?	I	Environmental Statement volume 5, annex 4.1: Marine Mammals Technical Report has been updated and data has been updated and corrected where required.
Natural England	2.5.6 Vol. 2 Chapter 4 – Marine Mammals 4.7.2.4 and 4.7.2.12 The ES should compare with SCANS III densities, as this appears to show a further increase in importance of the general area for harbour porpoise. It should also be noted that the SCANS II abundances quoted in the MU paper were miscalculated and have since been updated. Updated figures for all species should be obtained from the JNCC, as well as updated figures from SCANS III and incorporated in to the assessment.	I	The Marine Mammals Technical Report (Environmental Statement volume 5, annex 4.1) has been updated and additional data, including further aerial survey data and the SCANS III data, has been incorporated. The baseline section of this chapter has also been updated to reflect the changes to the density estimates for the different marine mammal species where appropriate.



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>19</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Natural England	2.5.7 Vol. 2 Chapter 4 – Marine Mammals 4.7.2.8 It should be noted that there is a population of white beaked dolphin present year round in Lyme Bay, suggesting that they are not necessarily restricted to more northerly areas in the summer period	N	Noted.
Natural England	2.5.8 Vol. 2 Chapter 4 – Marine Mammals 4.7.2.11 Now that the Joint Cetacean Protocol (JCP) data are available, this section should be updated for white beaked dolphin and all other relevant species	I	JCP III analyses have been included and are detailed within the Marine Mammals Technical Report (Environmental Statement volume 5, annex 4.1).
Natural England	2.5.9 Vol. 2 Chapter 4 – Marine Mammals 4.7.2.16, 4.7.2.36, Table 4.11 Natural England queries why the more precautionary density for the Hornsea Three marine mammal study area has not been used to calculate abundance for minke whale? Please can clarification be provided.	I	The Marine Mammals Technical Report (Environmental Statement volume 5, annex 4.1) has been updated to provide a comparison of the differing abundances recorded for minke whale and demonstrates that, following correction, the abundance estimates for both the Hornsea Zone plus 10 km buffer and the Hornsea Three plus 4 km buffer are lower than that of the SCANS III data. Therefore, the SCANS III data has been used within the updated assessment presented in paragraph 4.1.1.1 as it is deemed to be most precautionary.
Natural England	2.5.10 Vol. 2 Chapter 4 – Marine Mammals 4.7.2.21 and 4.7.2.24 It should be noted there is also a large haul out and pupping site at Horsey which is not mentioned in these paragraphs. Grey seals also do not tend to haul out in The Wash, rather they haul out along the North Norfolk and Lincolnshire coastlines.	I	The impacts to seals have been assessed based on the 'at sea usage' data, which also includes seal usage around the Donna Nook and north Norfolk coast haul out sites. The abundance records for seals have been updated within Environmental Statement volume 5, annex 4.1: Marine Mammals Technical Report and are used throughout the ES chapter (volume 2, chapter 4: Marine Mammals). The assessment includes calculation of the seal within dose-response curves and the assessment demonstrated that even piling at the most southerly potential HVAC location would not result in any barrier effects to the haul out sites along the north Norfolk coast (paragraph 4.11.1.141).
Natural England	2.5.11 Vol. 2 Chapter 4 – Marine Mammals Fig. 4.7 It should be noted in the text that this map is only based on a limited number of tagged seals from certain areas. The text should detail the numbers of seals tagged in each location to add context to the conclusions. It should be noted in the text that due to the locations of these tagged seals it may not be representative of the movements of those seals which haul out further south around Horsey and the Thames, or further north (north east England MU), unless the at sea densities are based on different tagged seals? Please can clarification be provided. Densities are also based on a model so text should briefly detail uncertainties associated with the model.	I	The impacts to seals have been assessed based on the 'at sea usage' data, which also includes seal usage around the Donna Nook and north Norfolk coast haul out sites. The abundance records for seals have been updated within Environmental Statement volume 5, annex 4.1: Marine Mammals Technical Report and are used throughout the ES chapter (volume 2, chapter 4: Marine Mammals). The assessment includes calculation of the seal within dose-response curves and the assessment demonstrated that even piling at the most southerly potential HVAC location would not result in any barrier effects to the haul out sites along the north Norfolk coast (paragraph 4.11.1.141). Seal tracks are presented in the Marine Mammals Technical Report (volume 5, annex 4.1). Where models have been used to calculate densities, the uncertainties within the model are discussed in the technical report.
Natural England	2.5.12 Vol. 2 Chapter 4 – Marine Mammals Table 4.13 Natural England does not believe the classification of VERs in this table has been applied consistently. For example, it is not clear why minke whale have been classified differently to white beaked dolphin.	I	The Marine Mammals Technical Report (Environmental Statement volume 5, annex 4.1) and this chapter have been updated, including with a reassessment of the importance of the white-beaked dolphin and this species has been reclassified as a VER of international importance.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>19</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Natural England	2.5.13 Vol. 2 Chapter 4 – Marine Mammals Table 4.14 Natural England queries if any modelling has been done on the area over which the drilling and cable installation sediment plume will impact and what percentage of the cSAC this equates to? If so, this should be detailed in the text.	I	More detail has now been added to the Environmental Statement regarding the dispersion and settling of sediment arising from drilling and cable installation. This is covered in Environmental Statement, Volume 2, Chapter 1: Marine Processes and Chapter 2: Benthic Ecology. The approach to characterising sediment plumes from construction activity has adopted an Evidence Based approach rather than a bespoke numerical modelling approach, as agreed with Natural England and the MMO through the EWG process. Potential in-direct effects on the harbour porpoise feature of the cSAC have been considered within the Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment.
Natural England	2.5.14 Vol. 2 Chapter 4 – Marine Mammals 4.11.1.44 Despite there being no disturbance thresholds for pinnipeds, current work by Hastie et al. (2015) mentioned in the text suggests there could be Temporary Threshold Shift (TTS)/Fleeing up to 9.8 km. Natural England queries what the distance is from the southern HVAC booster piling location to the coastline and if seals (including pups) could be prevented from reaching / leaving important haul out sites and/or foraging from these sites along the north Norfolk coast at sensitive times of the year? Please can clarification be provided on this point.	I	The assessment includes calculation of the seal within dose-response curves and the assessment demonstrated that even piling at the most southerly potential HVAC location would not result in any barrier effects to the haul out sites along the north Norfolk coast (paragraph 4.11.1.141, of Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 4: Marine Mammals).
Natural England	2.5.15 Vol. 2 Chapter 4 – Marine Mammals 4.11.1.75 Natural England agrees with this paragraph, but it should be noted that this is why the NOAA weighted SELs need to be reported as these do account for the higher frequency noise that porpoises are sensitive to and affected by.	I	Updated underwater noise modelling has been undertaken for the refined Project Description (Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3) and using a revised model with increased empirical evidence underpinning it. The updated underwater noise modelling is summarised throughout this chapter and presented in full in Environmental Statement volume 4, annex 3.1.
Natural England	2.5.16 Vol. 2 Chapter 4 – Marine Mammals 4.11.86 Natural England agrees with the statement that no firm conclusions can be drawn on the DEPONS work at this stage, and considers further work is required to update the model with project scenarios and construction schedules. There are limitations on data availability and as with any model there remain knowledge gaps and uncertainties which should be considered alongside the outputs.	N	Noted
Natural England	2.5.17 Vol. 2 Chapter 4 – Marine Mammals 4.11.1.104 Natural England considers that other important grey seal sites should be assessed in the final ES; namely Donna Nook and the North Norfolk Coastline (Blakeney and Horsey).	I	The impacts to seals have been assessed based on the 'at sea usage' data, which also shows seal usage around the Donna Nook and north Norfolk coast haul out sites. The abundance records for seals have been updated within Environmental Statement volume 5, annex 4.1: Marine Mammals Technical Report and are used throughout the ES chapter (volume 2, chapter 4).
Natural England	2.5.18 Vol. 2 Chapter 4 – Marine Mammals 4.11.1.121 Natural England queries why minke whale and white beaked dolphin would be habituated to boat presence and harbour porpoise would not, when they are the most numerous cetacean in the area? White beaked dolphins have been seen to bow ride in some areas, while harbour porpoises are seen to actively move away from (and be disturbed by) vessels (as per paragraph 4.11.1.133), so this would appear to just be different behaviours rather than habituation. Please can clarification be provided.	I	We agree that Harbour Porpoise will move away from vessels, there is empirical evidence that small scale avoidance will occur. The number of vessels that will be visiting the site have been refined and further details have been provided of the timings when the highest densities of vessels will be present in paragraph 4.11.1.200 et seq. of Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 4: Marine Mammals.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>19</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Natural England	2.5.19 Vol. 2 Chapter 4 – Marine Mammals 4.11.1.122 It should be noted that it is not just vessel noise that is an issue, but the physical presence of the vessel itself (Pirota et al., 2015). Vessel presence should also form part of the increased vessel traffic assessment.	I	While other wind farms in other EU countries are constructing and operating during the construction and operation of Hornsea Project Three, the overlap of disturbance arising from vessel traffic is minimal due to the ports of origin for the vessels for the relevant projects being within the waters of the respective countries and therefore the vessels will not pass through UK waters. The vessel impact assessment has been reassessed and the updated assessment has been presented in paragraph 4.11.1.200 et seq of Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 4: Marine Mammals with additional justification for the determination of magnitude and the overall assessment of effect significance.
Natural England	2.5.20 Vol. 2 Chapter 4 – Marine Mammals 4.11.1.130 The Lusseau et al. 2011 paper did not just find no impact from increased boat traffic for a theoretical wind farm (only using modelled data), but also found that boat interactions may disrupt foraging (from real data) and concluded that there is little understanding of the maximum number of interactions that will cause site deterioration (i.e. will cause a problem). It should be also noted that the conclusion concerning an increase in boat traffic and no impact on the bottlenose dolphin population was from a model and relies on the assumptions of the model being correct.	I	The impact assessment in paragraph 4.11.1.200 et seq (Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 4: Marine Mammals) has been updated to provide more detail on the expected vessel traffic throughout different stages of the development and provides further justification for the magnitude assessments used within the impact assessments. Further detail on the uncertainties within the assessment are provided.
Natural England	2.5.21 Vol. 2 Chapter 4 – Marine Mammals 4.11.1.136 Natural England considers that the text in this paragraph should also reflect recovery will be based on the amount of operational vessels, so may not be as high as stated.	I	The vessel impact assessment has been reassessed and the updated assessment has been presented in paragraph 4.11.1.200 et seq (Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 4: Marine Mammals) with additional justification for the determination of magnitude and the overall assessment of effect significance.
Natural England	2.5.22 Vol. 2 Chapter 4 – Marine Mammals 4.11.1.139 As per Natural England's previous comment, it is unclear why the magnitude has been assessed as minor. Will vessel traffic be as high in the years between the piling parts of the construction during other aspects of offshore construction? Please can clarification be provided.	I	While other wind farms in other EU countries are constructing and operating during the construction and operation of Hornsea Project Three, the overlap of disturbance arising from vessel traffic is minimal due to the ports of origin for the vessels for the relevant projects being within the waters of the respective countries and therefore the vessels will not pass throughout UK waters. The numbers of vessels predicted to be present during both construction and operations have been presented in section 4.11 of Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 4: Marine Mammals.
Natural England	2.5.23 Vol. 2 Chapter 4 – Marine Mammals 4.11.2.21 For the 25 year operation of the wind farm, a 22% increase in vessel traffic to the local area is predicted. Again, as per Natural England's previous comment, it is not clear how a long term (more than double the average life span of a harbour porpoise), high percentage increase in vessel traffic is only a minor effect. Please can clarification be provided.	I	The vessel impact assessment has been reassessed and the updated assessment has been presented in paragraph 4.11.1.200 et seq (Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 4: Marine Mammals) with additional justification for the determination of magnitude and the overall assessment of effect significance.
Natural England	2.5.24 Vol. 2 Chapter 4 – Marine Mammals 4.12.1.6 Natural England considers Tier 1 should possibly also include those projects at a similar stage to Hornsea Three – i.e. not submitted, but at the PEIR or similar stage. Natural England understands that DONG may not have access to this information at this time, but information from other projects should be checked and updated at an appropriate time in the future to be agreed.	I	Tier 1 projects have been restricted only to those projects that have been submitted or have been approved due to uncertainty whether other projects at PEIR stage or similar will actually be taken forward and it is not possible to assess the final design and the ultimate associated impacts. This approach has been developed to ensure that the assessments do not consider projects that may not ultimately be taken forward or may fundamentally change and for which the parameters are not fully developed. Including these projects within Tier 1 would risk that the scale of the projects would change so that they would have a greater effect than that assessed and thus the impacts had not been fully addressed. These projects are, however, considered in other tiers as appropriate and in line with the process detailed in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 5: EIA Methodology

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>19</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Natural England	2.5.25 Vol. 2 Chapter 4 – Marine Mammals Table 4.39 Natural England queries why no construction date information is provided for Aberdeen Bay here but is included in table 4.41.	I	The construction dates for Aberdeen Bay have now been included in within the Marine Mammal Chapter (Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 4) and all dates have been checked following the most recent available information.
Natural England	2.5.26 Vol. 2 Chapter 4 – Marine Mammals 4.13.1.4 According to Table 4.39, more than the stated five projects may overlap therefore the assessment should also include Triton Knoll and Borssele 3 and 4. Although Natural England accepts the text in paragraph 4.13.1.6, as to why they are not included, there is still the possibility they could overlap, so should be included as part of the worst case envelope. If there is evidence that they will not overlap then this should be provided. Neart na Gaoithe, Inch Cape, Seagreen and Convoys Wharf are all unknown in terms of construction dates, so worst case scenario would mean they would overlap. Even if no information is available, this should be stated as a possibility (and they should be added to Table 4.42). In addition, Table 4.40 does not include non UK projects (apart from Dutch UXO explosions) and should do, as much as possible given that the CEA is the North Sea MU.	I	The updated methodology and projects included are described in the assessment presented in section 4.13 (Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 4: Marine Mammals), including additional discussion of the uncertainties surrounding the Neart na Gaoithe, Inch Cape, Seagreen and Convoys Wharf projects.
Natural England	2.5.27 Vol. 2 Chapter 4 – Marine Mammals Table 4.42 It is also worth stating here that these ES assessments did not use the updated NOAA thresholds which show a much greater impact zone for harbour porpoise compared to the Southall et al. (2007) thresholds, so these distances are likely to be underestimating the area of impact. Worst case scenario and Table 4.42 should include the ES information for those projects where the construction timeframes are unknown but could overlap and this should be updated if possible for the ES submission.	I	The NOAA thresholds do not consistently result in larger impact areas than the Southall et al., (2007) thresholds therefore, whilst in some cases higher ranges may occur, in others lower ranges may occur. It is recognised that different Environmental Statements will have used different models and indeed potentially different threshold criteria (depending on whether they were undertaken prior to the NOAA 2016 being released). In all cases precaution will have been applied to the modelling input parameters, design scenarios and output assumptions and therefore, underestimations of real ranges are highly unlikely. As is the case for all other topics it is not the duty of the applicant to remodel or indeed assess other projects within the CEA, rather that information is taken at face value and fed into the assessment. However, notwithstanding this point, given the precautionary nature of the modelling and subsequent interpretation of outputs and the fact that NOAA does not always result in greater ranges means that it is highly unlikely that there will be an underestimate of real impact ranges within the projects included within the CEA.
Natural England	2.5.28 Vol. 2 Chapter 4 – Marine Mammals 4.13.1.16 Natural England considers 16 years is not a short term impact as stated in this paragraph. Paragraph 4.13.1.27 refers to 16 years as a long term impact. Natural England considers that 16 years is a long term impact, which therefore needs to carry through in the final ES across all impacts and receptors in terms of consistency.	I	We agree that a 16 year period is not a short-term impact, however, the impacts from TTS at each location over this 16 year period will be over only a few years at each site and as such will be short term at each location particularly as the impact ranges do not overlap between the different projects and alternative habitat will be available. Information has been included in the definitions of impact magnitude categories to define timescales (Table 4.17 Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 4: Marine Mammals).
Natural England	2.5.29 Vol. 2 Chapter 4 – Marine Mammals 4.13.1.17 If Hornsea Three on its own can affect 1.3% of the MU for TTS/Fleeing – any other wind farm construction at the same time will increase this value, therefore Natural England does not agree that it can be stated that cumulatively TTS will not be significant nor increase over and above what Hornsea Three alone will impact, especially given the change from Southall to NOAA being best scientific knowledge for noise thresholds.	I	The piling envelope for the project has been updated for the Environmental Statement following further engineering studies and in addition new modelling has been undertaken based on the revised project description. The results from the updated modelling are presented in Environmental Statement volume 4, annex 3.1: Subsea Noise Technical Report and incorporated within the CEA presented in section 4.13 (Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 4: Marine Mammals).



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>19</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Natural England	2.5.30 Vol. 2 Chapter 4 – Marine Mammals 4.13.1.18 Natural England considers it is not correct to say that the impact ranges for minke whale are small. They are actually larger than for harbour porpoise. Hornsea Project Two did assess the impact for minke and white beaked dolphin. Minke whales, due to the area of ensonification came out as a moderate adverse impact. It is worth noting that wind farms further north are going to have a larger impact on both minke whales and white beaked dolphins. While this is not an issue for the assessment of the project alone, it will be a consideration in terms of the cumulative assessment. The assessment should be updated to reflect this.	I	The piling envelope for the project has been updated for the Environmental Statement following further engineering studies and in addition new modelling has been undertaken based on the revised project description. The results from the updated modelling are presented in Environmental Statement volume 4, annex 3.1: Subsea Noise Technical Report and incorporated within the CEA presented in section 4.13 (Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 4: Marine Mammals).
Natural England	2.5.31 Vol. 2 Chapter 4 – Marine Mammals pp.100 and 101 Natural England agrees that adding the modelled areas for TTS and disturbance from each wind farm is unrealistic. However, it would be helpful if a similar table to Table 4.53 in the Hornsea Project Two ES marine mammal chapter could be provided, which contains some information on numbers affected with a large caveat in the table title.	I	Noted. Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 4: Marine Mammals Table 4.57 provides information on the number of individuals that may be within specific noise contours representing the potential for avoidance or disturbance. It is important to note that although this table presents the maximum estimates of numbers of animals affected from each project, adding them together will significantly overestimate the level of impact.
Natural England	2.5.32 Vol. 2 Chapter 4 – Marine Mammals 4.13.1.27 It should be noted that in discussing the magnitude of effect, not only disturbance will affect the receptor directly, but also TTS/Fleeing response.	I	The TTS threshold is not appropriate to use for the behavioural threshold of 'fleeing' for multiple pulse noise. TTS ranges have been presented as a separate impact to disturbance with the disturbance impacts assessed through a dose response curve. Significance of effect assessments have been undertaken separately for disturbance and are presented in section 4.11.1 (Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 4: Marine Mammals).
Natural England	2.5.33 Vol. 2 Chapter 4 – Marine Mammals 4.13.1.32 Natural England does not agree that porpoise have a low vulnerability in terms of underwater noise	I	While harbour porpoise show a high responsiveness to underwater noise, this does not necessarily imply vulnerability. A full discussion of this has taken place through the EWG and full meeting minutes are presented within the Evidence Plan (Consultation Report Annex 1 Evidence Plan).
Natural England	2.5.34 Vol. 2 Chapter 4 – Marine Mammals 4.13.1.36 Whilst Natural England notes the preliminary DEPONS results, please note the limitations of DEPONS as described above.	I	Noted. The uncertainties and knowledge gaps within the assessment are discussed alongside the results to provide context to the outputs.
Natural England	2.5.35 Vol. 2 Chapter 4 – Marine Mammals 4.13.1.50 It should be noted that projects in Tier 3 may well come forward and overlap with Hornsea Three and the other Tier 1 and 2 projects further down the line, causing an increased impact (and a longer temporal duration) on the harbour porpoise population. Natural England therefore considers the projects in each tier should be revisited and updated at a future date to be agreed.	I	The CEA has been updated within the Environmental Statement with the Tier assigned to each project or plan checked and confirmed. Where Tier 3 projects come forward post consent of Hornsea Three but prior to construction, it may be necessary to update the Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment however the Environmental Statement will not be updated.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>19</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Natural England	2.5.36 Vol. 2 Chapter 4 – Marine Mammals General Comment Natural England considers the cumulative assessment would be easier to follow and understand if the Tier 1 and 2 assessments were not separated for TTS and disturbance for each species (all Tier 1 noise impacts for each species and then all Tier 2), rather followed each other for each species. I.e. Tier 1 and Tier 2 TTS/disturbance for harbour porpoise, then Tier 1 and Tier 2 TTS/disturbance for white beaked dolphin etc. and both Tiers were combined in each species table.	I	Tier 1 projects have been restricted only to those projects that have been submitted or have been approved due to uncertainty whether other projects at PEIR stage or similar will actually be taken forward and it is not possible to assess the final design and the ultimate associated impacts. This approach has been developed to ensure that the assessments do not consider projects that may not ultimately be taken forward or may fundamentally change and for which the parameters are not fully developed. Including these projects within Tier 1 would risk that the scale of the projects would change so that they would have a greater effect than that assessed and thus the impacts had not been fully addressed.
Natural England	2.5.37 Vol. 2 Chapter 4 – Marine Mammals 4.13.1.62 As per comments above, Natural England considers that the cumulative physical disturbance from vessels, not just the acoustic disturbance, should be considered. Natural England disagrees that harbour porpoises will show habituation to vessels, rather they will be temporarily be disturbed away from the location and whatever they are doing. Heinanen and Skov (2015) reported that the number of ships was an important predictor of harbour porpoise density in the North Sea MU and suggested that markedly lower densities were present over a threshold of approximately over 80 vessels per day (passing through a 5 km <sup>2</sup> grid). What are the numbers reached cumulatively in the local area? The assessment should also take account of other wind farms that will be constructing / operational in other EU countries at the same time	I	While other wind farms in other EU countries are constructing and operating during the construction and operation of Hornsea Project Three, the overlap of disturbance arising from vessel traffic is minimal due to the ports of origin for the vessels for the relevant projects being within the waters of the respective countries and therefore the vessels will not pass throughout UK waters. The numbers of vessels predicted to be present during both construction and operations have been presented in section 4.11 (Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 4: Marine Mammals).
Natural England	2.5.38 Vol. 2 Chapter 4 – Marine Mammals 4.13.1.63 As per comments above, it is unclear why a moderate to large increase in vessel traffic away from the baseline, over a long period of time is assessed as minor. Please can clarification be provided.	I	The vessel impact assessment has been reassessed and the updated assessment has been presented in paragraph 4.11.1.200 et seq (Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 4: Marine Mammals) with additional justification for the determination of magnitude and the overall assessment of effect significance.
Natural England	2.5.39 Vol. 4 Annex 3.1 – Subsea Noise Technical Report 4.1.1.3 Natural England considers that seismic activity should be included.	I	Seismic activity has been screened into the EIA and is presented in paragraph 4.13.1.50 et seq. (Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 4: Marine Mammals). The BEIS oil and gas HRA is not currently available and therefore the average number and extent of seismic surveys over the past four years within 10 km of the Southern North Sea cSAC summer area has been used to inform the assessment. The Subsea Noise Technical Report (Environmental Statement volume 4, annex 3.1) has sought to undertake bespoke modelling of noise propagation from those activities associated with the project for which the application relates (namely percussive piling for Hornsea Project Three). Information related to seismic activity (from Oil & Gas activity) will be considered based on the information sources noted above.
Natural England	2.5.40 Vol. 4 Annex 3.1 – Subsea Noise Technical Report 5.1.1.9 and 5.2.2.1 The additional modelling at 2 m depth is not currently presented in the marine mammal chapter. Please can this be included.	N	The revised modelling approach (change from the dBSea model to the INSPIRE model) is based on depth average predictions of sound propagation. Therefore, no depth specific noise modelling results are presented.
Natural England	2.5.41 Vol. 4 Annex 3.1 – Subsea Noise Technical Report 5.1.2.9 Natural England queries if modelling of the 15 m pile would cause more issues and greater PTS/TTS/disturbance zones for low frequency cetaceans such as minke whales?	I	The impacts on the relevant species of marine mammals have been reassessed based on the updated noise modelling with the full impact assessment provided in Section 4.11.1 of Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 4: Marine Mammals.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>19</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Natural England	2.5.42 Vol. 4 Annex 3.1 – Subsea Noise Technical Report Fig. 5.3 and 5.4 Figures 5.3 and 5.4 and various of the appendix figures – Given SPL peak levels look like they are above 175 dB at the coast (or even nearer 190db for the HVAC south location), Natural England queries if this could constitute a barrier for hauled out seals, or impact pups?	I	The assessment includes calculation of the seal within dose-response curves and the assessment demonstrated that even piling at the most southerly potential HVAC location would not result in any barrier effects to the haul out sites along the north Norfolk coast (paragraph 4.11.1.141 et seq of Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 4: Marine Mammals).
Natural England	2.5.43 Vol. 4 Annex 3.1 – Subsea Noise Technical Report Table 5.6 Table 5.6 and other tables such as 5.9 and 5.10 – Natural England queries if the values for HF cetaceans are correct for the 155dB Weighted SEL values? Currently for 5,000kJ, there is a maximum of 8.8 km, but for the lower energy 2,500kJ, it is a distance of 17 km. Are all of these values explained by paragraphs 5.3.2.8 and 5.3.2.9 and the sensitivity of the hearing groups? Please could clarification be provided.	I	The lower hammer energy modelling uses the pile diameter for the pin piles and the larger area for the 155 dB weighted SEL is considered to be a result of the increased high frequency components of the noise profile from pins piles relative to the monopiles and the consequent impacts on high frequency species such as harbour porpoise. Full details of the frequency spectrum generated by each pile type and how this relates to the hearing spectrum of each of the marine mammal species is provided in Environmental Statement volume 4, annex 3.1: Subsea Noise Technical Report.
Natural England	2.5.44 Vol. 4 Annex 3.1 – Subsea Noise Technical Report Table 5.12 Natural England queries how 40% blow energy for the 5,000 kJ hammer reports a maximum range of 53 km, but a mean range of 58 km? Please could clarification be provided.	I	This has been corrected.
Natural England	2.5.45 Vol. 5 Annex 4.1 – Marine Mammal Technical Report 2.3.9.1 The Jones and Russell (2016) paper cited is not in the reference list and should be included.	I	Reference list has been updated.
Natural England	2.5.46 Vol. 5 Annex 4.1 – Marine Mammal Technical Report 4.5.2.2 Natural England considers this paragraph to be very out of date. Blakeney and Horsey are two of the biggest pupping sites in England, and together have more pups than the combined 'other Scottish colonies' which includes Shetland and the Scottish mainland (SCOS, 2016). Donna Nook also has significant numbers of pups. Combining these three locations in the central North Sea, it is likely that they have more pups than most other pupping sites in the UK, excepting the Outer Hebrides and Orkney (SCOS, 2016). Paragraph 4.5.2.3 is also out of date as grey seals do not tend to pup in the Wash, rather pupping is concentrated along the North Norfolk and Lincolnshire coastlines (i.e. Blakeney, Horsey and the surroundings in Norfolk and Donna Nook in Lincolnshire).	I	The abundance records for seals have been updated within volume 5, annex 4.1: Marine Mammals Technical Report and are used throughout the ES chapter.
Natural England	2.5.47 Vol. 5 Annex 4.1 – Marine Mammal Technical Report 4.6.2.2.2 Natural England considers this paragraph also needs updating; approximately 450 harbour seals are now present in the Thames region.	I	The abundance records for seals have been updated within volume 5, annex 4.1: Marine Mammals Technical Report and are used throughout the ES chapter.
Natural England	2.5.48 Draft Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment (RIAA) Table 4.2 Natural England queries if vessel noise should be 'vessel presence' causing disturbance? Otherwise Natural England considers vessel noise should sit with underwater noise.	I	An assessment on increased vessel traffic has been considered within the final Environmental Statement which includes both vessel noise and collision risk.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>19</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Natural England	2.5.49 Draft Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment (RIAA) Fig. 4.1 Berwickshire and North Northumberland Coast SAC has not been screened in for grey seal. Grey seals can certainly forage within the project area. However, as per the 'Major comment' above, if sites in the north east MU are screened out due to the evidence provided, then the MU population considered should only be the south east MU.	I	The Berwickshire and North Northumberland Coast SAC has been included within the updated Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment that accompanies the application for Development Consent.
Natural England	2.5.50 Draft Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment (RIAA) 7.4.6.8 Natural England does not consider it correct to state that grey seal tend to haul out in The Wash, rather they tend to haul out at Horsey and Winterton between October and January, (as well as Blakeney and Donna Nook).	I	Noted.
Natural England	2.5.51 Draft Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment (RIAA) 7.4.6.12 It should be noted there are also large breeding colonies at Blakeney and Horsey which are not in remote locations.	I	Noted.
Natural England	2.5.52 Draft Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment (RIAA) 7.5.2.39 Natural England queries if this paragraph should read 'in the absence of further mitigation', i.e. ADDs will already be used, but further mitigation may be required (e.g. a longer soft start at the 15% energy). Please can clarification be provided.	I	The underwater noise modelling has been updated. Mitigation options have been outlined within the Environmental Statement and Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment as required.
Natural England	2.5.53 Draft Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment (RIAA) Table 7.21 Natural England queries how the maximum WTG overlap for sequential piling 1.6%, but only another 0.23% for concurrent piling? Surely there are other WTGs that have more of an overlap than 0.23%? Please can clarification be provided.	I	Hornsea Three is located outside of the SNS cSAC therefore direct overlap with the designated site is limited. There is a small increase in the percentage overlap for concurrent piling because the spatial effects of piling each WTG overlap.
Natural England	2.5.54 Draft Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment (RIAA) 7.5.2.73 Natural England does not consider it likely that animals will return to the site within a 16 hour window of the piling day. Please can clarification be provided as to how this paragraph relates to the following paragraphs?	I	A 72 hour return time has been considered for the assessment.
Natural England	2.5.55 Draft Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment (RIAA) 7.5.2.70 – 7.5.2.75 Please can clarification be provided as to whether these calculations will be shown in the final RIAA?	I	Full explanation of the assessment approach is provided in Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment: behavioural disturbance Southern North Sea cSAC.
Natural England	2.5.56 Draft Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment (RIAA) Figure 7.9 It would be helpful if the turbine location could be shown in these figures.	I	Noted.



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>19</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Natural England	2.5.57 Draft Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment (RIAA) 7.5.2.76 Natural England would like it made clear that this conclusion is for the project on its own, not in combination with other plans and projects.	I	Conclusion has been drawn for both the Project alone (Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment section 6.5) and in-combination with other plans and projects (Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment section 6.7).
Natural England	2.5.58 Draft Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment (RIAA) 7.5.2.93. Natural England considers the actual number of return trips should be stated and then the vessel movements within the site during construction removed from the calculations.	I	A more realistic assessment approach for increase vessel traffic has been included within the assessment, as discussed with Natural England as part of the Evidence Plan, and a re-estimation of the vessel traffic expected throughout the different stages of the Hornsea Three development has been provided.
Natural England	2.5.59 Draft Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment (RIAA) General comment There appears to be no assessment of the cumulative impact of pile driving disturbance and disturbance from vessels? Please could clarification be provided as to why this is.	I	A more realistic vessel traffic assessment has been provided within the cumulative/in-combination assessment (see Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 4: Marine Mammals section 4.13 and the Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment section 6.7). This assessment has considered in detail the in-combination effects from vessel movement for each designated site.
Natural England	2.5.60 Draft Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment (RIAA) Section 7.8 As additional work is planned on the underwater noise assessment, Natural England does not agree that conclusions can be drawn against the Conservation Objectives of these sites at this time.	I	The piling assumptions (including soft start durations and pile size) have been updated following further engineering optimisation and are detailed in Environmental Statement volume 4, annex 3.1: Subsea Noise Technical Report and additional modelling has also been undertaken on these new assumptions. The Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment has drawn conclusions against the conservation Objectives based on this updated information where relevant.
Natural England	1.35 Receptor-led effects: The marine mammal chapter states that porpoise return times from piling noise could be quick (less than one day to three days) and although no conclusion is made on underwater noise, Natural England considers this to impact the statement made in this table stating that as animals will be disturbed from the area due to piling, they will not be exposed to the increased boat traffic. Any breaks in piling of more than one to three days will expose animals to boat traffic and the text should be updated to reflect this. (Volume 2, chapter 12, Table 12.8)	I	A more realistic vessel traffic assessment has been provided within the cumulative/in-combination assessment (see Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 4 section 4.13 and the Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment section 6.7). This assessment has considered in detail the in-combination effects from vessel movement for each designated site.
Natural England	Annex 1 Key concerns We note that the maximum piling duration that is used in the noise modelling is 4 hours, including the soft start. Natural England would like to seek confirmation from DONG Energy that this is a realistic worst case scenario as any piling which exceeds 4 hours would invalidate the noise modelling.	I	A revised noise modelling approach has been taken for the EIA. Since PEIR the design envelope has been refined and for piling scenarios taken forward to reflect the most likely piling durations based on past construction experience. The updated scenarios modelled and assessed for impacts to marine mammals have been worked through and agreed with the Marine Mammal EWG
Natural England	1.2 We are in agreement with the MMO and the MoD regarding Unexploded Ordnance (UXO) detonation onsite. Given the location of the array and unknown size and quantity of UXO, Natural England raises concerns in relation to the potential impacts to interest features of the Southern North Sea candidate SAC (cSAC). A broad assessment of UXO impact is still required. Other wind farms have assessed that approximately 40 UXOs are possible within the site. NE agree that this can be updated post consent, with a formal marine licence application, but the impact of UXOs still needs to be assessed within the EIA and HRA rather than scoped out. The agreement to undertake a broad assessment is detailed in the final row of Table 4.4 and should be reflected in the text. (Volume 1, chapter 3, paragraph 3.6.4.2)	I	It is noted that a UXO licence is not being sought as part of the DCO application. The impacts from UXO on marine mammals have been considered in paragraph 4.11.1.176 et seq of Environmental Statement volume 2 chapter 4: Marine Mammals, with the associated noise modelling based on that undertaken for Hornsea Project One and already provided to the MMO and its advisors as discussed through the EWG and full meeting minutes are presented with the Evidence Plan (consultation Report Annex 1 Evidence Plan). A consideration of the impacts from UXO clearance has also been included within the Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment.
<b>Section 42: Local Authorities (prescribed under section 43 of the Act)</b>			
No comments were received by the local authorities relating to marine mammals under Phase 2.A.			

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>19</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 42: Persons with an interest in the land (prescribed under section 44 of the Act)</b>			
No comments were received by landowners or land interests relating to marine mammals under Phase 2.A..			
<b>Section 47: Duty to consult local community</b>			
Friends of North Norfolk	14. PEIR Volume 2, which deals with offshore, impacts because of inter-relationship and cumulative harm to/ with onshore receptors, notably: - Chapter 4 Marine Mammals. The importance of both grey and common seal colonies, as an ecological and tourist asset. - Chapter 5 Offshore Ornithology. - Chapter 6 Commercial Fisheries. - Chapter 10 Seascape and Visual Resources.	I	An assessment of the cumulative effects of Hornsea Three with other plans and projects is presented Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 4: Marine Mammals, chapter 5: Offshore Ornithology, chapter 6: Commercial Fisheries and chapter 10: Seascape and Visual Resources as well as throughout the remainder of Environmental Statement chapters. A description of the likely inter-related effects arising from Hornsea Three on receptors is provided in the Environmental Statement in volume 2, chapter 12: Inter-Related Effects (Offshore).
Friends of North Norfolk	19. The majority of the North Norfolk Coastline is recognised, both nationally and internationally, for its exceptional landscape and ecological value with a number of overlapping Designations including the Norfolk Coast AONB, the North Norfolk Heritage Coast, many SSSI, SAC, RAMSAR sites and Marine Protection Areas/ MCZs.	I	A full assessment of the effects of Hornsea Three on benthic ecology, including on features of designated sites, is presented in volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology. Conclusions on the effects of Hornsea Three on the conservation objectives of the North Norfolk Coast and Saturn Reef SAC and The Wash and North Norfolk Coast SAC are presented in full within the RIAA for Hornsea Three. Discussions on the effects of Hornsea Three on the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ and the Markham's Triangle rMCZ are presented in full within volume 5, annex 2.3: Marine Conservation Zone Assessment.
Marguerite Russel	<b>Local matters landfall zone</b> - Local birds and wildlife must not suffer. Is it an important migratory route? How about the seals?	I	The final assessment for offshore birds is presented in Environmental Statement Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore Ornithology and the final assessment for Marine Mammals presented in Environmental Statement Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine Mammals with no impacts of major significance identified for either receptors.
Jill Wright	<b>Offshore array area</b> - Only that I hope you will ensure it is neither a hazard to marine animals nor to birds	I	The final assessment for offshore birds is presented in Environmental Statement Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore Ornithology and the final assessment for Marine Mammals presented in Environmental Statement Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine Mammals with no impacts of major significance identified for either receptors.
Dawn Moore	<b>EIA</b> - Not read or heard enough of the potential impact to wildlife at sea and surrounding land areas	I	Impacts on ecological receptors onshore and offshore are the relevant topic chapters of Environmental Statement volumes 2 and 3. Impacts on land uses are addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 6: Land Use and Recreation.
Pat Floyd	<b>PEIR Surveys</b> - Obviously the project will not improve the landscape while under construction and affects wildlife. All building along the route must be kept to a minimum height. I also have suspicions about the amount of turbines now situating in the North Sea and how this impacts whale migrations and could be partly responsible for so many whales being beached along the Norfolk and Suffolk coasts this year	I	Thank you for you feedback. The final assessment for offshore birds is presented in Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore Ornithology and the final assessment for Marine Mammals presented in Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine Mammals with no impacts of major significance identified for either receptors.
Valerie Stubbs	<b>Offshore Array</b> - I am concerned about the impact on wildlife - both birds which feed in the area and marine wildlife	I	The final assessment for offshore birds is presented in Environmental Statement Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore Ornithology and the final assessment for Marine Mammals presented in Environmental Statement Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine Mammals with no impacts of major significance identified for either receptors.
Christine Walton	<b>Offshore Array</b> - I am concerned about the impact on wildlife, particularly local and migrating birds (getting caught in blades etc.), Also the impact on creatures in the sea - fish and other mammals. Impact of possible pollution in the sea on growing plants/seaweed etc. and therefore impact on the food chain.	I	The final assessment for offshore birds is presented in Environmental Statement Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore Ornithology and the final assessment for Marine Mammals presented in Environmental Statement Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine Mammals with no impacts of major significance identified for either receptors. Measures to manage the risk of any pollution events during the construction and operation of the project are captured within the Development Consent Order (and accompanying Deemed Marine Licences) through the requirement for a Marine Pollution Contingency Plan.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>19</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Ruth Bullard	<b>Export Cable</b> - I hope the sea bed will be restored and there is little impact on marine life	I	Noted. See the Environmental Statement where impacts have been assessed for various receptors (such as Benthic Ecology, Fish and Shellfish, Marine Mammals and Ornithology) and mitigation measures proposed where appropriate.
Brian Donovan	<b>Export Cables</b> - Your expert at the Holt consultation justified needing 1.5 km of sea bed because of the inaccuracy of laying cables to that depth, whereas you can lay cables much closer when on the land. Do you expect the marine life you damage over such a wide distance to fully recover after the marine cables are laid?	I	The requirement for a 1.5km corridor width offshore is not associated with inaccuracy of cable laying but rather with the complexity of routing offshore to take into account environmental (e.g. protected reef features) and technical (e.g. outcropping rock or UXO) constraints which may only be fully understood during the detailed design process for the project, which will be undertaken post consent. The actual impacted footprint is linked primarily to the number of export cables and this will remain as assessed within the final application whether the cables are widely or narrowly spaced within the 1.5km corridor. The impacts of the installation of offshore cables are considered in volume 2 of the Environmental Statement and this includes consideration of recovery of habitats and species along the entire export cable route.
Simon Clarke	<b>Offshore Export Cable Corridor</b> - I am worried about the impact on marine life, especially the local crab fishing industry	I	Thank you for your comment. Please see in the Environmental Statement, section 6.11 of volume 2, chapter 6 (Commercial Fisheries) where the impact assessment considers the level of impact to specific fisheries (including crab) activities and fleets
<b>Section 48: Duty to publicise</b>			
No comments were received by in response to the public notice issued during Phase 2.A relating to marine mammals.			

Table 2.8: Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Further Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.B) relating to marine mammals.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>20</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 42: Prescribed consultees (The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009: Schedule 1))</b>			
No comments were received by prescribed consultees relating to marine mammals under Phase 2.B.			
<b>Section 42: Local Authorities (prescribed under section 43 of the Act)</b>			
No comments were received by local authorities relating to marine mammals under Phase 2.B.			
<b>Section 42: Persons with an interest in the land (prescribed under section 44 of the Act)</b>			
No comments were received by landowners or land interests relating to marine mammals under Phase 2.B.			
<b>Section 47: Duty to consult local community</b>			
No comments were received by the local community relating to marine mammals under Phase 2.B.			
<b>Section 48: Duty to publicise</b>			
No comments were received in response to the public notice issued during Phase 2.B relating to marine mammals.			

<sup>20</sup> Y = Yes change made; N = No change made; I = Incorporated into or considered when producing the assessment or landowner voluntary agreement offer; N/A = Not applicable.

## 2.5 Offshore Ornithology

Table 2.9: Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.A) relating to offshore ornithology.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>21</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 42: Prescribed consultees (The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009: Schedule 1))</b>			
ScottishPower Renewables (UK) Limited	Our intention is to register as an interested party due to the potential for cumulative and in-combination habitats issues to arise with Hornsea Project Three and SPR's East Anglia projects, specifically East Anglia TWO and ONE North Offshore Windfarms for which scoping requests will be submitted to the Planning Inspectorate in November of this year. At this stage our specific interest is in relation to the potential for offshore ornithological and marine mammal impacts and therefore cumulative and in-combination impacts upon European protected sites and species.	N	Noted
ScottishPower Renewables (UK) Limited	Whilst we have submitted this response as an early indication of our intention to participate in the Hornsea Three DCO pre-application process and subsequent examination, our intention is to work constructively with DONG Energy and other Southern North Sea Offshore wind applicants to resolve cumulative/in-combination issues, for the benefit of the offshore wind industry ensuring significant MWs are realised in the most appropriate locations. Should you wish to discuss this response in any further detail, please contact Helen Walker, ScottishPower Renewables, 8th Floor, 320 St Vincent Street, Glasgow G2 5AD, [REDACTED], tel: [REDACTED].	N	Noted
Dutch Ministry of Infrastructure and Environment	Birds: We note that in the analysis for certain species the numbers of casualties can be with major significance but this statement is reduced due to the remark that not all parks will be build and that the assumptions are worst case. But the impact on the population of additional mortality still needs to be studied in more detail. We are looking forward to results on this.	I	We note that the Dutch Ministry has recognised that the assessment is preliminary and subject to change. The final assessment for offshore birds is presented in the Environmental Statement, Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore Ornithology with no impacts of major significance identified.
Dutch Ministry of Infrastructure and Environment	We also note that the impact of wind parks in the Netherlands, Belgium and Germany are not taken into consideration. For bird populations which have an international habitat as the area of the southern part of the North Sea, an international approach to accumulation would be required. Within the international cooperation of North Sea countries as a follow-up of the Political declaration on Energy Cooperation (also signed by the UK) such an approach is looked into and developed further. The proposed next steps look good. Some remarks though: • The accumulation study for the winter period mixes up different populations/ A more coherent international approach would be appreciated • Attention could also be paid to possible mitigating measures to reduce the impacts, disregard if this is a significant effect or not.	I	The qualitative approach taken in cumulative and in-combination assessments means that it is not possible to incorporate projects in Dutch, Belgian and German waters as these projects do not quantify impacts as part of EIA consistent to that conducted by projects in UK waters. Environmental Statement Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore Ornithology includes consideration of transboundary effects (Section 5.14)
Norfolk Vanguard	In order to enable a robust cumulative assessment, we would like to have sight of and share information as soon as possible in relation to the baseline data that is currently being collected and ongoing assessment work pending completion, namely Chapter 3 (Fish and Shellfish Ecology), Chapter 4 (Marine Mammals), Chapter 5 (Offshore Ornithology), Chapter 6 (Commercial Fisheries) and Chapter 8 (Aviation, Military and Communication). We would welcome sight of the HRA Appropriate Assessment and discussions with the project team on the approach being taken, prior to the submission of the DCO application.	N	Hornsea Three has been in regular dialogue with the Vattenfall Vanguard project throughout the pre-application stage for each project.
Heather Davison	These comments are my own, as the Flamborough Head European Marine Site Project Officer, and may not represent the opinion of the Management Scheme as a whole.	N	Acknowledged

<sup>21</sup> Y = Yes change made; N = No change made; I = Incorporated into or considered when producing the assessment or landowner voluntary agreement offer; N/A = Not applicable.



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>21</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Heather Davison	The Flamborough and Filey Coast pSPA kittiwake colony has been experiencing population declines for a number of years, in line with other North Sea colonies. Kittiwakes are specialist feeders, feeding primarily on year zero sandeels during the breeding season. It is generally accepted that these declines are due to a reduction in the availability of prey species, as a result of climate change and fishing practices. Although the studies referenced in section 6.2.159 of the HRA Screening Report acknowledge that kittiwakes are extremely pelagic birds, this doesn't take into account the availability of prey within those habitats, nor the restriction to central place foraging during the breeding season. Whilst Frederickson (2012) agreed that kittiwakes can range widely, the report also stated that very little is known about kittiwake diet, especially during the winter months. Similarly, Langston (2010) rated the species as low vulnerability to habitat and prey interactions, but it was also noted in the same paper that food shortages lead to low adult survival. Furthermore, the kittiwake tracking results as part of the FAME/STAR projects should be considered here, in order to better understand the level at which kittiwakes use the Hornsea 3 area during the breeding season.	I	The FFC pSPA breeding Kittiwake colony has shown increases in recent years with the most recent colony counts showing this. Historically the colony at FFC pSPA has shown apparent declines however, a review of the counts that informed the Flamborough Head and Bempton Cliffs SPA designation presented in Coulson (2011) identifies considerable uncertainty surrounding these counts and concludes that the number of pairs was actually the number of individuals. This would indicate that the colony has actually been stable since the 1980s  The FAME tracking data has been used where appropriate throughout the ES/RIAA.
Heather Davison	As such, in my opinion, the evidence is not strong enough to completely discount LSE for kittiwakes and gannets during the construction/decommissioning phases of the project.	I	Noted. The impact on kittiwake at the Flamborough and Filey Coast pSPA has been considered in the RIAA.
Heather Davison	General Comments - Ensure that the Flamborough and Filey Coast potential Special Protection Area (pSPA) is referenced correctly throughout the document, particularly within sections 8.4.7.22 and 8.4.7.25 of the Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment (RIAA).	I	A full check of relevant sections has been undertaken
Heather Davison	The most up-to-date seabird colony counts should be used to inform this HRA; a full colony census of the Flamborough and Filey Coast pSPA was completed in 2017.	I	Advice provided by Natural England for previous offshore wind farm projects (e.g. Hornsea Project Two) has advised that designated populations should be used. Changes in populations at the pSPA are noted in a contextual manner throughout the PEI and will be included in a qualitative manner in relevant assessments
Heather Davison	Section 8.4.5.21 of the RIAA references a slightly increased risk of mortality in razorbills due to the ongoing care required for their young after fledging. This is also true of guillemots; the report should be altered to reflect this accurately.	I	A review of the text has been undertaken and updates made where necessary
Heather Davison	Paragraph 5.6.5.20 of the Offshore Ornithology (Chapter 5) document should be re-worded, particularly the second sentence.	I	A review of this section has been undertaken and reworded where appropriate.
Heather Davison	References to Wade et al (2016) The Wade et al (2016) paper is referenced throughout the documents in relation to seabird vulnerability to all aspects of offshore windfarms. Although the paper uses and references vulnerability scores established by Furness et al (2013), the uncertainty scores computed by Wade et al (2016) suggest where further information may be required in order to accurately assess vulnerability (i.e. high uncertainty of the existing data) and where it can be assumed that the data already available is sufficient (i.e. low uncertainty). It would be more transparent to use the original vulnerability scores, or explain how the Wade et al (2016) scores were calculated.	I	Consideration of the uncertainty scores presented in Wade et al. (2016) is included in Annex 5.1: Baseline Characterisation Report, Annex 5.2: Analysis of Displacement Impacts on Seabirds and Annex 5.3: Collision Risk Modelling
Heather Davison	Omission of Construction/Decommissioning Phases (Kittiwakes and Gannets) and Displacement Effects (Kittiwake) The construction/decommissioning phases, and any possible effects, have not been included in Tables 4.10 and 8.1 of the RIAA in relation to kittiwakes and gannets. Furthermore, any possible displacement effects on the kittiwake population have not been considered. This extends to Annex 5.2, where kittiwakes have, again, been excluded from any displacement analysis. No satisfactory explanation for these omissions has been given in the documents available, as explored below.	I	No LSE was identified for disturbance impacts on gannet and kittiwake that may occur in the construction/decommissioning phases. A clear process to identify Valued Ornithological Receptors (VORs) for inclusion in displacement analyses is presented in Annex 5.2: Analysis of Displacement Impacts on Seabirds with the rationale for screening out kittiwake presented. Natural England have also advised that displacement analysis is not required for kittiwake as part of the Evidence Plan process

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>21</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Heather Davison	Gannet Vulnerability to Construction/Decommissioning Section 6.2.164 of the HRA Screening Report states that gannets are seemingly tolerant of human activities at sea, as discards from fishing vessels can be an important food source. Fishing practices are not directly related, nor even directly comparable, to any construction or decommissioning activities which might occur as part of this project. Therefore, with no further evidence supplied, it cannot be assumed that there will be no effect on gannets during the construction/decommissioning phases. Moreover, the Wade et al (2016) report has been used to state that gannets are of low vulnerability to disturbance from vessels and demonstrate considerable flexibility in habitat use – see comment 2.	I	As stated gannet have a low vulnerability to disturbance and demonstrate a high habitat flexibility. Further information in relation to this is provided in the Environmental Statement volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore Ornithology and the RIAA. Therefore, no LSE is identified in relation to disturbance impacts
Heather Davison	Kittiwake Vulnerability to Construction/Decommissioning and Displacement Although it may be true that the construction/decommissioning phases would have no LSE on kittiwakes, the evidence used in section 6.2.158 of the HRA Screening Report is unconvincing. There seems to be a lack of evidence which specifically relates to kittiwake ecology; the broad term 'gulls' is used frequently in this section. It should also be considered whether the number of seabird observations in the studies referenced is substantial enough to be comparable with the number of kittiwakes which associate with this area of the Hornsea Zone (Table 1.45 of Annex 5.1 estimates a peak population of more than 12,000 within the development area during July). Furthermore, kittiwake has been completely omitted from the displacement analysis in Annex 5.2.	I	The process used to identify species for inclusion in displacement analyses is presented in Annex 5.1: Baseline Characterisation Report and Annex 5.2: Analysis of Displacement Impacts on Seabirds. Kittiwake have a low vulnerability to displacement impacts and therefore are not identified for consideration of displacement. This conclusion is also supported by Natural England who do not advise kittiwake is considered in relation to displacement impacts
Great Yarmouth Borough Council	Policy CS11 of the Great Yarmouth Local Plan Core Strategy confirms that designated nature conservation sites will be conserved and enhanced, and protected species such as the Little Terns should be adequately protected from adverse effects of new development, and where negative effects are unavoidable, suitable measures will be required to mitigate such impact(s). Therefore, any potential indirect impacts should be considered and where mitigation measures are necessary, should complement the measures set out in the Council's Natura 2000 Sites Monitoring and Mitigation Strategy.	I	Environmental Statement, Volume 2, Chapter 5 – Offshore Ornithology assesses the potential impact of the project on different bird species, including little tern. This chapter also highlights any necessary monitoring and/or mitigation measures which could prevent, minimise, reduce or offset the possible environmental effects identified in the EIA process. Any mitigation or monitoring proposed will consider relevant policy guidelines and stakeholder advice.
Marine Management Organisation	4.4. The MMO notes that the Southern North Sea is now a candidate Special Area of Conservation (cSAC), not a potential Special Area of Conservation (pSAC) as stated in the PEIR (paragraph 1.7.2.4 and Figure 1.16, Volume 2, Chapter 1 – Marine Processes, also paragraph 4.11.1.47 and Figure 1.16, Volume 2, Chapter 4 – Marine Mammals).	I	Hornsea Three acknowledge this comment and have amended references to the Southern North Sea so that it now reflects the fact that it is now a candidate Special Area of Conservation (cSAC).

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>21</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Marine Management Organisation	<p>1.6. Where the significance of a predicted impact is calculated as “Minor or Moderate”, the MMO recommends that the significance is assessed as “Moderate” in accordance with the ‘worst case scenario’ principle of the ‘Rochdale Envelope’ appraisal. Such impacts would therefore be significant in terms of the subsequent analysis required under the appropriate Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) regulations, according to the matrix rules used by DONG Energy in the PEIR (paragraph 2.9.1.9, Volume 2, Chapter 2 – Benthic Subtidal and Intertidal Ecology and replicated in subsequent ‘Offshore’ chapters).</p>	I	<p>Regarding Benthic Ecology, In the Environmental Statement, Paragraph 2.9.2.5 of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Subtidal and Intertidal Ecology clarifies that, in cases where a range is suggested for the significance of effect, there remains the possibility that this may span the significance threshold (i.e. the range is given as minor to moderate). In such cases the final significance is based upon the expert’s professional judgement as to which outcome delineates the most likely effect, with an explanation as to why this is the case. Additional explanatory text has been inserted into the relevant assessments in sections 2.11.1 to 2.11.3 of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology to clarify why, in instances where there is a choice in the matrix table, an effect has been considered as minor rather than moderate.</p> <p>For Ornithology, the process used to determine the significance of impacts upon relevant receptors is presented in Section 5.9.4 of Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore Ornithology. Where the significance value falls between two categories (e.g. minor or moderate significance) expert judgement is used to determine the significance value</p> <p>For Marine Mammals the magnitude and sensitivity matrix has been updated and all updates have been communicated to the relevant key stakeholders through the EWG.</p> <p>As discussed in the Marine Processes, Benthic Ecology and Fish and Shellfish EWG meeting of 5 December 2017, impact assessment conclusions have been amended to provide further justification for why a significance of minor (i.e. not significant) has been concluded for species of medium to high sensitivity. These are presented in in the relevant impact assessments in Section 3.11 (for Hornsea Three alone) and Section 3.13 (for Cumulative Effects) of volume 2, chapter 3: Fish and Shellfish Ecology.</p>
Marine Management Organisation	<p>1.7. The MMO recommends re-examination of the requirements for pre-construction, construction and post-construction monitoring following re-assessment of the magnitude and significance of the potential impacts of the proposed Project. The MMO advises that verification of the impact predictions as set out in the PEIR can, in many cases, only be provided by future monitoring of the relevant receptors. This important consideration should be taken into account when future monitoring requirements are detailed in the ‘Offshore’ chapters of the PEIR.</p>	I	<p>Consideration of the potential need for monitoring has been considered throughout the offshore chapters of the Environmental Statement. The proposed approach to monitoring for offshore elements of the project is discussed in the In Principle Monitoring Plan that accompanies the application for Development Consent.</p> <p>Explanatory text has been inserted into the relevant assessment sections in the Environmental Statement of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology to clarify why, in instances where there is a choice in the matrix table, an effect has been considered as minor rather than moderate. There are, however, no instances of effects being considered to be of moderate adverse significance. The proposals for future monitoring are outlined in the Environmental Statement in Table 2.25 of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology.</p> <p>The proposed approach to monitoring for offshore ornithology and marine mammals is discussed in the In Principle Monitoring Plan.</p> <p>Monitoring has not been proposed for fish and shellfish ecology, due to the lack of significant effects on fish ecology and the high level of confidence in the assessment presented.</p>
RSPB	<p>Volume 2: Chapter 5 – Offshore Ornithology The RSPB, in line with the recommendations of the BTO Avoidance Rate review and the SNCB response, do not think it is appropriate to use the extended version of the Band collision risk model for gannet and kittiwake while there is insufficient evidence to derive an avoidance rate appropriate to it. The “default” rate given in table 5.6 is based on historic rates used with the basic model and predates the realisation that it is inappropriate to use the same avoidance rates for the basic and extended model and therefore is not a suitable surrogate.</p>	I	<p>The BTO review did not recommend against the use of the Extended model rather it could not recommend avoidance rates for use with the Extended model. The application of a 98% avoidance rate to collision risk estimates obtained when using the Extended model is considered suitably precautionary</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>21</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
RSPB	Volume 2: Chapter 5 – Offshore Ornithology We also ask that for gannet during the breeding season an avoidance rate of 98% is presented as the evidence presented by Cook et al. for the change in avoidance rate for gannet was almost entirely based on non-breeding birds.	I	The use of avoidance rates in collision risk modelling follows the recommendations of Cook et al. (2014) and JNCC et al. (2014).
RSPB	Volume 2: Chapter 5 – Offshore Ornithology The RSPB do not accept the use of the 1% population threshold as criteria for further assessment as although in widespread use it is entirely arbitrary. However, based on the numbers presented we agree with the species list taken forward for further assessment, except for the cases detailed below. However, we note that while herring gull are included in table 5.7 that there is no supporting text.	I	It is noted that the RSPB agree with the suite of species taken through to impact assessment. Supporting information in relation to the inclusion and exclusion of specific species within the assessments can be found in the annexes to Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 5: Offshore Ornithology.
RSPB	Volume 2: Chapter 5 – Offshore Ornithology The RSPB do not consider it is correct to exclude displacement effects of kittiwake and collision of fulmar. While for kittiwake there exists a body of evidence suggesting no displacement, these data are almost entirely from out with the breeding season, when the effects of displacement will be most profound.	Y	Displacement effects on fulmar are included in Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore Ornithology and the Report to Inform the Appropriate Assessment. The identification of VORs for consideration in displacement analyses is presented in Annex 5.2: Analysis of Displacement Impacts on Seabirds. Natural England have advised that displacement analysis is not required for kittiwake as part of the Evidence Plan process
RSPB	Table 5.24 and 5.25 – The collision risk predictions for gannet are different in these tables, and in neither case is the annual mortality equal to the sum of the seasons even accounting for rounding error. Without confidence in these figures we cannot make an assessment on the likely scale of impact arising from this scheme.	I	Collision risk estimates have been updated since the publication of the PEIR.
RSPB	Para 5.11.2.170 – Recalculation of these values using the SNCB advised avoidance rate predicts an annual kittiwake mortality of 341. This is likely to be of more than a minor significance.	I	Collision risk estimates have been updated since the publication of the PEIR with a complete assessment provided in Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore Ornithology.
RSPB	Para 5.11.2.184, 185 and 186 – These paragraphs erroneously refer to common tern when they should be referring to arctic tern.	I	Text amended where necessary.
RSPB	The RSPB, in line with the recommendations of the BTO Avoidance Rate review and the SNCB response, do not think it is appropriate to use the extended version of the Band Collision Risk Model for gannet and kittiwake while there is insufficient evidence to derive an appropriate avoidance rate. The RSPB's position of the avoidance rate of kittiwake using the basic model is in alignment with the SNCBs, in that it should be 98.9%, rather than 99.2% as presented in Table 5.28. The correct use of avoidance rate would bring the total annual kittiwake collisions to 341. The RSPB also ask that for gannet an avoidance rate of 98% is presented, as the evidence presented by Cook et al. for the change in avoidance rate for gannet was almost entirely based on nonbreeding birds. The use of the avoidance rate for the breeding season predicts 40 collisions per annum in the breeding season. We are content with the use of 98.95 for non-breeding season, in line with Cook et al., and the SNCB guidance.	I	The use of avoidance rates in collision risk modelling follows the recommendations of Cook et al. (2014) and JNCC et al. (2014). The application of a 98% avoidance rate for gannet and kittiwake when using the Extended model of Band (2012) is considered suitably precautionary.
RSPB	Paras 5.13.1.1 – 5.13.1.16 – Displacement effects are estimated values and the RSPB considers that a minimum of 60% is appropriate for all auk species in the absence of better evidence.	I	A literature review has been undertaken (see Section 5.9.2 in the Environmental Statement, Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore Ornithology) to identify appropriate displacement rates for use in relevant assessments.
RSPB	Para 5.13.2.84 – The RSPB, in line with the recommendations of the BTO avoidance rate review and the SNCB response, do not think it is appropriate to use the extended version of the Band Collision Risk Model for gannet while there is insufficient evidence to derive an avoidance rate appropriate to it. We remain very concerned about cumulative impacts on gannet.	I	The application of a 98% avoidance rate for gannet when using the Extended model of Band (2012) is considered suitably precautionary



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>21</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
RSPB	Para 5.13.2.124 – The RSPB, in line with the recommendations of the BTO Avoidance Rate review and the SNCB response, do not think it is appropriate to use the extended version of the Band Collision Risk Model for kittiwake while there is insufficient evidence to derive an appropriate avoidance rate.	I	The application of a 98% avoidance rate for kittiwake when using the Extended model of Band (2012) is considered suitably precautionary
RSPB	Para 5.16.1.1 – The RSPB disagrees with the assertion “On this basis, there is no indication, at this stage, that Hornsea Three alone will have a significant impact on any VOR.” The RSPB disagrees that the in-combination effects assessment “involve considerable precaution”.	I	The final cumulative assessment is presented in Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore Ornithology with no significant effects identified from impacts associated with Hornsea Three alone.
RSPB	Para 5.1.6.1.4 - The RSPB does not consider that the comments on predicted mortality and the comparative roles of adults, juveniles and non-breeding birds are correct.	I	The contribution of adult, juvenile and non-breeding birds to the population of birds found at Hornsea Three is considered throughout the assessments presented in Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore Ornithology
RSPB	Volume 5: Annex 5.3 – Collision Risk Modelling The RSPB has set out concerns about the approach to Collision Risk Modelling in our response to Chapter 5 above. Para 1.3.2.2 – The RSPB awaits the outputs of the Offshore Renewables Joint Industry Programme with interest and has been involved with the project from the start, currently sitting on the expert panel that advises it. It is not always clear whether the version of the model used is Band (2012) or Masden (2015). In terms of avoidance rates we welcome the presentation of a range, but as highlighted above in our response to Chapter 5, we would prefer partitioning of different avoidance rates for gannet in breeding season and non-breeding season. We note that the predicted mortalities for gannet and kittiwake match those in table 5.24, but not for gannet in table 5.25. B3.4.4 – The RSPB consider that an acknowledgement that migrating birds are likely to fly higher than those that make up the generic data set would be welcome here. We consider that the avoidance rates presented are appropriate.	I	The Band (2012) collision risk model has been used. This approach was agreed through the Evidence Plan process in which RSPB participate.  A range of avoidance rates is presented within Environmental Statement volume 5, annex 5.3: Collision Risk Modelling. The use of avoidance rates in collision risk modelling follows the recommendations of Cook et al. (2014) and JNCC et al. (2014).
RSPB	Volume 6: Annex 3.1 – Onshore Ornithology – Wintering Bird Survey Report Subject to the concerns that we have highlighted in relation to pink-footed geese, the RSPB has no further comments on this document.	N	Acknowledged. Environmental Statement, volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation considers potential impacts on ecological receptors as a result of Hornsea Three. This includes potential impacts on species such as Pink-footed Geese.
RSPB	Para 8.7.2.12 – There is a need for PVA for kittiwake.	I	PVA modelling has been considered in the final RIAA.
RSPB	Annex 1: HRA Screening Report Para 4.4.1 – for reasons set out above, the RSPB does not agree with the assertion “This overview of the bird data indicates that Hornsea Three does not represent an area of significant importance for breeding, passage or wintering birds.” However, once the RSPB has had the opportunity to consider the full data and our concerns set out elsewhere in this document have been addressed we may be able to agree with this assertion.	I	Noted. A full dataset is included in the final RIAA/ES and associated Annexes.
Natural England	Section 2.6 – Offshore Ornithology Key Concerns 1. Likely Significant Effect Screening – methodology for screening SPA and Ramsar sites for Likely Significant Effects (LSE) for bird features General approach to LSE screening Natural England made some general comments (NE ref.: DAS2229/205871) regarding the method applied for determining whether sites should be taken forward to the Appropriate Assessment stage of HRA.	Y	Comments provided by Natural England have been considered in RIAA Annex 2: Additional Special Protection Areas Screening Exercise.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>21</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Natural England	<p>Section 2.6 – Offshore Ornithology Key Concerns</p> <p>1. Likely Significant Effect Screening – methodology for screening SPA and Ramsar sites for Likely Significant Effects (LSE) for bird features</p> <p>General approach to LSE screening</p> <p>The LSE test is a ‘coarse filter’ used to identify potential effect pathways that require further consideration through Appropriate Assessment. However, having identified potential impact pathways for particular features and sites, DONG Energy has ruled out LSE for some SPAs and features based on reference to information on the number of birds recorded in the Hornsea Three site specific surveys (e.g. Herring gull). Given that the baseline survey data is incomplete, Natural England does not consider that it is possible to conclude no LSE based on, for example, ‘insignificant numbers of Herring gull present at Hornsea Three’.</p>	I	<p>The assessment presented at PEIR stage was preliminary, as noted throughout the documents presented with additional survey data to be included as part of the final application. The additional survey data collected supports the conclusions made in relation to Likely Significant Effects as part of the PEIR.</p>
Natural England	<p>Section 2.6 – Offshore Ornithology Key Concerns</p> <p>1. Likely Significant Effect Screening – methodology for screening SPA and Ramsar sites for Likely Significant Effects (LSE) for bird features</p> <p>General approach to LSE screening</p> <p>In the case of fulmar, no LSE has been concluded for a number of SPAs that are within foraging range of Hornsea Three based on the species being assessed as having low vulnerability to disturbance and displacement caused by offshore wind farms (e.g. based on Wade et al. 2016). Natural England does not agree with DONG Energy’s conclusion of no LSE for fulmar at SPAs that are within foraging range of Hornsea Three as stated in paragraph 6.2.154 of our response to DONG Energy’s HRA Screening report: ‘Whilst fulmar may be considered as having low sensitivity to disturbance it is Natural England’s view that it is premature to rule out an LSE on fulmar from displacement effects, particularly given i) the importance of the array site for this species has not yet been quantified and ii) that there is no consideration here of cumulative impacts from multiple offshore windfarms within the foraging range of Flamborough fulmars’. Therefore, based on the information available at this stage of the assessment there are several SPAs and pSPAs that are potential LSE for fulmar.</p>	Y	<p>Consideration of displacement impacts on fulmar at Flamborough and Filey pSPA has been included in the final Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment (RIAA)</p>
Natural England	<p>Section 2.6 – Offshore Ornithology Key Concerns</p> <p>1. Likely Significant Effect Screening – methodology for screening SPA and Ramsar sites for Likely Significant Effects (LSE) for bird features</p> <p>General approach to LSE screening</p> <p>For tern species that are features of the Greater Wash pSPA, and North Norfolk Coast SPA and Ramsar site, DONG Energy has also concluded no LSE on the basis of ‘low sensitivity to the impacts associated with the installation of the export cable (Wade et al., 2016)’. However, Natural England advises that as result of the degree of habitat specialisation shown by terns (see MIG-Birds 2017) displacement and disturbance impacts should be assessed for tern species, as well as indirect effects on prey availability, and therefore in order to conclude no LSE for the tern features of the Greater Wash pSPA and North Norfolk Coast SPA requires demonstration that the export cable route (ECR) envelope has no potential overlap with tern foraging areas within the relevant SPAs.</p>	Y	<p>RIAA Annex 2: Additional Special Protection Areas Screening Exercise identifies the foraging ranges of tern species from North Norfolk Coast SPA in relation to the Hornsea Three export cable corridor. On a precautionary basis, the potential for LSE was identified for Sandwich tern with this species not considered in the RIAA.</p>
Natural England	<p>Section 2.6 – Offshore Ornithology Key Concerns</p> <p>1. Likely Significant Effect Screening – methodology for screening SPA and Ramsar sites for Likely Significant Effects (LSE) for bird features</p> <p>General approach to LSE screening</p> <p>A number of the SPA and pSPA sites that are in scope for the environmental assessment have breeding seabird assemblages which are considered site features. These seabird assemblages will have conservation objectives for the assemblage feature as a whole, incorporating objectives for abundance, diversity and the supporting habitat. Therefore any assessments need to take account of the conservation objectives for the seabird assemblage as well as those for individual species that are features.</p>	I	<p>All relevant features of SPA/pSPAs have been included in the RIAA with the identification of these features included in the HRA Screening Report (DONG Energy, 2016) and RIAA Annex 2: Additional Special Protection Areas Screening Exercise</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>21</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Natural England	<p>Section 2.6 – Offshore Ornithology Key Concerns</p> <p>1. Likely Significant Effect Screening – methodology for screening SPA and Ramsar sites for Likely Significant Effects (LSE) for bird features</p> <p>General approach to LSE screening</p> <p>Additionally, and relevant to the general LSE screening methodology presented by DONG Energy, as plans or projects that could contribute to in-combination effects are only considered in detail after the test of LSE has been applied, potentially significant in-combination impacts cannot be ruled out at this stage.</p>	N	<p>If a species is screened out based on no LSE from the Project alone it can be expected that any impact from the Project alone would not materially alter the current in-combination impact</p>
Natural England	<p>Section 2.6 – Offshore Ornithology Key Concerns</p> <p>1. Likely Significant Effect Screening – methodology for screening SPA and Ramsar sites for Likely Significant Effects (LSE) for bird features</p> <p>General approach to LSE screening</p> <p>In conclusion, Natural England advises that it is not possible to conclude no LSE, and therefore that no Appropriate Assessment is needed, for a number of European sites and their ornithological features that are currently missing from the Appropriate Assessment presented in the RIAA.</p>	I	<p>Identification of SPAs/pSPAs included in the RIAA is included in the HRA Screening Report (DONG Energy, 2016) and RIAA Annex 2: Additional Special Protection Areas Screening Exercise</p>
Natural England	<p>Section 2.6 – Offshore Ornithology Key Concerns</p> <p>1. Likely Significant Effect Screening – methodology for screening SPA and Ramsar sites for Likely Significant Effects (LSE) for bird features</p> <p>LSE screening applied separately to different seasons for SPA features</p> <p>Natural England advises that LSE screening and assessment should be undertaken at the level of the European site/feature and not broken down to an assessment of LSE for different stages of the species' life cycle. For example, DONG Energy has concluded no LSE for guillemot from Flamborough and Filey Coast pSPA (FFC pSPA) in the breeding season but has concluded a potential LSE for the non-breeding season and therefore has undertaken an Appropriate Assessment only for the non-breeding season for guillemot from FFC pSPA (see DONG Energy's Table 4.7).</p>	I	<p>There is no connectivity between a number of breeding features in the breeding season and Hornsea Three. Therefore, for the Project alone there is no predicted impact on breeding birds in the breeding season and the result of any assessment would be zero. Where this effects a feature, the in-combination assessment includes consideration of breeding season impacts at other projects</p>
Natural England	<p>Section 2.6 – Offshore Ornithology Key Concerns</p> <p>1. Likely Significant Effect Screening – methodology for screening SPA and Ramsar sites for Likely Significant Effects (LSE) for bird features</p> <p>LSE screening applied separately to different seasons for SPA features</p> <p>If there is the potential for LSE for a site/feature then that should trigger the need to undertake an Appropriate Assessment for that feature at that European site, which then needs to consider impacts for the species across all seasons/life cycle stages. So, in the case of guillemot there should be an Appropriate Assessment that considers impacts in the breeding season as well as the non-breeding season – even if it is subsequently concluded that there are no breeding season impacts based on the detailed Appropriate Assessment undertaken for that species/site. Additionally, given that the baseline data collection is incomplete it would be premature to conclude no possible impact pathway for FFC pSPA guillemot, for example, in the breeding season. Through the EWG process, Natural England has not agreed with DONG Energy for that to be the case.</p>	I	<p>There is no connectivity between a number of breeding features in the breeding season and Hornsea Three. Therefore, for the Project alone there is no predicted impact on breeding birds in the breeding season and the result of any assessment would be zero. Where this effects a feature, the in-combination assessment includes consideration of breeding season impacts at other projects</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>21</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Natural England	<p>Section 2.6 – Offshore Ornithology Key Concerns</p> <p>1. Likely Significant Effect Screening – methodology for screening SPA and Ramsar sites for Likely Significant Effects (LSE) for bird features</p> <p>Screening for European sites with breeding SPA Seabirds based on connectivity with Hornsea Three in the non-breeding season and screening for European sites that support mobile designated populations (e.g. migratory birds) with potential connectivity with Project Three</p> <p>There also appears to be a missing element to the LSE screening process for offshore ornithology which relates to potential connectivity between Hornsea Three and SPAs and Ramsar sites based on the presence of birds in project areas during the non-breeding season. This applies to migratory seabird, wildfowl and wader species that are non-breeding season features of SPAs and may migrate through Hornsea Three, as well as seabird species that are breeding season features of SPAs but present in the Hornsea Three project area during the non-breeding seasons. An example of this is the exclusion of the little gull feature of the Greater Wash pSPA from LSE screening based on connectivity between little gull migrating through the Hornsea Three array area and the Greater Wash pSPA.</p>	I	<p>Annex 5.2: Additional Special Protection Areas Screening Exercise includes consideration of impacts that may occur in the non-breeding season on breeding seabird features with a conclusion of no LSE reached for all features.</p> <p>No LSE was identified for all wader and wildfowl species in the HRA Screening Report (DONG Energy, 2016) based on the results of preliminary collision risk modelling for relevant species</p>
Natural England	<p>Section 2.6 – Offshore Ornithology Key Concerns</p> <p>2. Incomplete baseline datasets used to inform assessments</p> <p>The offshore ornithology assessments presented by DONG Energy are based on analysis of eleven months of baseline survey data collected between April 2016 and February 2017. In Vol. 2 Chapter 5. Offshore Ornithology, section 5.1.1.3 DONG Energy states that 'At the time of the preparation of this chapter of the PEIR, the baseline characterisation survey programme that will inform the EIA was still on-going. In consequence, the preliminary and emerging nature of the baseline characterisation survey data that informed this chapter of the PEIR has only enabled the latter to present a preliminary and incomplete assessment (section 5.11).'</p> <p>Natural England has advised DONG Energy through the Evidence Working Group (EWG) that two years or more of relevant baseline survey data for each species are required in order to characterise the baseline and to enable the assessment of potential impacts.</p> <p>Natural England therefore does not consider that it is possible to undertake any assessment of potential impacts, or to present any conclusions regarding significant effects or adverse effect on site integrity based on eleven months of data as DONG Energy has done in Section 5.11 of Chapter 5, and in Sections 8.5 and 8.7 of the draft RIAA and summarised in Table 8.26 of the draft RIAA. Therefore Natural England has not provided comments regarding the adverse effect on site integrity or EIA conclusions presented in the PEIR documents.</p> <p>Natural England understands that DONG Energy intends to submit their ES based on less than 24 months of baseline survey data collected for Hornsea Three. There have been discussions within the EWG about whether existing datasets for the wider Hornsea Zone and Hornsea Projects One and Two can be used in conjunction with the HOW3 data to inform the baseline characterisation however discussion of the results of this work are ongoing and not concluded.</p> <p>However, Natural England notes that given DONG Energy's final assessment of potential impacts on birds in the Hornsea Three offshore project areas will be based on less than two years of baseline survey data, there will be greater uncertainty associated with some of the predicted impacts than if assessments had been based on two years of data. As a result it will be important to consider this greater uncertainty when assessing the significance of predicted impacts on populations and features of European sites.</p>	I	<p>Throughout the PEIR it was noted that the assessments and conclusions presented were preliminary as they were based on only eleven months of baseline survey data. The final application includes data for 20 months with this supported by a meta-analysis to identify appropriate abundance metrics for those months for which only one year of data is available (December to March) (see Annex 5.4: Data Hierarchy Report)</p>



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>21</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Natural England	<p>Section 2.6 – Offshore Ornithology Key Concerns 3. Definition of project design parameters Section 3 of DONG Energy’s Draft RIAA presents detailed information about the potential current design envelope for Hornsea Three, including activities associated with the construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning of the project. This is important as it defines ‘Design Envelope’ which includes the maximum design parameters to be assessed for environmental impact. One such important parameter is the lifetime of the project, but it is not clear from the information in Section 3 what this time period will be for Hornsea Three. This needs to be specified as, for example, the length of time that the project is operational is a parameter important to the assessment of impacts such as predicted collisions.</p>	I	The lifespan of the project is up to 35 years and this has been included where relevant
Natural England	<p>Section 2.6 – Offshore Ornithology Key Concerns 4. Collision Risk Modelling: avoidance rates and Band model options DONG Energy presents collision estimates based on a range of avoidance rates and Band model options in Annex 5.3, including those avoidance rates advised by Natural England, however the assessment of significance under EIA presented in Chapter 5 (paragraphs 5.11.2.94 – 5.11.2.194) and under HRA (paragraphs 8.5.2.13 and 8.5.2.14 for gannet and 8.5.2.26 and 8.5.2.27 for kittiwake) is based on Band model options and avoidance rates that Natural England does not agree with for several species. Notably the use of the Extended Band model (Option 3) for the assessment of collision impacts for kittiwake and gannet, and for migratory CRM for little gull, skuas and terns. Further, Natural England does not agree with the use of 99.2% avoidance rate with the Basic Band model (Option 2) for kittiwake as presented in Table 5.28 of Chapter 5.</p>	I	Throughout the PEIR it was noted that the assessments and conclusions presented were preliminary. The final application includes data for 20 months with no changes identified in relation to the suite of species identified for collision risk modelling. Results of collision risk modelling are presented for a range of avoidance rates but only those that the Applicant believes to be most appropriate are taken through to the assessment.
Natural England	<p>Section 2.6 – Offshore Ornithology Key Concerns 4. Collision Risk Modelling: avoidance rates and Band model options DONG Energy presents collision estimates based on a range of avoidance rates and Band model options in Annex 5.3, including those avoidance rates advised by Natural England, however the assessment of significance under EIA presented in Chapter 5 (paragraphs 5.11.2.94 – 5.11.2.194) and under HRA (paragraphs 8.5.2.13 and 8.5.2.14 for gannet and 8.5.2.26 and 8.5.2.27 for kittiwake) is based on Band model options and avoidance rates that Natural England does not agree with for several species. Notably the use of the Extended Band model (Option 3) for the assessment of collision impacts for kittiwake and gannet, and for migratory CRM for little gull, skuas and terns. Further, Natural England does not agree with the use of 99.2% avoidance rate with the Basic Band model (Option 2) for kittiwake as presented in Table 5.28 of Chapter 5.</p>	I	<p>The use of avoidance rates in collision risk modelling follows the recommendations of Cook et al. (2014) and JNCC et al. (2014). The application of a 98% avoidance rate for gannet and kittiwake when using the Extended model of Band (2012) is considered suitably precautionary. Assessments for the project alone incorporate consideration of collision risk estimates calculated using all Options of Band (2012).</p>
Natural England	<p>Section 2.6 – Offshore Ornithology Key Concerns 4. Collision Risk Modelling: avoidance rates and Band model options Natural England notes some inconsistencies in the use of avoidance rates for little gull across the various PEIR documents. For example, Table 5.24 in Chapter 5 states that an AR of 98% is applied to Option 2 of the Band Model and an AR of 99.2% to Option 3. In paragraph 5.11.2.153 collision figures using an AR of 98.9% with Option 2 and 98% with Option 3 are presented. Annex 5.3 presents outputs using a range of Band Model Options and avoidance rates for little gull, including an AR of 99.2% with Option 2 of the Basic Band model and Natural England advises this is currently the most appropriate combination to use for little gull.</p>	Y	A 99.2% avoidance rate has been applied for little gull when using the Basic model of Band (2012) based on the information presented in Cook et al. (2014).

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>21</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Natural England	<p>Section 2.6 – Offshore Ornithology Key Concerns 4. Collision Risk Modelling: avoidance rates and Band model options</p> <p>Natural England notes some inconsistencies in the use of avoidance rates for little gull • The aerial survey programme for Hornsea Three is not yet complete with only data from April 2016 to February 2017 currently incorporated into the CRM. As a result DONG Energy does not have sufficient data to calculate the proportion of birds at rotor height at Hornsea Three for any species and therefore DONG Energy has only been able to undertake CRM using generic flight height information (from Johnston et al., 2014a&amp;b). As a result DONG Energy has not been able to present CRM outputs using Option 1 of the Band (2012) model (as this uses site specific flight height data). Natural England advises that if DONG Energy has sufficient data to calculate site specific flight height parameters when baseline data collection is complete they should present CRM outputs that include Option 1 of the Band model. Additionally, they should compare the site specific flight height data with the generic flight height data to test if they are significant differences.</p>	I	<p>Flight height data collected during baseline aerial surveys at Hornsea Three is not considered appropriate for use in collision risk modelling. This has been communicated to Natural England as part of the Evidence Plan process and further information is provided in Section 1.3 of Annex 5.3: Collision Risk Modelling. Alternative site specific flight height data from previous boat based surveys of the zone has been used in calculations of collision risk using Option 1 of the Band model</p>
Natural England	<p>Section 2.6 – Offshore Ornithology Key Concerns 5. Displacement</p> <p>Variable displacement and mortality applied to different seasons for species</p> <p>In Section 5.6.5.17 of Chapter 5, DONG Energy states that 'The potential impact of displacement will vary depending on the season.' For each species considered in the displacement assessment, DONG Energy has selected a single value for displacement and a single value for mortality for each season to take through to the assessment. The values of both displacement level and mortality are different for different seasons and species (Table 5.5). While it may be the case that displacement levels and mortality do vary at different times of the year for different species, there is no empirical evidence to suggest what these levels might be for different seasons, or even what the relative differences might be. For this reason, SNCB advice (MIG-Birds 2017) is that given there is currently no empirical evidence on the impacts of displacement to seabirds, the SNCBs do not view it as appropriate at this time to apply varying mortality levels by season.</p>	I	<p>Displacement mortality using a range of displacement and mortality rates is presented in Annex 5.2: Analysis of Displacement Impacts on Seabirds. Assessments presented in Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore Ornithology are based on displacement rates identified as part of a literature review presented in Section 5.9.2 of that document.</p>
Natural England	<p>Section 2.6 – Offshore Ornithology Key Concerns 5. Displacement</p> <p>Single value for displacement mortality taken through to the assessment of population significance</p> <p>In section 5.6.5.12 of Chapter 5 DONG Energy states that 'For those species selected for displacement analysis, although a range of values are presented within each matrix table (0-100%); a single level of displacement is selected within the table to take forward for the purposes of assessment. This level is species-specific and considered suitably conservative and representative of available evidence where available.'</p> <p>While DONG Energy does present the full displacement matrix for species as advised by the SNCBs (MIG-Birds 2017), Natural England does not agree with the methodology whereby only a single value for predicted displacement mortality is taken through to assessment. Natural England advises that a range of values are taken through to assessment of population impacts stage as this reflects the range of uncertainty around the predicted impact. In the face of considerable uncertainty around impact levels, this would enable a judgment to be made regarding the likelihood that, given the range of possible outcomes, mortality arising from displacement could give rise to a significant adverse impact (see also below for comments regarding presentation and consideration of variability and uncertainty around predicted impacts).</p>	N	<p>Displacement mortality using a range of displacement and mortality rates is presented in Annex 5.2: Analysis of Displacement Impacts on Seabirds. Assessments presented in Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore Ornithology are based on displacement rates identified as part of a literature review presented in Section 5.9.2 of that document.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>21</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Natural England	<p>Section 2.6 – Offshore Ornithology Key Concerns</p> <p>5. Displacement</p> <p>Assessment of displacement mortality for each season separately without consideration of impacts on populations across the whole annual cycle</p> <p>Natural England notes that where DONG Energy has undertaken an assessment of the significance of a displacement impact for a species, they have done this for each season separately but have not considered the overall level of displacement impact for a population across the whole annual cycle. SNCB advice (MIG-Birds, 2017) is that displacement impacts calculated for individual seasons should be summed across seasons to allow assessment of the annual impact on the population.</p>	N	It is not considered appropriate to sum the displacement mortality calculated for individual seasons as this potentially over-estimates the number of birds affected (through double-counting) with the total based on the number of seasons defined
Natural England	<p>Section 2.6 – Offshore Ornithology Key Concerns</p> <p>5. Displacement</p> <p>Exclusion of fulmar from displacement assessments</p> <p>Paragraph 5.6.5.4 of Chapter 5 identifies fulmar, gannet, guillemot, razorbill and puffin as species to be included in the assessment of displacement impacts. DONG Energy suggests in paragraph 5.6.5.13 that there is evidence for displacement of fulmar: 'With regards to those species screened into this assessment, Krijgsveld et al. (2011) identifies fulmar as a lower sensitivity species with a displacement rate of 28%, and gannet and auks as higher sensitivity species with displacement rates of 64% and 68% respectively.' Section 8.4.5.13 of the RIAA also suggests that displacement is considered to be a potential impact in relation to fulmar 'For fulmar and gannet, precautionary displacement rates of 30% and 70% are used, respectively (Table 8.4)'. Additionally, DONG Energy has presented an assessment of displacement impacts for fulmar in Section 1.4.1 of Annex 5.2 (Displacement Analysis).</p> <p>DONG Energy has also identified connectivity, via foraging range, between Hornsea Three and several SPAs where fulmar is either a feature in its own right or part of the seabird assemblage feature. However, DONG Energy has screened out fulmar as no LSE and therefore it is not considered in the AA. This is on the basis that any impact from displacement is assessed to be insignificant as fulmar are considered to be at low risk of disturbance/displacement from wind farms (e.g. Wade et al., 2016). However, Wade et al. (2016) also conclude that there is a high degree of uncertainty regarding the vulnerability of fulmar to displacement. Given this uncertainty, coupled with the incomplete baseline survey data for Hornsea Three and the demonstrated connectivity between SPAs for fulmar and Hornsea Three, Natural England considers that it is not possible to assume no LSE for fulmar at SPAs that are within the foraging range of Hornsea Three.</p>	Y	Fulmar is included in the RIAA.
Natural England	<p>Section 2.6 – Offshore Ornithology Key Concerns</p> <p>6. The need to present data and predicted impacts in a way that allows the full range of uncertainty (e.g. around input data, analysis, methodology) to be understood and evaluated</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is uncertainty around the predicted impacts in the assessments presented in the PEI. Some of this comes from natural variability and uncertainty in the input data (e.g. densities of birds at Hornsea Three, flight heights etc.) and some of which is due to imperfect understanding of how systems work (e.g. avoidance rates and collision models, effects of displacement on mortality of birds etc.). In order to be able to make an assessment of the significance of potential impacts on populations it is necessary to understand and, where possible, take account of this uncertainty.</li> <li>• The assessments presented by DONG Energy in the PEI documents do not take account of the range of uncertainty and variability in several of the key input parameters that are used.</li> </ul>	I	Uncertainty and variability associated with Collision Risk Monitoring input parameters (density, flight height distribution and avoidance rate) is presented in Annex 5.3: Collision Risk Modelling and considered in the assessments presented in Volume 2, Chapter 5: Collision Risk Modelling.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>21</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Natural England	<p>Section 2.6 – Offshore Ornithology Key Concerns</p> <p>6. The need to present data and predicted impacts in a way that allows the full range of uncertainty (e.g. around input data, analysis, methodology) to be understood and evaluated</p> <p>Natural England notes that upper and lower confidence limits are given for the monthly population estimates for species in the Hornsea Three project area in Annex 5.1, although these have not been used to inform the displacement or collision risk assessments presented in the PEI. Likewise, confidence intervals around the generic flight height data (e.g. Johnston et al., 2014 used for seabirds and Wright et al. (2012) used for migratory waterbirds) have not been factored into the collision risk assessments. However, DONG Energy has presented collision predictions in Annex 5.1 that include the standard deviations presented around the published avoidance rates (JNCC et al., 2014), but this range of collision predictions have not been used in the Appropriate Assessment or EIA chapters.</p>	I	<p>Uncertainty and variability is considered throughout the collision risk and displacement assessments presented in Chapter 2, Volume 5: Offshore Ornithology where this is possible and appropriate.</p>
Natural England	<p>Section 2.6 – Offshore Ornithology Key Concerns</p> <p>6. The need to present data and predicted impacts in a way that allows the full range of uncertainty (e.g. around input data, analysis, methodology) to be understood and evaluated</p> <p>Natural England advises that the assessments of displacement and collision mortality should both use the information on uncertainty and variability in the input parameters (e.g. bird densities, flight heights, avoidance rates) to allow consideration of the range of values predicted impacts may fall within, and to allow an assessment of confidence in the conclusions made regarding adverse effects on site integrity and significance of impacts for populations.</p>	I	<p>Uncertainty and variability is considered throughout the collision risk and displacement assessments presented in Chapter 2, Volume 5: Offshore Ornithology where this is possible and appropriate.</p>
Natural England	<p>Section 2.6 – Offshore Ornithology Key Concerns</p> <p>7. Data for ornithological assessments relating to the export cable route (ECR)</p> <p>Calculation of densities of birds (red-throated diver, little gull and common scoter) in the ECR for use in the assessment of potential impacts has been based on analysis of survey data incorporated into Lawson et al. (2016) (Section 5.11 of Chapter 5). It is not clear how the densities used in the PEI assessments have been derived. The density maps presented in the PEI (e.g. figures 1.7, 1.8 and 1.28 in Annex 5.1) show a mean density surface based on densities of birds modelled across all survey months. These mean density surfaces were generated by Lawson et al. (2016) in order to facilitate the identification of potential boundaries for an SPA. These modelled densities cannot be used directly to derive a density estimate for the ECR for a displacement assessment as they do not represent a peak seasonal density and will underestimate peak densities of birds in the ECR. However, the PEI reports indicate that densities of birds for the ECR may have been derived from the underlying data presented in Lawson et al (2016) – for example, paragraph 5.11.1.22 of Chapter 5: ‘The density of red-throated diver within the Hornsea Three offshore cable corridor as calculated from the underlying data used in Figure 5.4 is 0.18 birds/km<sup>2</sup>’. It is not clear how this density value was calculated or whether it represents a peak seasonal density for the ECR based on the raw data. Natural England requests further information regarding the methods for deriving the densities of red-throated diver, common scoter and little gull in the ECR as presented in the PEI.</p>	I	<p>The methodology used to calculate densities for use in assessments is provided in Section 5.11.1 of Volume 2 and Chapter 5: Offshore Ornithology and in Section 8.5.1 of the RIAA.</p>



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>21</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Natural England	<p>Section 2.6 – Offshore Ornithology Key Concerns</p> <p>8. EIA methodology including population scales</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DONG Energy's approach to determining the significance of impacts based on combining receptor sensitivity and magnitude of impact (Sections 5.9-5.11) is confusing and difficult to follow. To determine the significance of an impact, a sequence of criteria is evaluated against each species, each season and each impact. The criteria include receptor sensitivity; magnitude of impact; and significance. Within these criteria there are a number of sub-criteria, for example, receptor sensitivity is made up of conservation value, vulnerability, recoverability.</li> <li>• This matrix approach involves multiple layers of categorisation for each species and in a number of cases the assessment against a particular criterion has not been done consistently across species and subjective decisions are then multiplied across a number of different criteria. Further, the assessment of EIA significance has been undertaken separately for each potential impact that could affect a species and also separately for each season (Table 5.46 of Chapter 5) which makes it difficult to determine whether there could be an overall significant effect on a particular species.</li> </ul>	I	<p>The methodology used to determine the significance of impacts is presented in Section 5.9 of Environmental Statement Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore Ornithology incorporating a number of criteria to identify receptor sensitivity and magnitude. These are then cross-referenced in a matrix to determine the significance of an impact. As with any impact assessment expert judgement is applied where necessary to identify the appropriate sensitivity, magnitude and significance.</p>
Natural England	<p>Section 2.6 – Offshore Ornithology Key Concerns</p> <p>8. EIA methodology including population scales</p> <p>Species included in the EIA assessment – 'valued ornithological receptors' (VORs) - have been defined using criteria set out in section 5.7.2.3. One of these criteria is that a VOR is any migratory species which 'is at particular risk of collisions with turbines'. Application of this criterion would include Herring gull as a VOR, however it is excluded as a VOR by DONG Energy in Table 5.7 based on application of a further criterion (not mentioned in 5.7.2.3) based on numbers recorded during the aerial surveys at Hornsea Three. Other species meeting the qualification criteria to be a VOR according to 5.7.2.3 have also been excluded as VORs in Table 5.7 based on data from the aerial surveys. Given that the baseline surveys and population estimates for the project areas are not complete, Natural England does not consider that it is appropriate to use the incomplete data to exclude species as VORs at this stage. Further, Natural England does not agree with the use of 1% thresholds in relation to different population scales to screen species out from further consideration under EIA as there is the potential for species to be screened out of impact assessments at an individual project level, where there could be a significant issue at the CIA level.</p>	I	<p>The identification of VORs is included in Annex 5.1: Baseline Characterisation Report with the process used for identification described in Section 1.6 with this process updated since the submission of the PEIR.</p>
Natural England	<p>Section 2.6 – Offshore Ornithology Key Concerns</p> <p>8. EIA methodology including population scales</p> <p>Table 1.5 of Annex 5.1 gives regional, national and international population importance levels for species that have been used to calculate 1% thresholds of importance at different scales for species. It is not clear where some of these population sizes have been derived from. For example, there are national population sizes given for the non-breeding season for species that are incorrectly cited as being sourced from Musgrove et al. (2013) or Burton et al. (2012). For example, the non-breeding national population for puffin listed as 536,514 birds in Table 1.5. There are no non-breeding season population estimates for puffin in either Musgrove et al. (2013) or Burton et al. (2012). The figure appears to represent the total number of puffin predicted to be in UK waters in the non-breeding season from Furness (2015), but this is not a 'national population estimate' for puffin in the non-breeding season.</p>	I	<p>The source of relevant biogeographic populations is included in Table 1.5 of Environmental Statement volume 5, Annex 5.1: Baseline Characterisation Report.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>21</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Natural England	<p>Section 2.6 – Offshore Ornithology Key Concerns 8. EIA methodology including population scales For breeding seabirds the national population estimates are largely derived from Seabird 2000 (Mitchell et al., 2004). Musgrove et al. (2013) recognised that these estimates are out-of-date and considered extrapolating Seabird 2000 estimates forward to the present, but because of the difficulty in calculating an accurate population trend no adjustment was made, although the authors did assess whether the population estimates should now be considered too high or too low. A number of seabird species have shown large declines in the UK since 2000, and Musgrove et al. (2013) highlight this indicating that UK population estimates for these species are known to be lower than the published figure. These population trends need to be considered when making assessments against national (and biogeographic) population sizes that may be significantly different from the published estimates.</p>	I	<p>Consideration of recent seabird population trends is included in Section 1.3.3 of Environmental Statement volume 5, Annex 5.1: Baseline Characterisation Report. It has previously been advised by Natural England not to alter populations based on updated information (e.g. when using populations from Furness (2015)).</p>
Natural England	<p>Section 2.6 – Offshore Ornithology Key Concerns 8. EIA methodology including population scales The assessment of magnitude of impacts as set out in Table 5.13 is based on factors such as spatial extent, duration, frequency and reversibility of the impact. However, for some impacts, such as collisions and displacement, a quantitative assessment of impact is made and DONG Energy has assessed whether this predicted additional mortality exceeds 1% relative to baseline mortality. However, it is not clear how this threshold has been factored into the assessment of magnitude or significance of the impact. Natural England advises that predicted mortalities that exceed 1% of baseline mortality for a population require further investigation as to the likelihood of significant impact</p>	I	<p>The use of the 1% threshold as advised by Natural England has been applied throughout Chapter 2, Volume 5: Offshore Ornithology and Section 8 of the RIAA. Where this threshold is surpassed further investigation (e.g. through population modelling) of the impact magnitude is provided.</p>
Natural England	<p>Section 2.6 – Offshore Ornithology Key Concerns 8. EIA methodology including population scales In assessing the significance of EIA impacts, DONG Energy has determined that anything categorised below 'moderate' in the matrix (Table 5.14 in Chapter 5) is not significant. However Natural England considers that excluding any impacts categorised as below moderate could lead to errors in assessing cumulative effects properly as limited impacts when taken cumulatively can become significant.</p>	N	<p>No VOR has been excluded from cumulative assessment based on the significance determined for an impact from the project alone. However, it is worth noting that if the magnitude of an impact is trivial then Hornsea Three would be unlikely to materially alter the current cumulative impact for a VOR.</p>
Natural England	<p>Section 2.6 – Offshore Ornithology Key Concerns 8. EIA methodology including population scales Natural England requests that DONG Energy sets out a transparent methodology which explains the EIA assessment approach, and that they then demonstrably apply that methodology to the assessment.</p>	I	<p>The methodology used to determine the significance of impacts is presented in Section 5.9 of Environmental Statement Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore Ornithology and is considered to be transparent and fully described. This aligns with the methodology details in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 5: EIA methodology.</p>
Natural England	<p>Section 2.6 – Offshore Ornithology Key Concerns 9. Missing/incomplete elements to PEIR • Natural England notes that due to the incomplete baseline survey data there are a number of aspects of the assessments that are not presented in the PEIR documents and which need to be addressed in the Environmental Statement. These include: - Flight height information for birds in project areas, including consideration of variability in flight heights and comparison with the generic flight height data; - Population modelling of impacts to determine significance; - Details of how the meta-analysis will be used to inform the characterisation of the baseline environment; - Details of how predicted impacts on species present in the Hornsea Three project area during the breeding season will be apportioned to SPA populations, including in particular FFC pSPA; • Natural England would therefore welcome further discussion with DONG Energy prior to submission of the completed Environmental Statement to agree assessment methodologies and data requirements.</p>	I	<p>Throughout the PEIR it was stated that the assessments and analyses conducted, and therefore the conclusions reached, were preliminary with further data to be incorporated into the final application.</p> <p>Consideration of variability in collision risk modelling is presented in Environmental Statement volume 5, Annex 5.3: Collision Risk Modelling and is considered throughout the assessments presented in Section 5.11.2 of Environmental Statement Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore Ornithology and Section 8 of the RIAA.</p> <p>Population modelling is considered where necessary in Section 11 of Environmental Statement Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore Ornithology and Section 8 of the RIAA.</p> <p>Details of how the meta-analysis has been used to inform the assessments presented in Environmental Statement Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore Ornithology and Section 8 of the RIAA is included in Annex 5.4: Data Hierarchy Report.</p> <p>The approach to apportioning for relevant breeding features incorporated into the RIAA is presented in Annex 5.3: Phenology, connectivity and apportioning for features of FFC pSPA.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>21</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Natural England	Section 2.6 – Offshore Ornithology Key Concerns 9. Missing/incomplete elements to PEIR However, despite the incomplete nature of the assessments presented by DONG Energy in the PEIR documents, Natural England notes that some of the estimated impacts (e.g. those presented for the gannet and kittiwake features of FFC pSPA) indicate the potential for an adverse effect on site integrity from Hornsea Three when considered in combination with other plans and projects.	I	Throughout the PEIR it was stated that the assessments and analyses conducted, and therefore the conclusions reached were preliminary with further data to be incorporated into the final application. The updated assessments are considered in the RIAA when forming conclusions as to impacts on site integrity.
Natural England	Section 2.6 – Offshore Ornithology Key Concerns 9. Missing/incomplete elements to PEIR Natural England also notes that estimated impacts to gannet under EIA, when considered cumulatively with other wind farms have the potential to give rise to a significant effect.	I	Throughout the PEIR it was stated that the assessments and analyses conducted, and therefore the conclusions reached were preliminary with further data to be incorporated into the final application. The updated assessments are considered in the RIAA when forming conclusions as to impacts on site integrity.
Natural England	2.6.1 Vol. 2 Chapter 5 – Offshore Ornithology 5.1.1.3 Natural England notes that the offshore ornithology assessments presented are based on incomplete baseline datasets for the Hornsea Three project area as the offshore ornithology survey programme is ongoing. The assessments presented in the PEIR documents are based on 11 months of survey data from Hornsea Three. Natural England has advised DONG Energy through the Evidence Working Group process that two years or more of relevant baseline survey data for each species is required in order to characterise the baseline environment and inform the assessment of potential impacts in the ES. Therefore, all comments and advice given by Natural England on the PEIR documents are preliminary and relate to the proposed assessment methodologies and not DONG Energy's statements relating to the significance of impacts, as information on the distribution and abundance of birds at the project site and surrounding area is incomplete.	I	Noted. Throughout the PEIR it was stated that the assessments and analyses conducted, and therefore the conclusions reached were preliminary with further data to be incorporated into the final application.
Natural England	2.6.2 Vol. 2 Chapter 5 – Offshore Ornithology 5.2.1.5 Natural England does not consider that these three points represent 'impacts', rather they are 'legislative' impact pathways. Actual 'impacts' include collisions, displacement, disturbance, barrier effects etc. – i.e. as described by the DONG Energy in paragraph 5.2.1.6. Natural England notes that SPAs do not need to be 'nearby' for an impact pathway to exist. The key point is that there needs to be connectivity between the feature of a designated site and the Hornsea Three project area. This could be via foraging areas, wintering areas, migration routes etc. that are spatially remote from the designated site.	I	Noted, relevant text has been amended.
Natural England	2.6.3 Vol. 2 Chapter 5 – Offshore Ornithology 5.3.1.2 This statement is not very clear but suggests either that only projects within the North Sea and/or that only impacts that occur within the North Sea study area are considered in the CEA. For example, gannet from Flamborough and Filey Coast pSPA (FFC pSPA) may migrate back to the colony through the Irish Sea and the English Channel and therefore could be impacted by offshore windfarms in these areas. Conversely, impacts on species present in the Hornsea Three project area can extend to birds and colonies present in areas outside of the North Sea boundaries. Natural England requests clarification of the spatial scale and connected populations that will be used for the cumulative effects assessment and note that for some species it may be appropriate to include projects situated outside of the North Sea as well as to consider impacts on receptors at a wider scale than just the North Sea.	I	In general, the initial scope of projects has considered all operational, in-construction or planned wind farms along the east coast of Britain (based on the BDMPS scales presented in Furness (2015), as well as non-UK projects in the North Sea, within potential foraging range.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>21</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Natural England	<p>2.6.4 Vol. 2 Chapter 5 – Offshore Ornithology Table 5.3 Summary of key consultation issues raised during consultation activities undertaken for Hornsea Three relevant to offshore ornithology. Natural England does not consider that Table 5.3 is an accurate reflection of the consultation issues raised or the agreements reached – in particular from the EWG meetings. See below for some examples. The agreements reached at each EWG meeting were clearly documented as a Table in the meeting minutes so could be replicated in Table 5.3. Natural England considers there has been a rather selective presentation of some of the issues and some assumed or inferred agreements that were not explicitly stated as EWG agreements in the minutes.</p>	I	The consultation table presented in Environmental Statement Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore Ornithology has been updated to include additional consultation activities and comments received from Natural England.
Natural England	<p>2.6.5 Vol. 2 Chapter 5 – Offshore Ornithology Table 5.3 Scoping Opinion, 25/11/16) Baseline Surveys: 'The survey methodologies have been discussed with the Expert Working Group (EWG) through the Evidence Plan process and supplemented by existing data, have been agreed as appropriate to enable the characterisation of the baseline environment. The EWG have agreed that monthly aerial surveys from April 2016 – September 2017, considering the timescales of the Project, is the most appropriate approach to providing enough site specific data to characterise the baseline environment.'</p>	I	The consultation table presented in Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore Ornithology has been updated to include additional consultation activities and comments received from Natural England
Natural England	<p>2.6.6 Vol. 2 Chapter 5 – Offshore Ornithology Table 5.3 Natural England (Hornsea Three Scoping Opinion, 25/11/16) Foraging ranges: 'It has been agreed with the Expert Working Group (EWG) that where there is specific SPA data this has been used over Thaxter et al., (2012) and any additional data supplied will be reviewed and considered. Otherwise Thaxter et al., (2012) is deemed appropriate.' This section is not very clear. The text implies that only available foraging data for a species that is specific to a particular SPA will be used over Thaxter et al. (2012), but there may be other cases (in addition to data specific to an individual SPA) where Thaxter is not the most appropriate source to use for foraging ranges – and this was the point that Natural England made in the EWG meetings (see note below) and in our scoping response. Natural England suggests that the text highlighted in previous column could be reworded as follows to clarify this point: 'It has been agreed with the Expert Working Group (EWG) that where there is appropriate foraging range data specific to a colony for a species this will be used over Thaxter et al., (2012). Further, any additional data supplied on foraging ranges for relevant species will be reviewed and considered in addition to information presented in Thaxter et al., (2012).' Natural England note that the minutes from March 2017 EWG state: 'TN stated that it is agreed that where there is site specific SPA data this should be used over Thaxter et al. 2012, MK stated that there may be evidence from other colonies nearby to an SPA or within the same region that is more relevant than Thaxter et al 2012. AM confirmed that RSPB has data from more UK and international colonies than Thaxter presented and this will be made available. SB noted that any additional data supplied will be reviewed and where appropriate and reasonable, taken in to account in the assessment.'</p>	I	All relevant foraging range data have been considered as part of the HRA with these data incorporated into Annex 3: Phenology, connectivity and apportioning for features of FFC pSPA.



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>21</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Natural England	<p>2.6.7 Vol. 2 Chapter 5 – Offshore Ornithology Table 5.3 Natural England (Hornsea Three Scoping Opinion, 25/11/16) Connectivity with Hornsea Three: 'Full logic for the screening of SPAs and establishment of connectivity was outlined within the HRA Screening Report. The approach is based upon the application of mean-maximum foraging ranges as reported by Thaxter et al. (2012). In some cases more specific information is available from GPS/satellite tracking studies, such as, for example, the FAME/STAR initiatives for kittiwake and gannet colonies associated with the FFC pSPA.' The point being made by Natural England in the Scoping Opinion was that connectivity may be mediated between Hornsea Three and a designated site in other ways than just via a species' foraging range. For example, it might occur via migratory pathways and non-breeding season distributions – and that all types of connectivity need to be considered when screening sites, not just information on foraging ranges from breeding colonies. Additionally, some species relevant to HOW3 are non-breeding season features of SPAs</p>	I	All relevant information that may indicate connectivity between a feature and Hornsea Three has been considered in the HRA Screening process (see the HRA Screening Report, Annex 2: Additional Special Protection Areas Screening Exercise and Annex 3: Phenology, connectivity and apportioning for features of FFC pSPA).
Natural England	<p>2.6.8 Vol. 2 Chapter 5 – Offshore Ornithology Table 5.3 EWG 10/03/16 According to the minutes from the meeting there were 2 Agreements which were: 1) It was agreed that the requirement for an intertidal EWG would be determined following determination of the export cable landfall; 2) Aerial surveys would be the most suitable platform for HOW03 ornithological surveys. Table 5.3 needs to accurately reflect what was actually agreed at the EWG meetings. Natural England is not aware that there was any 'inception of the meta-analysis' at this meeting. The meta-analysis had not been agreed at this stage and DONG Energy had not agreed that they would undertake one. Natural England also clarified that 'digital aerial surveys would be the preferred survey methodology' in our response to the draft minutes.</p>	I	The consultation table presented in Environmental Statement Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore Ornithology has been updated to include additional consultation activities and comments received from Natural England.
Natural England	<p>2.6.9 Vol. 2 Chapter 5 – Offshore Ornithology Table 5.3 EWG 13/04/16 Agreements from minutes were: 1) It was agreed that the wording of the meeting minutes from EWG meeting on the 10.03.2016 would be amended to state 'Natural England advises that two years or more of relevant baseline survey data for each species is required'. 2) It was agreed the meta-analysis SoWs would be updated to include the requirement to investigate points (i) and (ii)* above and variability in flight height data collected for the Hornsea Zone, Hornsea Projects One and Two and then circulated to Natural England and RSPB the w/c 18th April. 3) It was agreed that the proposed aerial survey methodology for HOW03 was appropriate, noting the risk of collecting less than 2 years of site-specific survey data; * i) will 12-months of data be sufficient to inform the HOW03 assessment, ii) if not how can we integrate the existing dataset into the data collected for HOW03?</p>	I	The consultation table presented in Environmental Statement Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore Ornithology has been updated to include additional consultation activities and comments received from Natural England.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>21</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Natural England	<p>2.6.10 Vol. 2 Chapter 5 – Offshore Ornithology Table 5.3 EWG 27/07/16 Agreements documented in EWG minutes: 'The EWG agreed that intertidal ornithology will be assessed within the terrestrial and offshore ornithology chapters as appropriate rather than in a separate ES Chapter. The EWG agreed that the Little Tern data collected is anticipated to be sufficient to inform the EIA, with the addition of supporting fisheries data. A final position on little tern at Zone 4 will be made once the final survey report has been reviewed. The EWG agreed that all the relevant designated conservation sites have been considered in relation to the export cable corridor, with the additional inclusion of the Outer Thames Estuary SPA. The EWG agreed that relevant construction/decommission impacts, their applicability to HOW03, the data gaps identified and the approach to filling the data gaps had been considered in relation to the export cable corridor. The EWG agreed that all relevant operation/maintenance impacts, their applicability to HOW03, any data gaps identified and the approach to filling these data gaps had been considered in relation to the export cable corridor. Potential habitat modification of foraging habitats was included as an impact. The EWG agreed that all key assessment issues from HOW01/02, relevant to HOW03, had been considered and all the HOW03 specific issues had been highlighted in relation to the export cable corridor.'</p>	I	The consultation table presented in Environmental Statement Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore Ornithology has been updated to include additional consultation activities and comments received from Natural England.
Natural England	<p>2.6.11 Vol. 2 Chapter 5 – Offshore Ornithology Table 5.3 EWG 21/11/16 The only Agreement from meeting was: 'It was agreed that all fulmar and adult gannets present during the breeding season, would be assumed to be breeding birds for the purposes of impact assessment.' There was no agreement about 18 months of survey data. What was documented in the minutes (but not as an agreement) was: 'AR [DONG] confirmed that surveys would extend for 2 years, but that due to the deadlines for submission of the ES, it would only be possible to include data from surveys undertaken up to Aug or Sept in 2017. AM [RSPB] noted that this meant that there would be 2 breeding seasons in the baseline data and this was a positive step.'</p>	I	The consultation table presented in Environmental Statement Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore Ornithology has been updated to include additional consultation activities and comments received from Natural England.
Natural England	<p>2.6.12 Vol. 2 Chapter 5 – Offshore Ornithology Table 5.3 EWG 29/03/17 Natural England submitted comments on the EWG minutes from this meeting – we queried some of the text in the agreements as presented in the draft but these do not appear to have been amended in the version of the minutes presented in Annex 2 of the RIAA Evidence Plan document. In relation to the agreement about the collision risk modelling (CRM) which was: 'The EWG has agreed that where possible the Masden update (2015) will be utilised, otherwise the Band model (2012) will be used. Both the basic and extended approaches for the Band Model (2012) will be presented.' Natural England notes that they have subsequently advised the DONG Energy (EWG 05/06/17) that as a result of some testing of the stochastic collision risk model (Masden, 2015), undertaken as part of an externally commissioned Natural England project, some issues with the model have been highlighted and until these are addressed Natural England advice is to run Band (2012), but to also present collision figures using upper and lower confidence intervals for key parameters that impact upon the CRM – including bird densities, flight heights and avoidance rates (Hornsea Project Two took this approach to their CRM and their approach can be used as a guide).</p>	I	The consultation table presented in Environmental Statement Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore Ornithology has been updated to include additional consultation activities and comments received from Natural England.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>21</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Natural England	2.6.13 Vol. 2 Chapter 5 – Offshore Ornithology 5.6.1.4 See comments above regarding baseline surveys. This paragraph does not accurately reflect what the EWG has agreed regarding the baseline surveys and in particular the suitability of 18 months of baseline data.	I	The consultation table presented in Environmental Statement Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore Ornithology has been updated to include additional consultation activities and comments received from Natural England.
Natural England	2.6.14 Vol. 2 Chapter 5 – Offshore Ornithology 5.6.1.5 There may be additional sources of data that may also be informative in characterising the baseline for the offshore cable route, for example, data from post construction surveys undertaken by other OWFs in the vicinity (e.g. Sheringham Shoal, Dudgeon, Lincs and Race Bank). While these surveys may not cover the exact cable corridor area they could provide additional contextual information to help characterise the wider sea area around the cable route. Additionally it is not clear whether the DONG Energy has utilised the raw data from the third party surveys mentioned here or has referred only to the information presented in the published report (Lawson et al., 2016). Natural England requests clarification regarding the data and methodology used to derive baseline information on densities of birds in the offshore cable corridor.	N	The approach taken was that advised by Natural England as part of HRAs undertaken for other offshore wind farms. The data used are those that inform the designation of the Greater Wash pSPA and it is considered that these are the most relevant data for use in assessment.  The relevance of survey data from other offshore wind farms, which do not overlap with the Hornsea Three export cable corridor, is unclear and hence these have not been incorporated into the assessment.
Natural England	2.6.15 Vol. 2 Chapter 5 – Offshore Ornithology 5.6.3.1 Natural England is unclear about what this section refers to or which designated sites have been identified by this process. If it is referring to the HRA screening, then the key consideration is whether there is potential for connectivity between features of designated sites and the Hornsea Three project area at any time of the year. Step Three is particularly unclear regarding the process used to identify connectivity between designated sites and the Hornsea Three project area.	I	This text has been removed.
Natural England	2.6.16 Vol. 2 Chapter 5 – Offshore Ornithology 5.6.3.4 As noted above (Table 5.3 – Foraging ranges) it is not just tracking data specific to the colony that should be considered in priority to Thaxter et al. (2012) – it is any relevant evidence of foraging ranges for species and/or colonies. Some of the foraging ranges presented in Thaxter et al. (2102) are assigned 'low' confidence and are based on either indirect evidence of foraging distances and/or limited sample sizes from a small number of colonies (which for some species are predominantly colonies outside of the UK). Therefore, it is quite likely that for a particular colony in the UK there could be more relevant or appropriate information about foraging ranges that could be used to inform the assessment. This is particularly the case since foraging ranges have been shown to vary considerably between colonies and regions, and also between years for individual colonies. Natural England notes that the agreement at the EWG was that existing baseline data available along the export cable route (ECR), is sufficient to inform the EIA.	I	All relevant foraging range data have been considered as part of the HRA with these data incorporated into Annex 3: Phenology, connectivity and apportioning for features of FFC pSPA.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>21</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Natural England	<p>2.6.17 Vol. 2 Chapter 5 – Offshore Ornithology 5.6.5.4 This list appears to refer to species considered for displacement impacts within the OWF area of the project (i.e. the turbine area and not the ECR etc.), but this is not explicitly stated. This needs to be made clear in the text as there are other species (some of which are features of SPAs) that need to be considered in relation to potential displacement impacts in the cable corridor areas. For example, the list makes no mention of species like red-throated diver and common scoter, which may be present in cable corridor areas and may be impacted by construction of the cable route as well as by displacement/disturbance impacts from ship traffic plus ancillary structures (e.g. transmission and maintenance structures that will be constructed along the cable route) that may fall within or near the Greater Wash pSPA. Section 5.6.5.15 does explain that red throated diver and common scoter were not flagged as VORs in the offshore windfarm areas due to low densities – although this seems premature since the baseline data collection is not yet complete or agreed. The section then does go on to say that red throated diver and common scoter are flagged as VOR for the cable corridor. Natural England suggests that red throated diver and common scoter are either listed in this section as species considered for displacement impacts – or there is a clearer statement of 1) the list of species included in displacement assessment for the OWF areas and 2) the list of species for cable corridor. Natural England also requests clarification regarding whether the population estimates presented for auks and used in the displacement assessments have used availability bias corrected numbers for the auks. Section 1.2.3.10 of the baseline data report indicates that the birds on water figures will be corrected for availability bias but it is not clear if the population estimates given in the tables e.g. Table 1.22 for puffin in the baseline data report are the availability bias corrected figures.</p>	I	This section of Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 5: Offshore Ornithology has been updated to include further information and to address this comment.
Natural England	<p>2.6.18 Vol. 2 Chapter 5 – Offshore Ornithology 5.6.5.11 Natural England does not agree that tern species can be screened out of further assessment at this stage as there may be overlap of foraging areas for terns that are features of the Greater Wash pSPA with the ECR. Due to the degree of habitat specialisation shown by terns (see MIG-Birds 2017) displacement and disturbance impacts in relation to the ECR that falls within the Greater Wash pSPA should be considered for tern species, as well as indirect effects on prey availability.</p>	I	RIAA Annex 2: Additional Special Protection Areas Screening Exercise includes consideration of tern features at the Greater Wash pSPA with the potential for LSE identified on a precautionary basis for Sandwich tern.
Natural England	<p>2.6.19 Vol. 2 Chapter 5 – Offshore Ornithology 5.6.5.12 While DONG Energy presents a full displacement matrix as per SNCB guidance on displacement assessments (MIG-Birds 2017) they only take a single value through to assessment of impacts. Natural England's advice is to take the range of values through to assessment as this reflects the range of uncertainties in the assessment. The problem with an approach whereby a specific figure is selected to take through to the assessment stage e.g. 2% mortality in the breeding season and then 1% in the non-breeding season (see for example Table 5.5) is that it becomes difficult understand the scale of the variability and uncertainty inherent in the assessment– it is therefore more useful to retain the full range of values throughout the assessment and to consider lower and upper values when making judgements about the potential significance of predicted impacts. This was the approach that Natural England advised for both HOW1 and HOW2 (noting that we additionally considered the upper and lower 95% confidence limits around the density estimates in the assessments). See table 5.5 of in point 2.6.19 Natural England also does not agree with the application of variable mortality rates in different seasons – see Table 5.5 and section 5.6.5.17 below.</p>	I	A literature review has been undertaken (see Section 5.9.2 in Environmental Statement Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore Ornithology) to identify appropriate displacement rates for use in relevant assessments.



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>21</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Natural England	2.6.20 Vol. 2 Chapter 5 – Offshore Ornithology 5.6.5.15 Natural England does not find this section very clear – if what DONG Energy is saying is a 2 km buffer will be used for assessment of displacement impacts on red throated diver and common scoter specific to the cable corridor and not a 4 km buffer as advised for these species by the SNCBs when assessing displacement from offshore windfarm footprint areas, then that is consistent with Natural England's advice (noting that we would also advise that within the 2 km buffer 100% displacement of birds should be considered). Natural England requests clarification of this point.	I	A 2 km buffer around potential disturbance sources associated with the Hornsea Three export cable has been used based on the advice provided by Natural England to other offshore wind farm projects.
Natural England	2.6.21 Vol. 2 Chapter 5 – Offshore Ornithology 5.6.5.16 Natural England does not understand this point and request clarification. It is not clear whether this refers only to the assessment of displacement impacts in the cable corridor or additionally includes the OWF area assessments. Given that the DONG Energy will not have collected any survey data from the offshore cable corridor for bird species it is not clear how they will calculate a seasonal mean peak population estimate for species in this area. Further, if birds are present in areas across multiple seasons then in order to undertake a complete assessment of displacement impacts it is necessary to sum the predicted impacts across all relevant seasons – this may not be necessary for VORs in the cable corridor if they are only present in one season, but for other areas VORs may be present across multiple seasons.	I	Additional methodological information has been provided in Section 5.11.1 of Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 5: Offshore Ornithology for red-throated diver and common scoter.
Natural England	2.6.22 Vol. 2 Chapter 5 – Offshore Ornithology 5.6.5.17 While Natural England agrees that the potential impact of displacement could vary across seasons, we do not consider that there is evidence to suggest what different mortality levels might be for different seasons – or even relative differences. Therefore, SNCB advice is: 'Given there is currently no empirical evidence on the impacts of displacement to seabirds, the SNCBs do not view it as appropriate at this time to apply varying mortality levels by season' (MIG-Birds 2017).	I	The displacement mortality calculated when applying a range of mortality rates is presented in Environmental Statement volume 5, Annex 5.2: Analysis of Displacement Impacts on Seabirds for all VORs in all relevant seasons.
Natural England	2.6.23 Vol. 2 Chapter 5 – Offshore Ornithology 5.6.6.8 The text 'a lower tip clearance of 34.97 m reduces collisions' does not make sense as it does not specify what it is compared to. Further, Natural England does not understand what the statement 'The lower tip height clearance is consistent with the consented value at Hornsea Project Two' means? It is the impact from Hornsea Three on the ornithological receptor in question that is relevant to the consenting process, not the tip height clearance of the turbines. Just because HOW2 was consented and has a similar lower tip height, it does not follow that this should be consented at other OWFs, which seems to be what the text is implying.	I	The Project Envelope for Hornsea Three was designed taking into account the mitigation applied for Hornsea Project Two of an increased lower tip height when compared to a normal minimum lower tip height for offshore wind farms of 22 m above LAT. This higher than normal lower tip height was deliberately incorporated as a designed in mitigation measure in relation to collision risk impacts for birds. An increased lower tip height will decrease collision risk when compared to a lower tip height.
Natural England	2.6.24 Vol. 2 Chapter 5 – Offshore Ornithology 5.6.6.9 Given that the baseline data collection has not been completed Natural England considers that it is not possible to finalise the list of species present at Hornsea Three that need to be included in the CRM. For example, it may be necessary to include species like herring gull.	I	Acknowledged. Throughout the PEIR it was stated that the assessments and analyses conducted, and therefore the conclusions reached were preliminary with further data to be incorporated into the final application. The final list of species incorporated into collision risk modelling, when considering all baseline survey data, is consistent with that identified at PEIR stage.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>21</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Natural England	2.6.25 Vol. 2 Chapter 5 – Offshore Ornithology 5.6.6.10 Note: Natural England's advice is to use Band (2012) for the CRM at present (as per explanation in 5.6.6.2), but to include consideration of the variability and uncertainty in the various input parameters when assessing potential collision predictions.	I	Uncertainty and variability associated with CRM input parameters (density, flight height distribution and avoidance rate) is presented in Environmental Statement volume 5, Annex 5.3: Collision Risk Modelling and considered in the assessments presented in Environmental Statement Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore Ornithology.
Natural England	2.6.26 Vol. 2 Chapter 5 – Offshore Ornithology 5.6.6.11-5.6.6.12 Natural England does not agree with use of Extended Band model with any avoidance rate (AR) for kittiwake or gannet – i.e. Natural England does not advise use of a default 98% AR for these species with the Extended Band model as used by DONG Energy. The ARs recommended for use with kittiwake and gannet in JNCC et al. (2014) are for use with the Basic Band model only.	I	The avoidance rates applied in collision risk modelling follow those advised in Cook et al. (2014) and JNCC et al. (2014). A 98% avoidance rate, applied for gannet and kittiwake when using the Extended model, is considered suitably precautionary.
Natural England	2.6.27 Vol. 2 Chapter 5 – Offshore Ornithology 5.6.6.15 It is difficult to determine if there might be other species that should be included when the baseline data collection is not complete.	I	Acknowledged. Throughout the PEIR it was stated that the assessments and analyses conducted, and therefore the conclusions reached were preliminary with further data to be incorporated into the final application. The final list of species incorporated into collision risk modelling, when considering all baseline survey data, is consistent with that identified at PEIR stage.
Natural England	2.6.28 Vol. 2 Chapter 5 – Offshore Ornithology 5.6.6.22-5.6.6.23 Natural England has not agreed a list of species for migratory CRM at the EWG. There are a number of other species that could be included although those listed are probably the most significant either in terms of population flux through the region and collision risk in the area. Natural England requests that a clear audit trail is presented to clarify the reasons for excluding other migratory species not on this list.	I	It is noted that Natural England considers these species to be the most significant either in terms of population flux through the region and collision risk in the area. The suite of species to be included in the migratory CRM was presented to Natural England as part of the Evidence Plan process with no objections raised.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>21</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Natural England	<p>2.6.29 Vol. 2 Chapter 5 – Offshore Ornithology 5.7.1.2-5.7.1.5</p> <p>'It was concluded following consultation on the HRA Screening Report and discussion with the Expert Working Group (EWG), that a Likely Significant Effect (LSE) on three of the pSPA/SPAs above (Greater Wash pSPA, Flamborough and Filey Coast pSPA, and Flamborough Head and Bempton Cliffs SPA) could not be ruled out during the screening exercise and these sites have therefore be taken forward to the Draft Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment (RIAA) for Hornsea Three.'</p> <p>There was discussion about screening and LSE at the March EWG as documented in the minutes from the meeting:</p> <p>'Assessment of LSE on non-breeding sites. TN stated that the proposed approach is to consider the likelihood of a significant effect on the population (through analysis of the site specific baseline information) and then work back to the non-breeding sites, in order to avoid presenting a very large number of SPAs. MK noted that we just need to be sure that no designated sites are missed taking this approach. SB stated that it will be made clear in PEIR that site specific data will be reviewed and depending on what this shows additional sites may be considered, but the approach we are taking initially is to focus on the important issues. MK explained that it is important to have a clear audit trail for when sites have been screened out. The group agreed.'</p> <p>The December 2016 HRA scoping report uses the following criteria for identifying SPAs: See table 5.1 of scoping report.</p> <p>Therefore according to the criteria listed in Table 5.1, the list of SPAs should include all SPAs where species present in the Hornsea Three project area could be connected features. This could include a large number of SPAs designated for their non-breeding season bird interest (e.g. wintering waterbirds) as well as SPAs designated for breeding populations (e.g. seabird colonies), but where the connectivity with Hornsea Three is mediated in any season (i.e. including the non-breeding season). In both cases the key point is that for any species recorded in the Hornsea Three area an assessment needs to be undertaken to determine whether there could be connectivity (in any season) with any SPA where the species is a designated feature.</p> <p>To date more than 20 species have been recorded at the Hornsea Three site based on the digital aerial surveys carried out April 2016-Feb 2017 and these species have potential connectivity with a range of SPAs. Natural England also notes that a much longer list of species has been recorded (over 100 species) in the Hornsea Zone when all the offshore surveys associated with the various Hornsea projects are taken into account.</p> <p>Therefore, there are potentially a large number of species that are present in the Hornsea Three area that could have connectivity with a range of SPAs, and Natural England does not agree that there is a clear audit trail that demonstrates why the Greater Wash pSPA and Flamborough and Filey Coast pSPA are the only two SPAs where a LSE could not be ruled out. This is particularly the case given the incomplete baseline which means that the screening process has been based on survey data from only 11 months.</p>	I	<p>A clear audit trail in relation to the SPAs/pSPAs included in the RIAA is included in the HRA Screening Report (DONG Energy, 2016), Annex 5.2: Additional Special Protection Areas Screening Exercise and in Section 4 of the RIAA.</p>
Natural England	<p>2.6.30 Vol. 2 Chapter 5 – Offshore Ornithology 5.7.2</p> <p>Valued Ornithological Receptors – DONG Energy has used a set of criteria for identifying species as VORs – but this has been applied only to species recorded from the baseline surveys April 2016-Feb 2017. DONG Energy will need to revisit this process once they have a fuller set of baseline data since this could add species to the list. Alternatively, DONG Energy could have used the list of species recorded as present in the wider Hornsea Zone as a guide at this stage in the absence of a complete baseline for Hornsea Three.</p>	I	<p>Acknowledged. Throughout the PEIR it was stated that the assessments and analyses conducted, and therefore the conclusions reached were preliminary with further data to be incorporated into the final application.</p> <p>Environmental Statement volume 5, Annex 5.1: Baseline Characterisation Report includes a description of the process used to identify VORs and identifies the final list of VORs to be considered in Environmental Statement Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore Ornithology.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>21</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Natural England	<p>2.6.31 Vol. 2 Chapter 5 – Offshore Ornithology 5.7.2.25 This text is confusing as it talks about 2 SPAs and 2 pSPAs but then lists 1 SPA and 3 pSPAs. The most up to date information for the English SPAs and pSPAs is available here:  <a href="http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/5446040786305024?category=4698884316069888">http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/5446040786305024?category=4698884316069888</a>  <a href="http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/4521874151178240?category=4698884316069888">http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/4521874151178240?category=4698884316069888</a>  <a href="http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/4891545554649088?category=4698884316069888">http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/4891545554649088?category=4698884316069888</a>  <a href="http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/5400434877399040?category=5758332488908800">http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/5400434877399040?category=5758332488908800</a>  <a href="http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/5511099672690688?category=5758332488908800">http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/5511099672690688?category=5758332488908800</a>                      The current situation in relation to the pSPAs is that Fulmar is a main component of the seabird assemblage at FFC pSPA; fulmar a listed part of seabird assemblage but not a main component at Coquet Island pSPA; and fulmar a listed part of seabird assemblage but not a main component at Farne Islands pSPA; fulmar a listed part of seabird assemblage but not a main component of Northumberland Marine SPA (note that the site is now fully classified as an SPA);                      Additionally in Scotland:                      Forth Islands SPA – fulmar are a feature.</p>	I	Noted, text amended where necessary.
Natural England	<p>2.6.32 Vol. 2 Chapter 5 – Offshore Ornithology Table 5.7 This table is confusing and seems to exclude some species as VORs that Natural England considers should be VORs. Some of these appear to have been excluded based on low numbers recorded in the Hornsea Three baseline surveys, however given that the baseline surveys are incomplete the identification of VORs will need to be revisited when a complete baseline has been agreed. Further some VORs are relevant to the ECR area, but DONG Energy has not collected any data for this area therefore other datasets for these species will need to be considered for these species (e.g. terns, common scoter, red throated diver).                      For example, DONG Energy has excluded Herring gull as a VOR even though Herring gull meets at least one of the criteria for inclusion as a VOR listed in 5.7.2.3 (namely that 'the species (migratory) is at particular risk of collisions with turbines'). It is also listed as only having a local conservation value despite being red listed BoCC (Eaton et al., 2015) which seems to contradict the definition in Table 5.9 which suggests that a red listed species should be of regional importance.                      DONG Energy has also omitted Sandwich tern and little tern – but these are features of the Greater Wash pSPA and may be a VOR in relation to the ECR. According to the criteria set out in 5.7.2.3, storm petrel should be a VOR by virtue of being an Annex 1 species.                      According to the criteria in Table 5.9, guillemot and razorbill should be of international conservation value as Bird species that form part of a cited interest of an SPA or Ramsar site that may potentially interact with Hornsea Three at some stage of their life cycle.                      Also the conservation values for some species seem to be different between Tables 5.7, 5.11 and 5.12 for example for guillemot the Conservation Value is regional in Table 5.7 and 5.11 but International in Table 5.12.</p>	I	<p>Acknowledged. Throughout the PEIR it was stated that the assessments and analyses conducted, and therefore the conclusions reached were preliminary with further data to be incorporated into the final application.</p> <p>Environmental Statement volume 5, Annex 5.1: Baseline Characterisation Report includes a description of the process used to identify VORs and identifies the final list of VORs to be considered in Environmental Statement Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore Ornithology.</p>
Natural England	<p>2.6.33 Vol. 2 Chapter 5 – Offshore Ornithology Table 5.8 Maximum design scenario considered for the assessment of potential impacts on offshore ornithology – It is not clear whether the 696 km<sup>2</sup> area referred to in this section relates only to the windfarm footprint or the footprint with a buffer (e.g. 2 km or 4 km depending on the species) around it. Displacement can occur beyond the physical boundaries of the turbines and Natural England requests clarification of whether the area defined here for assessing displacement impacts includes the appropriate buffers.</p>	I	The maximum design scenario table has been updated following changes to the project design. The buffers used for displacement analyses are identified in Environmental Statement volume 5, Annex 5.2: Analysis of Displacement Impacts on Seabirds and in Section 5.9.2 of Environmental Statement Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore Ornithology.



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>21</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Natural England	2.6.34 Vol. 2 Chapter 5 – Offshore Ornithology Table 5.8 Operational phase – The report does not give any information about the length of time that the windfarm will be operational. Natural England requests information about the operational lifespan of the project as this will affect the time period over which impacts such as collisions should be assessed.	I	The lifespan of the project (up to 35 years) has been included where relevant.
Natural England	2.6.35 Vol. 2 Chapter 5 – Offshore Ornithology Table 5.11 Note the VORs that have been assessed are those identified in Table 5.7 which as indicated in earlier comments may be incomplete. It is not clear why little gull has a Conservation Value of only 'national' when it is a feature of the Greater Wash pSPA (which would make it 'international' Conservation Value). It may be because DONG Energy has concluded that there is no impact pathway between collision risk at Hornsea Three and the Greater Wash pSPA and no impacts associated with the ECR. However, there needs to be consideration of whether there is any connectivity of birds migrating through the OWF (and therefore at risk of collision) with the Greater Wash pSPA feature birds. Additionally, Natural England is not clear why the recoverability assessment for little gull is 'High' as there is no information on the population trend and other species with a similar fecundity level have been ranked as only having 'medium' recoverability. Natural England does not agree with DONG Energy's assessment that there is no (or 'trivial') connectivity between razorbill and guillemot at Hornsea Three and FFC pSPA. While Hornsea Three is beyond the mean maximum foraging range of FFC pSPA based on Thaxter et al (2012), DONG Energy has agreed to consider other evidence of connectivity and there has not been any agreement between Natural England and DONG Energy that there is no connectivity/impact pathway between Hornsea Three and FFC pSPA for these species – therefore their Conservation Value could be 'international'.	I	Environmental Statement volume 5, Annex 5.1: Baseline Characterisation Report identifies the final list of VORs and their associated conservation values.  Consideration of likely collision risk impacts on the little gull feature of the Greater Wash pSPA is provided in RIAA Annex 2: Additional Special Protection Areas Screening Exercise with no LSE identified  RIAA Annex 3: Phenology, connectivity and apportioning for features of FFC pSPA includes discussion on connectivity between Hornsea Three and the razorbill and guillemot features of FFC pSPA.
Natural England	2.6.36 Vol. 2 Chapter 5 – Offshore Ornithology 5.9.1.12-5.9.1.13 Natural England notes that according to the DONG Energy's definition of population trends it appears that a species showing a population decline of up to 24% since the Seabird 2000 census would be categorised as having a stable population (which then indicates 'medium recoverability'). Natural England does not agree that populations that have declined by up to 24% since Seabird 2000 can necessarily be assessed as having medium recoverability – for example great black-backed gull has experienced an 11% decline (JNCC, 2016) and is Amber listed in Birds of Conservation Concern 4 (Eaton et al., 2015) so it is not clear that it should be categorised as having 'medium recoverability'. This highlights the issue that some of the criteria for determining the significance of effects for the EIA assessments do not seem to reflect the population status of the species or level of conservation concern associated with the species based on published assessments (such as Eaton et al 2015).	I	The recoverability categories assigned to each VOR have been reviewed. It is worth noting that although a population decline may have occurred this is not the only factor that is considered when assigning a recoverability to a VOR as presented in Environmental Statement volume 5, Annex 5.1.
Natural England	2.6.37 Vol. 2 Chapter 5 – Offshore Ornithology 5.11.1.23 The assessment for red throated diver displacement is against the regional population – taken from Furness (2015). The numbers in Furness (2015) are not strictly a 'population' – they are the estimated number of birds predicted to be in the southern North Sea in the non-breeding season along with their origins – and is more useful for apportioning impacts to specific sites. Natural England suggests that other population scales should also be considered for the EIA assessment such as the UK and biogeographic populations (e.g. see Birdlife International, 2004 and Musgrove et al., 2013).	N	The use of the regional population from Furness is considered precautionary as the use of a larger population (e.g. UK or other biogeographic populations) would reduce the potential impact.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>21</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Natural England	2.6.38 Vol. 2 Chapter 5 – Offshore Ornithology 5.11.2.98 Natural England would welcome discussion with DONG Energy regarding the appropriate population scale to assess predicted impacts against.	I	The population scales against which impacts are assessed are identified in Environmental Statement volume 5, Annex 5.1: Baseline Characterisation Report and throughout the species-specific assessment sections in Section 5.11 and 5.13 of Environmental Statement Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore Ornithology.
Natural England	2.6.39 Vol. 2 Chapter 5 – Offshore Ornithology 5.11.2.153 Little gull assessment. It is not clear why DONG Energy presents Option 2 with 98.9% AR and Option 3 with 98%. We do not advise the use of Option 3 for little gull. For Option 2, based on Cook et al. (2014), Natural England considers a 99.2% AR is appropriate. From Table 5.24 it looks like a 98% AR 98% has been used with Option 2 and 99.2% with Option 3. Natural England also advises that the CRM should consider the variability around the generic flight height data in Johnston et al (2014a &b).	I	A 99.2% avoidance rate has been applied for little gull when using the Basic model of Band (2012) based on the information presented in Cook et al. (2014). A 98% avoidance rate is considered suitably precautionary when using the Extended model of Band (2012).
Natural England	2.6.40 Vol. 2 Chapter 5 – Offshore Ornithology 5.12.1.8 Cumulative effect assessment methodology 'In general the initial scope of projects has considered all operational, in-construction or planned wind farms along the east coast of Britain, as well as non-UK projects in the North Sea, within potential foraging range.' Natural England does not agree that this necessarily defines the geographical scope of projects for CEA. It will depend on the specific population being considered.	I	In general, the initial scope of projects has considered all operational, in-construction or planned wind farms along the east coast of Britain (based on the BDMPS scales presented in Furness (2015), as well as non-UK projects in the North Sea, within potential foraging range.
Natural England	2.6.41 Vol. 2 Chapter 5 – Offshore Ornithology 5.12.1.9 Natural England is not clear what is meant here. The population parameter (e.g. survival rates) used in the models to assess impacts have not been updated to include population parameters that account for additional mortality contributed by these operational projects. As a result, mortality impacts from these projects are not captured in the baseline demographic rates.	I	The text referred to is guidance from PINS and has been taken into account when identifying those projects included in the CEA. In practice, no projects have been removed where there is potential for an ongoing impact or where impacts are not captured as part of the baseline.
Natural England	2.6.42 Vol. 2 Chapter 5 – Offshore Ornithology Table 5.37 There appear to be projects missing from this list e.g. Hornsea Project Two appears to be missing altogether (should be Tier 1); and there is no reference to Thanet extension. Natural England also considers that Beatrice Demonstrator and Blyth should be listed. Natural England notes that EA3 is listed under Tier 2 but should be Tier 1 now. The 4 Scottish projects subject to the Judicial Review seem to appear under Tier 1 and also Tier 2.	I	Projects included in CEA are identified in Table 5.42 of Environmental Statement Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore Ornithology.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>21</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Natural England	<p>2.6.43 Draft Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment (RIAA)</p> <p>4.4.4.1 'Following consultation it was requested within Natural England's Scoping response that effects on prey availability should be considered for ornithological features and it has been agreed through the Evidence Plan process, that this impact will be considered if the marine processes assessment identifies connectivity, with specifically the Flamborough Front.'</p> <p>Natural England's understanding is that the EWG agreed that effect on prey availability with respect to operational phases impacts in offshore areas 'depends on the outcome of the discussion within the Marine Processes and Benthic Ecology ES chapters. If the assessment concludes that there is no significant impact to benthic ecology then this impact does not need to be considered.'</p> <p>Natural England notes that:</p> <p>1) this discussion referred specifically to operational phase effects on prey availability within the offshore windfarm areas of Hornsea Three (i.e. not ECR impacts on prey availability); and</p> <p>2) the text quoted above does not reflect this agreement within the EWG. It was not the case that connectivity with the Flamborough Front in the Marine Processes chapter was the only consideration required to be able to exclude prey availability changes as a potential impact from the assessment.</p>	N	The impact on ornithological features as a result of changes in prey availability was considered as part of the HRA Screening process with no LSEs identified.
Natural England	<p>2.6.44 Draft Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment (RIAA)</p> <p>Table 5.7 Designed-in measures adopted as part of Hornsea Three – offshore ornithology – Natural England does not agree with the statement that the minimum legal requirement for lighting will minimise the risks to migrating birds. Natural England understands that there may be a legal requirement for some form of lighting, but it does not necessarily follow that a specification for a legal minimum will be the best in terms of minimising environmental impact.</p> <p>'This provides for a lower blade tip height clearance of 34.97 m LAT. This hub-height is considered appropriately conservative so as to minimise the risk of bird collisions.'</p> <p>Natural England is unclear about the rationale of the statement that a lower blade height of 36 m LAT might result in even fewer collisions.</p>	I	<p>The impact on ornithological features as a result of lighting was considered as part of the HRA Screening process with no LSEs identified.</p> <p>An increase in lower blade tip height will reduce the number of collisions due to the skewed nature of the flight height distribution of seabirds when flying across the sea when compared to lower tip heights.</p>
Natural England	<p>2.6.45 Draft Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment (RIAA)</p> <p>5.4.1.4 'Further risk assessment may however be required if population data used to inform SPA citations is less contemporary than construction and operation of any projects and plans.'</p> <p>DONG Energy has excluded operational projects from the CIA. However, regarding the point highlighted – which we agree with – it is not clear if this has been done where applicable. The Planning Inspectorate's Advice Note Seventeen: Cumulative Effects Assessment (PINS, 2015) says:</p> <p>'Where other projects are expected to be completed before construction of the proposed NSIP and the effects of those projects are fully determined, effects arising from them should be considered as part of the baseline and may be considered as part of both the construction and operational assessment. The ES should clearly distinguish between projects forming part of the baseline and those in the CEA.'</p> <p>Therefore DONG Energy needs clearly demonstrate that the effects of those projects have been fully determined and are part of the baseline.</p>	I	The projects and plans selected as relevant to the CEA are based upon the results of a screening exercise undertaken as part of the 'CEA long list' of projects (see the Environmental Statement, volume 4, annex 5.2: Cumulative Effects Screening Matrix and annex 5.3: Location of Schemes). Each project on the CEA long list has been considered on a case by case basis for scoping in or out of this chapter's assessment based upon data confidence, effect-receptor pathways and the spatial/temporal scales involved. The Projects included in CEA are identified in Table 8.27 of the Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment.
Natural England	<p>2.6.46 Draft Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment (RIAA)</p> <p>5.4.1.9 It is not clear why this list is restricted to southern North Sea only. The appropriate geographical scale depends on the population scale being used for the assessment.</p>	I	In-combination assessments for ornithological receptors include all relevant projects in the relevant seasonal Biologically Defined Minimum Population Scales (BDMPS) for a species.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>21</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Natural England	2.6.47 Draft Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment (RIAA) 8.2.1.1 Natural England would welcome the opportunity to discuss the Conservation Objectives for the relevant SPAs with DONG Energy so that we can provide the most up-to-date information available.	I	The Conservation Objectives used in the Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment for SPAs/pSPAs are identified in in the Environmental Statement in Section 8.2 of the Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment (RIAA).
Natural England	2.6.48 Draft Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment (RIAA) 8.4.1.4 Natural England considers that this misrepresents the EWG position. See comments on this under the main Ornithology Chapter.	I	Text has been amended consistent with the agreement reached at the EWG meeting in March 2017.
Natural England	2.6.49 Draft Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment (RIAA) 8.4.5.9 This is an odd reference to use in the context of this paragraph on displacement impacts and it is not clear what point DONG Energy is trying to make here. The Krijgsfeld et al. (2011) work predominantly concerns species like gulls which are not generally included in the assessment of displacement impacts. Additionally, the Krijgsfeld et al. (2011) work cited looked at barrier effects and macro-avoidance of birds in flight rather than displacement explicitly.	I	This section has been updated to include further information and to address this comment.
Natural England	2.6.50 Draft Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment (RIAA) 8.4.5.13 The statement about fulmar displacement seems to contradict other parts of DONG Energy's assessment where displacement impacts on fulmar have been discounted and screened out of the assessment process (e.g. see Table 8.1). For razorbill the DONG Energy cites 64% displacement from Krijgsfeld et al. (2011) and then 30% from Walls et al. (2013) and concludes that a displacement level of 40% is then precautionary. This does not seem to be a logical conclusion based on the evidence presented – which would be that a precautionary level would be 68%. Irrespective of this, the variation in displacement rates highlighted by the DONG Energy is precisely the reason why Natural England advises a range of values are presented – Natural England typically has considered 30-70% for auks which encompasses the evidence available. The 64% macro-avoidance for gannet from Cook et al. (2014) is not additional evidence – the figure in Cook et al. (2014) is taken from the Krijgsfeld et al. (2011) work. Noting that Cook et al. (2014) also mention the work of Vanermen et al. (2013) which suggests a macro-avoidance rate of 0.84 for gannet although this reference is not mentioned by DONG Energy here.	Y	Fulmar is included in the RIAA. Further information on the displacement rates selected is included in Environmental Statement volume 5, Annex 5.2: Analysis of Displacement Impacts on Seabirds.
Natural England	2.6.51 Draft Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment (RIAA) 8.4.5.15 Note that while it may be possible to exclude red throated diver and common scoter as VOR in the array area – the current assessment in the PEIR is based on just 11 months of baseline survey data and should be revisited when the full baseline dataset is agreed and has been collected.	I	Acknowledged. The PEIR and draft HRA clearly stated that the assessments presented were preliminary due to the limited temporal extent of the site-specific surveys. The assessments presented now incorporate aerial survey data for 20 months supplemented with the results of a meta-analysis for those months where only one year of data exists.



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>21</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Natural England	2.6.52 Draft Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment (RIAA) 8.4.5.16 Natural England requests clarification about what is meant by this statement. Natural England advises that for assessing the impacts of displacement the mean peak count for each defined season is calculated and use for the assessment. However, where displacement impacts are assessed over more than one season for a species, Natural England advises that the summed impacts are considered to give an annual assessment.	I	This section has been updated to include further information and to address this comment.  It is not considered appropriate to sum the displacement mortality calculated for individual seasons as this potentially over-estimates the number of birds affected (through double-counting) with the total based on the number of seasons defined.
Natural England	2.6.53 Draft Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment (RIAA) Table 8.4 Natural England does not agree with the selection of different mortality rates for displacement in different seasons. DONG Energy has used lower mortality rates in the non-breeding seasons. SNCB advice note (MIG-Birds 2017) says: 'It seems probable that the fitness consequences of displacement (in terms of productivity and mortality) might vary between stages of the annual life cycle. However, once again, empirical data on this is lacking. Until supporting data can be collected this is considered theoretically plausible but unproven.' And 'Given there is currently no empirical evidence on the impacts of displacement to seabirds, the SNCBs do not view it as appropriate at this time to apply varying mortality levels by season. This is because the theoretical arguments, as highlighted in previous sections, regarding breeding versus non-breeding season impacts, could be made in either direction. Therefore, the SNCBs recommend that, for the time being, seasonality in the assessment process, in terms of predicted impacts, should be treated consistently.'	I	Displacement mortality using a range of displacement and mortality rates is presented in Environmental Statement volume 5, Annex 5.2: Analysis of Displacement Impacts on Seabirds. Assessments presented in Environmental Statement Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore Ornithology are based on displacement rates identified through as part of a literature review presented in Section 8.3.2 of the RIAA.
Natural England	2.6.54 Draft Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment (RIAA) 8.4.6 See Natural England's comments on CRM under Natural England's general comments as well as relevant comments on the Chapter 5 Ornithology above.	I	Noted. See previous responses.
Natural England	2.6.55 Draft Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment (RIAA) 8.4.6.8 Natural England does not agree that displacement and collision impacts cannot be added together. The CRM accounts for birds that avoid the windfarm footprint – they are not factored into the collision risk. These birds that 'macro-avoid' the site are the ones that are displaced and may suffer mortality impacts as a result of displacement – therefore adding collision and displacement mortality is not double counting. For example, if the macro avoidance rate used in the CRM equates to the displacement rate – the two impacts can be summed without any double counting of impacts.	N	Displacement and collision risk impacts could be added together if macro-avoidance and the displacement rate applied are consistent. However, this is often not the case and therefore these impacts should not be added together as they are presented in the RIAA or Environmental Statement Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore Ornithology. In addition, collision risk is considered to be an annual impact whilst displacement mortality is not considered likely to occur year on year.
Natural England	2.6.56 Draft Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment (RIAA) 8.4.7 Baseline Information – Natural England has not commented on this as currently data collection is incomplete.	N	Acknowledged. Throughout the PEIR it was noted that the assessments and conclusions presented were preliminary as they were based on only eleven months of baseline survey data. The final application includes data for 20 months with this supported by a meta-analysis to identify appropriate abundance metrics for those months for which only one year of data is available (December to March) (see Environmental Statement volume 5, Annex 5.4: Data Hierarchy Report).

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>21</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Natural England	2.6.57 Draft Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment (RIAA) 8.4.7.9 The counts are from accurate whole colony censuses (rather than estimated). However, Natural England is not aware that there was a census in 2011 therefore we are unsure where the figure of 9,947 pairs in 2011 comes from.	I	A population of 9,947 was provided by Natural England during the application process for the Hornsea Project One offshore wind farm with an unpublished Natural England report referenced as the source.  Due to Natural England's uncertainty as to the source of this population any reference to it has been removed from the final application.
Natural England	2.6.58 Draft Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment (RIAA) 8.4.7.16 Furness (2015) has updated figures for the number of birds in the southern North Sea.	N	Furness (2015) does not present flyway populations and does not distinguish between the northern and southern North Sea and therefore the populations presented are not relevant.
Natural England	2.6.59 Draft Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment (RIAA) 8.5.1.11 See general comments in relation to HRA screening for little gull and Sandwich, common and little tern features of Greater Wash pSPA.	I	RIAA Annex 2: Additional Special Protection Areas Screening Exercise includes consideration of tern features at the Greater Wash pSPA with the potential for LSE identified on a precautionary basis for Sandwich tern.
Natural England	2.6.60 Draft Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment (RIAA) 8.5.2.1 This is correct but it would be clearer to state that the current colony size is less than this to avoid confusion given that the figures presented for the other features are taken from the pSPA departmental brief which cites a population size of 44,520 pairs for kittiwake. Note the puffin figure for the pSPA was updated to 980 pairs/1960 individuals.	I	Additional text has been added to the RIAA for kittiwake, identifying the pSPA population size. The population size for puffin has been amended.
Natural England	2.6.61 Draft Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment (RIAA) 8.5.2.2 As stated in Natural England general comments – the potential for LSE is on the features and the SPA not on the feature but only in the non-breeding season for example. If a plan or project has the potential to impact on birds associated with an SPA during the breeding season, then the magnitude of that impact should be estimated, and considered alongside impacts in the nonbreeding seasons, in order to conduct an overall test for LSE at a given SPA. Likewise, if there is a potential impact on a species associated with an SPA site in the non-breeding season, then this should be considered alongside impacts in the breeding season. The methodology applied has not considered the potential impacts across all seasons for the qualifying features of Flamborough and Filey Coast pSPA. We do not agree with the methodology whereby impacts are considered for only one part of the year, excluding other seasons.	N	It is assumed that this comment is referring to the razorbill and guillemot features of FFC pSPA for which no connectivity was identified between the pSPA and Hornsea Three during the breeding season. The point being made is therefore irrelevant as there would be an impact of zero on breeding birds from the pSPA during the breeding season. The screening process therefore already considers impacts across an entire annual cycle.
Natural England	2.6.62 Draft Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment (RIAA) 8.5.2.22 The text here implies that Thaxter et al. (2012) reports a foraging range for kittiwake from FFC pSPA which is not the case. The foraging ranges in Thaxter for kittiwake are predominately derived from Alaskan colonies and include no data for FFC pSPA.	Y	Noted. Text updated.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>21</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Natural England	<p>2.6.63 Draft Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment (RIAA)</p> <p>8.5.2.29 Puffin – Natural England does not consider that basing the assessment of foraging range of puffins from FFC pSPA only on the evidence in Thaxter et al. (2012) is robust. Thaxter et al. (2012) points out: 'At the time of writing, only one study had used direct tracking (VHF radio-transmitters) to study the foraging ranges of puffin (Wanless et al., 1990). Those results were based on only one individual (Table 3). Therefore, the representative ranges presented for puffin in Table 1 are indirect estimates based on trip duration, time-activity budgets, and flight speed, to which we have assigned low confidence.'</p> <p>At 130 km from FFC pSPA, Hornsea Three is likely to be beyond the typical foraging range of puffin – but there is some evidence of variation in foraging range behaviour at individual colonies associated with overnight stays at sea even in the chick-rearing period (Harris et al 2012) as well as evidence of birds foraging at much greater distances when food availability is poor.</p> <p>DONG Energy does acknowledge that there could be connectivity between FFC pSPA birds and Hornsea Three and has not excluded an LSE but then goes on to exclude any connectivity in the breeding season for puffin.</p> <p>Natural England requests further discussion with DONG Energy regarding the apportioning of predicted breeding season impacts to FFC pSPA.</p>	I	RIAA Annex 3: Phenology, connectivity and apportioning for features of FFC pSPA includes further discussion on the likely connectivity between breeding puffin from FFC pSPA and Hornsea Three.
Natural England	<p>2.6.64 Draft Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment (RIAA)</p> <p>8.5.2.31 Natural England has not agreed any methodology regarding the age structure of birds in the Hornsea Three project area.</p>	I	RIAA Annex 3: Phenology, connectivity and apportioning for features of FFC pSPA identifies the approaches used to apportion impacts from Hornsea Three to breeding populations from FFC pSPA with any agreements reached at previous offshore wind farm projects identified.
Natural England	<p>2.6.65 Draft Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment (RIAA)</p> <p>8.5.2.49 Natural England considers that this section misrepresents the evidence. There are no data from FFC pSPA used in the calculation of foraging ranges presented for guillemot in Thaxter – so it is misleading to suggest the 'mean foraging range of breeding guillemots from the Flamborough and Filey Coast pSPA colony is 37.8 km, while the mean-maximum range is 84.2 km and highest maximum reported 135 km'.</p> <p>DONG Energy has screened out breeding season impacts from the assessment for guillemot altogether as with the other auk species. So displacement impacts are only assessed for the non-breeding season. The baseline surveys have recorded some high numbers of guillemot present in the breeding season – a peak of 15,651 birds in June which is of similar magnitude to counts in the non-breeding season, and 35% birds recorded so far have been during the breeding season months.</p> <p>Natural England requests further discussion with DONG Energy regarding the apportioning of predicted breeding season impacts to FFC pSPA.</p>	I	Noted, text amended and further discussion held at subsequent EWG meetings.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>21</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Natural England	<p>2.6.66 Draft Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment (RIAA)</p> <p>8.6.1.2 Projects/plans considered cumulatively alongside Hornsea Three have been allocated into three 'Tiers', reflecting their current stage within the planning and development process. Tier 1 includes projects that are operational, under construction, consented. Tier 2 includes all projects where the developer has submitted a Scoping Report to PINs and Tier 3 includes all projects where the developer has advised the Planning Inspectorate in writing that they intend to submit an application in the future but have not submitted a Scoping Report.</p> <p>While Natural England does not have serious concerns about the use of a three 'tier' in-combination assessment, we advise that presentation of projects in a higher number of tiers provides better resolution of the different stages different projects are at. This approach also helps differentiate between those projects with high, medium and low confidence in the data and so allows the decision maker to give more weight to those projects for which there is higher confidence in the data. Natural England advises that based on EC guidance 'Managing Natura 2000 sites: The provisions of Article 6 of the Habitats Directive 92/43/EEC' and The Planning Inspectorate Advice Note 10, that an approach including a greater breakdown of tiers may be useful. For example, the tiers could include;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Built and operational projects;</li> <li>2. Projects that are under construction;</li> <li>3. Permitted application(s) not yet implemented;</li> <li>4. Submitted application(s) not yet determined;</li> <li>5. All refusals subject to appeal procedures not yet determined;</li> <li>6. Projects on the National Infrastructure's programme of projects; and</li> <li>7. Projects identified in the relevant development plan.</li> </ol> <p>Recent offshore windfarm projects have adopted this approach and we have found it to be beneficial. Natural England therefore suggests that inclusion of a larger number of tiers than currently proposed that reflects the uncertainty in the impact figures presented for projects within each tier would be beneficial.</p> <p>Natural England would be happy to discuss this further within the Expert Working Group meetings.</p>	N	The tiering system used for the in-combination assessment is described in Section 8.6 of the RIAA and is consistent across all documents in the application for Development Consent for Hornsea Three.
Natural England	<p>2.6.67 Draft Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment (RIAA)</p> <p>8.6.1.3 The key point is not that the Hornsea Three baseline surveys have occurred after projects became operational, but whether the operational impacts from these projects can be demonstrated to have been factored into the population level impacts that are being predicted. Natural England considers that means that the mortality from the operational windfarms needs to have been captured within the demographic parameters and population trends (e.g. survival rates etc.) being used in the population models in order for their impacts to be discounted from the in-combination totals. If the survival rates and productivity rates that are used in the population models have not taken account of the mortality and productivity impacts arising from these operational projects then the projects cannot be assumed to be part of the baseline environment.</p>	N	The text referred to is guidance from PINS and has been taken into account when identifying those projects included in the CEA. In practice, no projects have been removed where there is potential for an ongoing impact or where impacts are not captured as part of the baseline.



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>21</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Natural England	2.6.68 Draft Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment (RIAA) Table 8.19 There appear to be projects missing from this list e.g. Hornsea Project Two appears to be missing altogether (should be Tier 1); and there is no reference to Thanet extension. Natural England also considers that Beatrice Demonstrator and Blyth should be listed. Natural England notes that EA3 is listed under Tier 2 – but should be Tier 1 now. The 4 Scottish projects subject to the Judicial Review seem to appear under Tier 1 and also Tier 2. It is not also clear whether the DONG Energy has reduced the impacts for projects that have or plan not to build out to the full consented configuration. Natural England advice is that impacts should be assessed in relation to predictions based on the consented envelope for a project and should not be reduced on the basis that a project has initially built to a different configuration.	I	Projects included in CEA are identified in Table 8.27 of the RIAA.
Natural England	2.6.69 Draft Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment (RIAA) 8.7.1 DONG Energy has only considered potential impacts relating to red throated diver and common scoter. DONG Energy should also include the other pSPA features (e.g. little gull, as well as Sandwich tern, common tern and little tern features, dependent on overlap with foraging ranges). DONG Energy has also only considered Dogger and East Anglia zone projects as having overlapping construction activities with Hornsea Three. Overlap with Hornsea Projects One and Two construction activities should also be considered.	I	RIAA Annex 2: Additional Special Protection Areas Screening Exercise includes consideration of tern features at the Greater Wash pSPA with the potential for LSE identified on a precautionary basis for Sandwich tern.  Projects included in CEA are identified in Table 8.27 of the RIAA.
Natural England	2.6.70 Draft Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment (RIAA) 8.7.2 Natural England would welcome discussion with DONG Energy regarding the in-combination assessment methodology for the breeding seabird features of FFC pSPA.	N	Noted. The Applicant welcomes further discussion with Natural England on this topic which has commenced through the EWG process.
Natural England	1.31 It is important to note that the significance of effects on different receptors in the same receptor group (i.e. different species of birds in 'offshore ornithology') may vary according to the sensitivity of receptors. Therefore, where a number of species have been considered within the assessments in this chapter, a range is provided for significance of effect. The above statement highlights the complications in considering 'receptor groups' rather than individual receptors. There may be difficulties in drawing conclusions of significance when a range is presented. The precautionary principle would suggest adopting the highest level of significance; however, this may not always be a sound approach. Natural England would therefore recommend that individual receptors are considered. (Volume 2, chapter 12, paragraph 12.7.1.7)	I	For assessment of impact mechanisms where there are significant differences between species in relation to impact magnitude, species are assessed independently. For impacts where it is clear that all species will fall below a significance threshold, receptor groups are used for simplicity. The significance of impacts for all receptors considered is presented in the summary tables presented at the end of each impact assessment section.
Natural England	1.37 Inter-related effects on offshore ornithology: at present it is not possible to agree with the residual effect conclusions for a number of standalone impacts due to insufficient data (see comments related to offshore ornithology in Annex 2, Section 2.6 below). Therefore, inter-related effects will need to be re-assessed for the final application once fit for purpose evidence is available. (Volume 2, chapter 12, Table 12.9)	I	This comment is acknowledged. The Inter-related effects for Ornithology have been updated in the Environmental Statement (please see Environmental Statement volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore Ornithology and the Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment).
<b>Section 42: Local Authorities (prescribed under section 43 of the Act)</b>			

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>21</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Great Yarmouth Borough Council	Policy CS11 of the Great Yarmouth Local Plan Core Strategy confirms that designated nature conservation sites will be conserved and enhanced, and protected species such as the Little Terns should be adequately protected from adverse effects of new development, and where negative effects are unavoidable, suitable measures will be required to mitigate such impact(s). Therefore, any potential indirect impacts should be considered and where mitigation measures are necessary, should complement the measures set out in the Council's Natura 2000 Sites Monitoring and Mitigation Strategy.	I	Environmental Statement, Volume 2, Chapter 5 – Offshore Ornithology assesses the potential impact of the project on different bird species, including little tern. This chapter also highlights any necessary monitoring and/or mitigation measures which could prevent, minimise, reduce or offset the possible environmental effects identified in the EIA process. Any mitigation or monitoring proposed will consider relevant policy guidelines and stakeholder advice.
<b>Section 42: Persons with an interest in the land (prescribed under section 44 of the Act)</b>			
No comments were received by landowners or land interests relating to offshore ornithology under Phase 2.A..			
<b>Section 47: Duty to consult local community</b>			
Dr Moss Taylor (Honorary Warden of the Weybourne Camp Reserve)	3. During this summer I have carried out my annual breeding bird survey of Weybourne Camp, and as expected have confirmed the presence of several species defined as Red- and Amber-listed in 'Birds of Conservation Concern': Grey Partridge (2 pairs), Skylark (12 pairs), Swallow (5 pairs), Whitethroat (14 pairs), Mistle Thrush (1 pair), Dunnock (5 pairs) and Linnet (13 pairs), many of which nest within the PEIR boundary. I believe that these findings will be confirmed by the teams of Environmental Surveyors from NIRAS that also covered Weybourne Camp as part of your own environmental survey, along the proposed route of the PEIR boundary. Their team also found evidence of breeding by Little Ringed Plovers along the PEIR boundary route on Weybourne Camp.	I	Noted. Results of the onshore ornithology surveys are reported in Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 3.9: Wintering and Migratory Birds and annex 3.10: Breeding Birds Survey. These have then informed the assessment of potential impacts in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation.
Friends of North Norfolk	19. The majority of the North Norfolk Coastline is recognised, both nationally and internationally, for its exceptional landscape and ecological value with a number of overlapping Designations including the Norfolk Coast AONB, the North Norfolk Heritage Coast, many SSSI, SAC, RAMSAR sites and Marine Protection Areas/ MCZs.	I	A full assessment of the effects of Hornsea Three on benthic ecology, including on features of designated sites, is presented in volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology. Conclusions on the effects of Hornsea Three on the conservation objectives of the North Norfolk Coast and Saturn Reef SAC and The Wash and North Norfolk Coast SAC are presented in full within the RIAA for Hornsea Three. Discussions on the effects of Hornsea Three on the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ and the Markham's Triangle rMCZ are presented in full within volume 5, annex 2.3: Marine Conservation Zone Assessment.
Marguerite Russel	<b>Local matters landfall zone</b> - Local birds and wildlife must not suffer. Is it an important migratory route? How about the seals?	I	The final assessment for offshore birds is presented in Environmental Statement Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore Ornithology and the final assessment for Marine Mammals presented in Environmental Statement Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine Mammals with no impacts of major significance identified for either receptors.
Jill Wright	<b>Offshore array area</b> - Only that I hope you will ensure it is neither a hazard to marine animals nor to birds	I	The final assessment for offshore birds is presented in Environmental Statement Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore Ornithology and the final assessment for Marine Mammals presented in Environmental Statement Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine Mammals with no impacts of major significance identified for either receptors.
Valerie Stubbs	<b>Offshore Array</b> - I am concerned about the impact on wildlife - both birds which feed in the area and marine wildlife	I	The final assessment for offshore birds is presented in Environmental Statement Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore Ornithology and the final assessment for Marine Mammals presented in Environmental Statement Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine Mammals with no impacts of major significance identified for either receptors.
Christine Walton	<b>Offshore Array</b> - I am concerned about the impact on wildlife, particularly local and migrating birds (getting caught in blades etc.), Also the impact on creatures in the sea - fish and other mammals. Impact of possible pollution in the sea on growing plants/seaweed etc. and therefore impact on the food chain.	I	The final assessment for offshore birds is presented in Environmental Statement Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore Ornithology and the final assessment for Marine Mammals presented in Environmental Statement Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine Mammals with no impacts of major significance identified for either receptors. Measures to manage the risk of any pollution events during the construction and operation of the project are captured within the Development Consent Order (and accompanying Deemed Marine Licences) through the requirement for a Marine Pollution Contingency Plan.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>21</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Francis Farron	<b>Proposal</b> - I am in favour of offshore wind over onshore wind or nuclear energy but it needs to be 'green' In that the industry protects the environment even if it means some slight loss of production by turning turbines off to protect migratory birds	I	The final assessment for offshore birds is presented in Environmental Statement Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore Ornithology with no impacts of major significance identified for either receptors. Consideration has been given to the impacts on migratory birds in this chapter.
Maureen Durrant	<b>Offshore Array</b> - I would be very concerned about the effect these huge turbines have on the marine and migrating birds	I	Thank you for you feedback. The final assessment for offshore birds is presented in Environmental Statement Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore Ornithology with no impacts of major significance identified.
Brian Donovan	<b>EIA</b> - I can see a lot of work has been carried out for the PIER. I think that the report covers all the areas that could possibly be thought of, so that is good. But one area of importance to me is Vol 2, chapter 5, "offshore ornithology". I asked in the consultation how many birds are anticipated being killed annually. No one at the consultation knew. It seems that this PIER document does not answer my question either. (Please say if I have missed it). Despite many paragraphs and words, para 5.11.2.223 concludes negligible effect, despite, as the text says, the precise number of birds is unknown. So some birds will killed, but the number has never been measured by previous windfarms	I	At the point of PEIR, the baseline data collection had not been completed for offshore ornithology and hence it was not possible to provide numbers of potential birds impacted at that time. The final assessment for offshore birds is presented in Environmental Statement Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore Ornithology with the potential impacts on each species quantified and no impacts of major significance identified.
<b>Section 48: Duty to publicise</b>			
<i>No comments were received by in response to the public notice issued during Phase 2.A relating to offshore ornithology.</i>			

Table 2.10: Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Further Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.B) relating to offshore ornithology.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>22</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 42: Prescribed consultees (The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009: Schedule 1))</b>			
RSPB	<b>2. Offshore potential alternative route</b> Avoiding cable laying within the Norfolk Sandbanks & Saturn Reef Special Area of Conservation is important. A route that further minimises impact to features of this site seems appropriate, subject to additional survey data indicating that there are no features that could be considered linked to the SAC being affected. We note additional surveys are being conducted in August and October 2017 and look forward to seeing the results of the surveys.	I	A full assessment of the effects of Hornsea Three on benthic ecology, including on features of the North Norfolk Sandbanks and Saturn Reef SAC, is presented in volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Subtidal and Intertidal Ecology. Conclusions on the effects of Hornsea Three on the conservation objectives of the North Norfolk Sandbanks and Saturn Reef SAC are presented in full within the RIAA for Hornsea Three (document reference number 5.2). The additional benthic data collected during surveys in 2017 are presented and interpreted in volume 5, annex 2.1: Benthic Ecology Technical Report and summarised in section 2.7.1 of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology.
RSPB	<b>3. Near shore potential alternative route</b> Further information will need to be presented to demonstrate that the potential alternative route option is appropriate. Whilst use of the data from other wind farms projects may be appropriate, it must be confirmed that the interval since these surveys took place is appropriate for drawing conclusions. We note that there do not appear to be any survey coverage for the majority of the potential alternative route. It is not clear that additional survey work has been commissioned by Ørsted to ensure decisions about this potential option will be assessed in the apparent absence of data to understand what the impacts of laying a cable in this area would be.	I	As agreed with the Benthic and Fish Ecology and Marine Processes EWG, the nearshore area, including the re-route (i.e. in the vicinity of the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ), is characterised by a combination of Hornsea Three site specific data and desktop data sources in this area. These are fully discussed in volume 5, annex 2.1: Benthic Ecology Technical Report and summarised in section 2.7.1 of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology.
RSPB	<b>4. The RPSB's response to the broad questions posed by Ørsted on the offshore routes</b> a) Do consultees have any comments on the location of the potential offshore alternative routes? The RSPB holds no information to indicate that the potential offshore alternative routes are not appropriate. We await the outcomes of further surveys and data collection to inform our final position.	I	As agreed with the Benthic and Fish Ecology and Marine Processes EWG, the nearshore area, including the re-route (i.e. in the vicinity of the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ), is characterised by a combination of Hornsea Three site specific data and desktop data sources in this area. These are fully discussed in volume 5, annex 2.1: Benthic Ecology Technical Report and summarised in section 2.7.1 of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology.
RSPB	b) Are there any additional baseline data sources available that could be used to inform the EIA? Data sets have already been identified that could be appropriate to support a baseline understand of the proposed alternative corridor areas, subject to confirming the age of the data is appropriate. We recommend that the Eastern Inshore Fisheries and Conservation Authority (EIFCA) is approached for data if this has not already happened.	I	As agreed with the Benthic and Fish Ecology and Marine Processes EWG, the nearshore area, including the re-route (i.e. in the vicinity of the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ), is characterised by a combination of Hornsea Three site specific data and desktop data sources in this area. These are fully discussed in volume 5, annex 2.1: Benthic Ecology Technical Report and summarised in section 2.7.1 of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology.  Hornsea Three contacted the Eastern IFCA about the assessment they are progressing, as suggested by RSPB, however Eastern IFCA were unable to share any information on this assessment for inclusion in the final DCO application.
RSPB	c) Do consultees have any comments on the approach to the EIA if the potential offshore alternatives routes are taken forward? The RSPB expects the EIA to identify the preferred options for the cable corridor that will be used. Should Ørsted wish to retain options for flexibility for the project then sufficient information must be presented to assess the impact of all options and ensure that adverse effect on the integrity of protected areas are avoided and that important marine features will be protected during construction where they lie outside of protected areas.	I	Updates in the form of two reroutes have been made to the Hornsea Three offshore cable corridor described in the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) as a result of the consultation process, one at the northern end of the Hornsea Three offshore cable corridor and one in the nearshore section, around the west side of the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ (see Figure 2.1 of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology and volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives).
<b>Section 42: Local Authorities (prescribed under section 43 of the Act)</b>			
No comments were received by local authorities relating to offshore ornithology under Phase 2.B.			

<sup>22</sup> Y = Yes change made; N = No change made; I = Incorporated into or considered when producing the assessment or landowner voluntary agreement offer; N/A = Not applicable.



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>22</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 42: Persons with an interest in the land (prescribed under section 44 of the Act)</b>			
<i>No comments were received by landowners or land interests relating to offshore ornithology under Phase 2.B.</i>			
<b>Section 47: Duty to consult local community</b>			
<i>No comments were received by the local community relating to offshore ornithology under Phase 2.B.</i>			
<b>Section 48: Duty to publicise</b>			
<i>No comments were received by in response to the public notice issued during Phase 2.B relating to offshore ornithology.</i>			

## 2.6 Commercial Fisheries

Table 2.11: Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.A) relating to commercial fisheries.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>23</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 42: Prescribed consultees (The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009: Schedule 1))</b>			
National Federation of Fishermen's Organisations	<b>Prior Consultation:</b> The Commercial Fisheries PEIR makes reference to a consultation meeting held with the NFFO on 8th February 2017. The list of issues included in the PEIR do not, however fully reflect all of the issues discussed at that meeting.	I	Further details have been added to Table 6.4 (summary of consultation issues) of volume 2, chapter 6 (Commercial Fisheries) of the Environmental Statement to reflect discussions during the 8 February 2017 consultation meeting. In addition, full meeting minutes are available in volume 5, annex 6.1: Commercial Fisheries Technical Report.
National Federation of Fishermen's Organisations	<b>Commercial Fisheries Mitigation:</b> The commercial fisheries chapter details a number of measure that would assist in mitigating fisheries impacts. In addition, we consider the following measures should be considered and/or combined into the proposed fisheries coexistence and liaison plan applying to both the OWF array and export cables; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Adherence to FLOWW best practice guidelines.</li> <li>- Consult with fisheries stakeholders on the production of cable burial plans/cable burial risk assessment and monitoring plans.</li> <li>- Where significant risk is identified with bottom towed fishing gears consider this in proposing any protection and contingency remedial works.</li> <li>- Use post installation trawl surveys to verify clear seabed.</li> <li>- Communicate the results of post installation surveys to fisheries stakeholders.</li> <li>- Use of Kingfisher to provide hazard information and alert of emergent hazards e.g. de-burial of cables.</li> <li>- Protect emergent hazards through appropriate means prior to remediation works being completed.</li> <li>- We take the view that there should be no in situ seabed hazards left in place following decommissioning and any infrastructure that remains buried in the seabed following an adequate assessment of the options should be subject to an ongoing monitoring regime with retained liability to address any emergent hazards.</li> <li>- We encourage the use of funding arrangements like the West of Morecombe Fisheries Fund as a mechanism to support fishing industry stakeholders affected by the project and provisioning of work opportunities (e.g. guard vessels or surveys for example) available to affected fisheries stakeholders as far as practically possible.</li> </ul>	I	Designed-in measures adopted as part of Hornsea Three, that are considered as embedded mitigation for commercial fisheries, are detailed in Table 6.13 of volume 2, chapter 6 (Commercial Fisheries) of the Environmental Statement. These include: a commitment to follow FLOWW guidance, where possible; post construction survey to detect any construction debris and subsequent removal where necessary and/or possible; notification of all offshore and seabed structures (locations of cables to be disseminated via Kingfisher Information Service - Cable Awareness (KISCA) Charts); and a commitment to develop a FCLP (document reference number A8.10).
National Federation of Fishermen's Organisations	With respect to demersal trawl fleets that have been assessed under the worst case scenario to be moderately impacted, the proposed mitigation to consider alternative foundation types (Commercial fisheries PEIR, P60-62) lacks clarity with respect to how any residual impacts would be addressed - for example, would a floating foundation be ruled out that excluded fishing activity as a means to limit impact?	Y	Floating foundations were removed from the project envelope following PEIR based on consultation feedback. Given the updated maximum design scenario of GBS foundations rather than floating turbines, together with updated criteria definitions for sensitivity of receptors and magnitude of impact, the justifications have been updated within the impact assessment (section 6.11 of volume 2, chapter 6 (Commercial Fisheries) of the Environmental Statement). Furthermore, Table 6.13 of volume 2, chapter 6: Commercial Fisheries confirms the commitment to developing a FCLP. An Outline FCLP has been provided as part of the application to the Secretary of State for Development Consent (document reference number A8.10).
National Federation of Fishermen's Organisations	<b>Prior Consultation:</b> In particular, this does not cover that the approach to EIA methodology was discussed highlighting that we consider that the assessment should explicitly assess the level of compatibility in the operation of fishing activities within the immediate footprint and vicinity of the project before going on assess wider impact significance taking account of available access to alternative fishing grounds.	I	The impact assessment (section 6.11 of volume 2, chapter 6 (Commercial Fisheries) of the Environmental Statement) considers the level of impact to specific fisheries activities and fleets within the footprint of the impact (considered under magnitude criteria), prior to assessing availability of alternative grounds (considered under sensitivity of the fleet).

<sup>23</sup> Y = Yes change made; N = No change made; I = Incorporated into or considered when producing the assessment or landowner voluntary agreement offer; N/A = Not applicable.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>23</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
National Federation of Fishermen's Organisations	<b>Prior Consultation:</b> We consider this important when considering the east inshore and offshore marine plan policy aimed at maximising coexistence (policy GOV 2) so that mitigation is aimed directly at addressing this policy and mitigation responses are not just as a broader consideration according to impact significance as defined in the assessment's use of DMRB methodology. This would be best informed by an assessment of the range of alternatives and not just the worst case scenario.	I	Details of the policies within the East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plans relevant to commercial fisheries are included within section 6.4 of volume 2, chapter 6 (Commercial Fisheries) of the Environmental Statement. The removal of floating turbines from the project description results in the maximum design scenario assessing gravity based structure foundations (GBS) (see Table 6.9 of volume 2, chapter 6: Commercial Fisheries). Coexistence is therefore fundamental to the commercial fisheries impact assessment.
National Federation of Fishermen's Organisations	<b>Commercial Fisheries EIA Methodology:</b> This matter has not subsequently been addressed in the EIA methodology. The fact that the worst case scenario assumes not fishing will take place within the array area during the operation of the project does not resolve this issue as it does not account for the possibility that other forms of turbine foundation, cable layout and array configuration will likely result in varying degrees of compatibility with different types of fishing activity. If they are not explicitly assessed then how best to promote coexistence is not being given due consideration.	I	The maximum design scenario (see Table 6.9 of volume 2, chapter 6: Commercial Fisheries) describes turbine layout parameters (minimum spacing: 1,000 m) and scenarios for exclusion of commercial fisheries at each stage of the development. The removal of floating turbines from the project description results in the maximum design scenario assessing GBS foundations. Coexistence is therefore fundamental to the commercial fisheries impact assessment.
National Federation of Fishermen's Organisations	<b>Commercial Fisheries EIA Methodology:</b> The application/interpretation of the DMRB significance and magnitude methodology to commercial fisheries, as it stands, lacks clarity. The sensitivity criteria combines elements on whether the fisheries receptors are compatible with the project element being assessed and the degree to which they can relocate and operate elsewhere. These would benefit from being separated out. In addition, the embedded criteria of vulnerability and recoverability remain underdefined.	I	The criteria used for defining the sensitivity of the receptor and the magnitude of the impact has been updated (see impact assessment criteria in section 6.9.2 of volume 2, chapter 6 (Commercial Fisheries) of the Environmental Statement).
National Federation of Fishermen's Organisations	<b>Commercial Fisheries EIA Methodology:</b> In addition, the assessment of magnitude makes no reference to the spatial dimension of the magnitude of impact i.e. is this defined within the footprint of the project element being assessed or is it related to the range fishing grounds in which the fleet segments operate? It also combines fisheries resources as with fisheries access issues and period of impact. These would benefit by being separated out into their own analyses, as for instance, a total loss of ability to undertake fishing activities is in reality a major impact irrespective of whether or not the fisheries resource is impacted - the methodology currently requires both to be impacted for the classification of moderate to major magnitude.	I	The criteria used for defining the sensitivity of the receptor and the magnitude of the impact has been updated (see impact assessment criteria in section 6.9.2 of volume 2, chapter 6 (Commercial Fisheries) of the Environmental Statement).
National Federation of Fishermen's Organisations	<b>Commercial Fisheries EIA Methodology:</b> Given the ambiguities, however, the subsequent assessment classifications are difficult to follow and compare. Given that the worst case scenario (floating turbine) would assume that fisheries will be unable to take place within the footprint of the project in the area of construction and once the project has been commissioned, it is not clear how moderate and low classifications of impact magnitude have been arrived at for different fleet segments.	I	Given the updated maximum design scenario of GBS foundations rather than floating turbines, together with updated criteria definitions for sensitivity of receptors and magnitude of impact, the justifications have been updated within the impact assessment (section 6.11 of volume 2, chapter 6 (Commercial Fisheries) of the Environmental Statement). Furthermore, Hornsea Three is committed to developing a Fisheries Coexistence and Liaison Plan (FCLP) and an Outline FCLP has been provided as part of the application to the Secretary of State for Development Consent (document reference number A8.10).
National Federation of Fishermen's Organisations	<b>Commercial Fisheries EIA Methodology:</b> We disagree with the premise, implicit in this approach, that should fishing activity no longer be able to take place within the footprint of an area when it previously did take place, that a non-significant impact assessment outcome (as determined under this methodology) should require no further intervention to promote coexistence with that activity.	I	Given the updated maximum design scenario of GBS foundations rather than floating turbines, together with updated criteria definitions for sensitivity of receptors and magnitude of impact, the justifications have been updated within the impact assessment (section 6.11 of volume 2, chapter 6: Commercial Fisheries). Furthermore, Hornsea Three is committed to developing a FCLP and an Outline FCLP has been provided as part of the application to the Secretary of State for Development Consent (document reference number A8.10).

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>23</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
National Federation of Fishermen's Organisations	<b>Commercial Fisheries EIA Methodology:</b> In so far as the cumulative assessment methodology is concerned, we consider that existing completed projects and other forms of marine management that has a bearing on fisheries should also be factored into the assessment, not just new and known future proposals.	I	Regulations pertaining to routine commercial fisheries management, including EU and UK fisheries legislation, including the Landing Obligation, are not considered plans or projects subject for assessment within the cumulative assessment (see volume 1, chapter 5: Environmental Impact Assessment Methodology for further methodology details). Projects completed before or during the time period assessed within the baseline assessment (up to 2016) are considered to form part of the baseline. Projects completed post 2016 are not reflected in the baseline and are included within the cumulative assessment (see section 6.12 of volume 2, chapter 6: Commercial Fisheries).
Norfolk County Council	<b>Commercial Fishing</b> 2.22 It is felt that where there is likely to be a demonstrable impact on commercial fishing affecting communities in Norfolk that DONG Energy should provide appropriate mitigation and compensation to those fishing communities affected.	I	Designed-in measures adopted as part of Hornsea Three, that are considered as embedded mitigation for commercial fisheries, are detailed in the Environmental Statement in Table 6.13 of volume 2, chapter 6: Commercial Fisheries. Where significant impacts have been identified, further measures related to mitigating disturbance as per FLOWW guidance have been proposed.
Norfolk Vanguard	In order to enable a robust cumulative assessment, we would like to have sight of and share information as soon as possible in relation to the baseline data that is currently being collected and ongoing assessment work pending completion, namely Chapter 3 (Fish and Shellfish Ecology), Chapter 4 (Marine Mammals), Chapter 5 (Offshore Ornithology), Chapter 6 (Commercial Fisheries) and Chapter 8 (Aviation, Military and Communication). We would welcome sight of the HRA Appropriate Assessment and discussions with the project team on the approach being taken, prior to the submission of the DCO application.	N	Hornsea Three has been in regular dialogue with the Vattenfall Vanguard project throughout the pre-application stage for each project.
Wells and District Fishermen's Association	At the present time, we will not comment on the wind farm site itself as it is beyond the usual area of fishing operations for our members. However, we will comment on your proposed cable route which cuts through our fishing grounds. If not handled well, our members will be caused considerable disruption as well as loss of fishing opportunity leading to financial loss. We are concerned!	I	Details on the fishing patterns, species mix, gear configurations and grounds targeted in the vicinity of the Hornsea Three array area and offshore cable corridor are presented in the Environmental Statement in the baseline section 6.7 of volume 2, chapter 6: Commercial Fisheries and volume 5, annex 6.1: Commercial Fisheries Technical Report. The potential impacts to local fishing fleets are considered in detail within the commercial fisheries impact assessment (section 6.11 of Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 6: Commercial Fisheries).
Wells and District Fishermen's Association	Specifically, we are concerned about the pre-dredging along the cable route; the digging of jointing cable pits; the building of sub stations along the cable route; the acquisition of land (Crown Commission); ploughing/trenching of cables into the seabed; and rock dumping. The above activities cause great upheaval to the seabed with sand and chalk fines being suspended in the water column for several miles. This can alter the topography of the seabed. In our experience, shellfish do not react well to this kind of disturbance and this can have long term consequences to the viability of the fishing grounds which we have to live with.	I	The potential impacts to crab and other shellfish resources from increased suspended sediment concentrations and sediment deposition are considered in detail in the Environmental Statement within section 3.11 of volume 2, chapter 3: Fish and Shellfish Ecology. This has informed the assessment of the potential for displacement or disruption of commercially important fish and shellfish resources in the commercial fisheries assessment (section 6.11 of Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 6: Commercial Fisheries).
Eastern Inshore Fisheries and Conservation Authority	Role of the Eastern Inshore Fisheries and Conservation Authority (Eastern IFCA) The role of the Eastern IFCA is "to lead, champion and manage a sustainable marine environment and inshore fisheries" in our district, which extends from the Humber to Harwich, and six nautical miles out to sea. The Hornsea Project Three Cable Corridor lies partly within the Eastern IFCA district. Therefore, it is considered appropriate for Eastern IFCA to provide comment on the proposal. Our interest focuses primarily on the inshore section of the cable route corridor.	N	Acknowledged



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>23</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Eastern Inshore Fisheries and Conservation Authority	<p>Use of the relevant marine plan</p> <p>In all consultation responses, the Authority assesses applications (and pre-applications) according to the Eastern IFCA vision and adherence of those same applications with policies detailed in the relevant marine plan, as directed under section 58(1) of the Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009.</p> <p>The plans relevant to the Authority's district are the East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plans. We consider whether proposed developments will have a positive, negative or negligible effect on plan policies related to the IFCA vision to "manage a sustainable marine environment and inshore fisheries". These considerations also enable the IFCA to provide advice in relation to the need to protect the environment, the need to protect human health and the need to prevent interference with other legitimate users of the sea.</p>	I	<p>Details of the policies within the East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plans relevant to commercial fisheries are included in the Environmental Statement within section 6.4.2 of volume 2, chapter 6: Commercial Fisheries.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>23</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Eastern Inshore Fisheries and Conservation Authority	<p>Policy GOV3 and FISH 1</p> <p>Within our district the cable corridor and surrounding areas lie within extremely important fishing grounds, particularly for the UK potting industry. In this area the use of passive gears is restricted within 3nm and is dominated by potting activity, almost exclusively targeting crab and lobster. Whelks are also fished, but further offshore between 3 and 6nm, and are mainly targeted in the winter, as opposed to crabs which are mainly targeted in the summer. The crab fishery represents a substantial contribution to both national and local economies (Welby, 2015). It is estimated that there are around 42 vessels operating out of ports on the north Norfolk coast between Sea Palling and Wells. Generally, fishers deploy between 200 and 1300 pots per vessel at any one time. The majority of fishers operate within the 3nm limit, as the fishery is generally exploited by single handed, small and open vessels. Other static gear fisheries occur, but on a much smaller scale. These include gill and trammel netting for bass, skate and cod and drift netting for herring (mainly in winter) and cod. A very low level of shrimp trawling occurs outside of the 3nm boundary on soft ground but this is generally impractical due to the concentration of pots in the area.</p> <p>Dredging for seed mussel has occurred in the past outside of the 3nm boundary (Byelaw 15 restricted area) on an ephemeral mussel bed, previously forming a significant fishery of approximately 10,000 tonnes in 2011. Whilst the value of this fishery was not assessed, the current value of seed mussel is around £100 per tonne for sublittoral mussels and £250 per tonne for intertidal mussels. There is currently no dredge fishery here but there is potential for this to occur again in the future. When sublittoral mussel beds occur, Eastern IFCA promotes their harvesting in recognition of the high value of this resource to local fisheries. Eastern IFCA authorises such activity with strict conditions to ensure the surrounding seabed habitats (including designated features of marine protected areas) are not adversely affected by the activity.</p> <p>According to the PEIR documentation (Volume 2, Chapter 6.11.1.28) vessels will be temporarily excluded across a '3.1 km2 area along the cable route corridor' during the construction phase for a total period of 36 months (Three, 12 month periods over 11 years). This will lead to a reduction in access to, or exclusion from, established fishing grounds along the cable corridor route and could lead to gear conflict and increased fishing pressure on adjacent grounds, additional steaming to alternate fishing grounds and a reduction in landings. In the environmental assessment, this was outlined as significant in EIA terms and Eastern IFCA agree with this. It is known that the fishermen tend to leave their pots on the ground between catches, only bringing them up for maintenance or when otherwise necessary. Temporary relocation of pots along the cable corridor route has the potential to be highly significant to the local fishing industry and the local economy.</p> <p>The mitigation described in the document states that where required justifiable disturbance payouts will be given and that they will follow the FLOWW guidance documents (2014 and 2015). The effects of construction activities will be highly dependent on the location of the cable route fisheries exclusion zone. From previous experience, it is estimated that during the construction of the Dudgeon offshore windfarm around 10 potting vessels had to move to other fishing grounds. This was not considered a significant disturbance to the fleet as a whole. One reason for this was that the cable route was not positioned within the most heavily fished areas. Current proposals for the Hornsea Three offshore windfarm suggest a much larger fisheries exclusion zone, with the potential for significant impacts. Further information is required on the proportion of the fleet that will be affected and the area that the fishery will be excluded from to assess the potential impacts and ensure appropriate action. The highest concentrations of potting activity occur over harder ground (rock and chalk features) throughout the summer and are more spread out over softer ground during the rest of year. It is therefore recommended that, to minimise impacts on the fishing industry, the cable route should avoid the subtidal rock and chalk habitat. This is in line with the above (discussed under the previous section of this consultation), to avoid this feature of the Cromer Shoal MCZ when laying the cable route to ensure conservation objectives of the designation are also met.</p>	I	<p>Details on the fishing patterns, species mix, gear configurations and grounds targeted in the vicinity of the Hornsea Three offshore cable corridor have informed the baseline section 6.7 of volume 2, chapter 6 (Commercial Fisheries) of the Environmental Statement and volume 5, annex 6.1: Commercial Fisheries Technical Report.</p> <p>The potential impact to local fishing fleets are considered in detail within section 6.11 of volume 2, chapter 6: Commercial Fisheries.</p> <p>The nearshore cable route has been refined since the publication of the PEIR and hence the area which will be impacted during cable installation has reduced</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>23</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Marine Management Organisation	6.9. The MMO considers that DONG Energy have carried out appropriate consultation with UK and foreign fishing industry to date. DONG Energy have acknowledged that "During the construction process vessels with pots set along the offshore cable corridor will be required to move [their] pots and cease fishing activities at particular construction locations" (paragraph 6.11.1.30, Volume 2, Chapter 6 – Commercial Fisheries). The MMO advises that a reduction in access to or exclusion from potting grounds is likely to involve compensation payments to fishers as mitigation for construction activities within the proposed cable corridor, in accordance with the current FLOWW Best Practice Guidance for Offshore Renewables Developments (January 2014) referenced in the report. The MMO strongly encourages open communication with commercial fishing interests throughout the Project planning and development process.	I	Hornsea Three acknowledge this. No action required.
Marine Management Organisation	1.8. It is recognised that the collection of data to inform the potential impacts of the proposed Project is an iterative process and more up to date information is likely to be available to inform the forthcoming application. The following suggestions have been made for further consideration before the application is submitted; A review of the benthic impacts and their significance following incorporation of the most recent project data, together with analysis of the Markham's triangle grab samples and samples taken during the Humber Regional Environmental Characterisation and the southern North Sea Synthesis surveys which fall within the array area and export cable corridor; - Use of the Dudgeon offshore wind farm pre-construction benthic ecology survey carried out in 2014, which would provide a more up to date data source than the 2009 characterisation survey used in the PEIR; - Incorporation of the Commercial Fisheries Scouting Survey methodology, results and interpretation, which was undertaken in 2016 and 2017 on behalf of DONG Energy for the Project; - Use of 2016 and 2017 data on commercial fishery landings and vessel movements, which can be provided by the MMO to ensure that potential impacts on commercial fisheries can be based upon the most current available data.	I	Comment acknowledged and the Environmental Statement in volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology has been updated to include the additional data collected in 2017, including Annex I reef (biogenic and stony) assessments for the offshore cable route corridor.  The results of the Dudgeon offshore wind farm pre-construction benthic ecology survey reports have incorporated into the baseline presented in the Environmental Statement in section 2.7 of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology and are discussed in volume 5, annex 2.1: Benthic Ecology Technical Report.  In the Environmental Statement, Table 6.6 of volume 2, chapter 6: Commercial Fisheries presents the site specific survey data which has informed the commercial fisheries baseline characterisation and includes the results of Commercial Fisheries Scouting Surveys undertaken along the inshore section of the Hornsea Three offshore cable corridor. Table 6.5 of volume 2, chapter 6: Commercial Fisheries summarises the key desktop datasets used to inform the commercial fisheries baseline which includes landing statistics data for UK registered vessels between 2012 and 2016 obtained from the MMO.
Natural England	2.4.15 Vol. 2 Chapter 6 – Commercial Fisheries Table 6.13, Fig. 6.19, 6.13.3.4 Offshore windfarm listed to be consented, operational or in construction: the list of UK OFWs needs checking as a number of projects has been left off the list, for example, Lincs OFW and Lynn and Inner Dowsing OWF have not been included.	I	The cumulative effect assessment methodology is provided in the Environmental Statement in section 6.12, with the assessment in section 6.13 of volume 2, chapter 6: Commercial Fisheries which has been updated with the latest available information on other plans and projects. The Lincs and Lynn and Inner Dowsing OWFs were considered but have been scoped out of the cumulative assessment on account of being considered part of the Hornsea Three commercial fisheries baseline (see volume 4, annex 5.3: Cumulative Effects Screening Matrix).
Natural England	2.4.16 Vol. 2 Chapter 6 – Commercial Fisheries Table 6.15 It is reported for 'Electromagnetic fields, habitat alteration, noise and other ecological impacts due to operational and maintenance activities leading to displacement or disruption of commercially important fish and shellfish resources' that measures are adopted as part of the project are detailed in chapter 3. However in Chapter 3, see table 3.27, with the exception of the PEMMP there are no other measures adopted by the project under the operational phase. This needs checking as it is currently misleading.	I	As described in the Environmental Statement in volume 2, chapter 3: Fish and Shellfish Ecology, EMF during operation would be mitigated by use of armoured cable for array, interconnector cables and export cables buried at a sufficient depth to reduce the potential impact of EMF on fish and shellfish. An appropriate PEMMP will be produced and followed to cover the operation and maintenance phase of Hornsea Three to ensure that the potential for release of pollutants from construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning plant is minimised (see Table 3.16 of volume 2, chapter 3: Fish and Shellfish Ecology).
VisNed	<b>Offshore Array</b> - As stated during meetings VisNed is strongly in favor of the largest type of turbines. This means spacing between turbines will be as wide as possible and shape the best possible conditions for fishing in an array.	Y	The maximum design scenario (see in the Environmental Statement, Table 6.9 of volume 2, chapter 6: Commercial Fisheries) describes turbine layout parameters (minimum spacing: 1,000 m) and scenarios for exclusion of commercial fisheries at each stage of the development. The maximum number of turbines has been reduced from 340 at PEIR to 300 at the point of application in response to this and other comments.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>23</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
VisNed	<b>Mitigation Measures</b> - We encourage a pragmatic approach during construction keeping as much of the area open and no unnecessary closures for parts of the area where no construction is taking place. Closure of the whole area has a much larger impact on certain vessels and fishing communities than the Dutch demersal fleet as a whole. As stated during meetings VisNed is strongly in favour of the largest type of turbines. This means spacing between turbines will be as wide as possible and shape the best possible conditions for fishing in an array.	I	The maximum design scenario (see in the Environmental Statement, Table 6.9 of volume 2, chapter 6: Commercial Fisheries) describes turbine layout parameters (minimum spacing: 1,000 m) and scenarios for exclusion of commercial fisheries at each stage of the development.  The removal of floating turbines from the project description results in the maximum design scenario assessing gravity based structure foundations (GBS) (see Table 6.9 of volume 2, chapter 6: Commercial Fisheries). Coexistence is therefore fundamental to the commercial fisheries impact assessment.
<b>Section 42: Local Authorities (prescribed under section 43 of the Act)</b>			
Norfolk County Council	Commercial Fishing 2.22 It is felt that where there is likely to be a demonstrable impact on commercial fishing affecting communities in Norfolk that DONG Energy should provide appropriate mitigation and compensation to those fishing communities affected.	I	Designed-in measures adopted as part of Hornsea Three, that are considered as embedded mitigation for commercial fisheries, are detailed in the Environmental Statement in Table 6.13 of volume 2, chapter 6: Commercial Fisheries. Where significant impacts have been identified, further measures related to mitigating disturbance as per FLOWW guidance have been proposed.
<b>Section 42: Persons with an interest in the land (prescribed under section 44 of the Act)</b>			
No comments were received by landowners or land interests relating to commercial fisheries under Phase 2.A..			
<b>Section 47: Duty to consult local community</b>			
Ann Abbott	5. The North Sea here supports the small scale crab and lobster fishery which is vital to the economy and character of the area.	I	Detailed characterisation of commercial fisheries, including lobster and crab fisheries, is presented in the baseline section of the Environmental Statement (volume 2, chapter 6: Commercial Fisheries, section 6.7) and volume 5, annex 6.1: Commercial Fisheries Technical Report.
Robert J Cumber	2) The impact on marine archaeology, wildlife and local fishing interests Having carefully read the non-technical summary of the PEIR I can find no direct reference to the north Norfolk chalk reef. This is of great concern as it seems inevitable that the laying and maintenance of 6 major cables along the seabed towards Weybourne will significantly disrupt the delicate ecology of the area. Reports about the reef such as the Marine Survey by SeaSearch East <a href="http://seasearch.org.uk/downloads/Norfolk%20Chalk%20Reef%20report%202010.pdf">http://seasearch.org.uk/downloads/Norfolk%20Chalk%20Reef%20report%202010.pdf</a> make it clear (section 6.8) that the reef can easily be worn away by the simple movement of the tides on a loose crab pot. Presumably cable laying / untethered cables has the potential to create significant reef damage. It is clear from this report that because of the depth of the seawater and the effect of tidal movement at Weybourne the reef has by no means been adequately surveyed at this point. What steps are proposed to fully survey and evaluate the chalk reef at Weybourne prior to any cable laying being permitted? Whilst the reef itself is an amazing geological feature so too is all the marine life which inhabits it including the fish, crab and lobsters which provide the livelihood for the small but highly important fishing community which launches at Weybourne. In our opinion the whole of the north Norfolk reef should be created a SSSI and no cables permitted to cross it whatsoever. Whilst the local fishermen live alongside and respect the reef industrial cable-laying ships will not.	I	Since PEIR publication, the Hornsea Three offshore cable corridor has been re-routed to avoid reef features within the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ. No direct impacts on chalk reef habitats will therefore occur.  A full assessment of the effects of Hornsea Three on benthic ecology, including on features of designated sites, is presented in Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology. Discussions on the effects of Hornsea Three on the qualifying benthic habitats of the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ is also presented in Environmental Statement volume 5, annex 2.3: MCZ Assessment.
Friends of North Norfolk	14. PEIR Volume 2, which deals with offshore, impacts because of inter-relationship and cumulative harm to/ with onshore receptors, notably: - Chapter 4 Marine Mammals. The importance of both grey and common seal colonies, as an ecological and tourist asset. - Chapter 5 Offshore Ornithology. - Chapter 6 Commercial Fisheries. - Chapter 10 Seascape and Visual Resources.	I	An assessment of the cumulative effects of Hornsea Three with other plans and projects is presented Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 4: Marine Mammals, chapter 5: Offshore Ornithology, chapter 6: Commercial Fisheries and chapter 10: Seascape and Visual Resources as well as throughout the remainder of Environmental Statement chapters. A description of the likely inter-related effects arising from Hornsea Three on receptors is provided in the Environmental Statement in volume 2, chapter 12: Inter-Related Effects (Offshore).



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>23</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
David and Julie Brooks	<p>Further to our email dated 15 September 2017 we have another comment as follows: 11) We are concerned about the effect of such a massive engineering project on the local fishermen. Fishing boats, using tractors, are launched, and landed, regularly from Weybourne Beach to catch the large numbers of crabs which are important to the local economy, being used by many restaurants and fishmongers in the area. Their livelihood would presumably be seriously diminished for a long time. Also, there are many fishermen who fish regularly from the beach for mackerel, etc. Fish and crab stocks could be severely depleted by this disruption to the seabed and beach.</p>	I	<p>The potential impacts to crab and other shellfish and finfish resources are considered in detail in the Environmental Statement within volume 2, chapter 3: Fish and Shellfish Ecology. This has informed the commercial fisheries EIA, which has assessed the potential for displacement or disruption of commercially important fish and shellfish resources (section 6.11 of volume 2, chapter 6: Commercial Fisheries). The potential impact to local fishing fleets are also considered in detail within the commercial fisheries impact assessment (section 6.11 of volume 2, chapter 6: Commercial Fisheries).</p>
Rt Hon Norman Lamb MP	<p>They also have misgivings, which I share, about the plans for a phased delivery of the project that could last for nearly a decade. Were that to happen it would have a major adverse effect on residents' lives, livelihoods- especially fishing and tourism- and environment and a lasting impact on transport infrastructure, wider tourism, flora and fauna.</p>	Y	<p>During the design refinement Hornsea Three has sought to minimise the duration of any disruption, and has reduced the total number of phases from three to two, and reduced the duration of the construction phase onshore from eleven to eight years.</p> <p>Potential impacts from Hornsea Three on socio-economic and tourism are identified and assessed in Environmental Statement Volume 3, Chapter 10: Socio-Economics. Taking into consideration the mitigation designed into Hornsea Three, no significant adverse effects are predicted.</p> <p>Impacts from Hornsea Three on transport and ecological receptors are assessed in Environment Statement volume 3, chapters 7: Traffic and Transport and chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation. Inter-related effects on local residents, as a result of impact interactions, are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 11: Inter-related Effects.</p>
<b>Section 48: Duty to publicise</b>			
<i>No comments were received by in response to the public notice issued during Phase 2.A relating to commercial fisheries.</i>			

Table 2.12: Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Further Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.B) relating to commercial fisheries.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>24</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 42: Prescribed consultees (The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009: Schedule 1))</b>			
Eastern Inshore Fisheries and Conservation Authority	Within our district the cable corridor route and surrounding areas lie within important fishing grounds, particularly for the UK potting industry. In this area the use of passive gears is restricted within 3nm and is dominated by potting activity, almost exclusively targeting crab and lobster. Whelks are also fished, but further offshore between 3 and 6nm, and are mainly targeted in the winter, as opposed to crabs which are mainly targeted in the summer. The crab fishery represents a substantial contribution to both national and local economies (Welby, 2015). It is estimated that there are around 42 vessels operating out of ports on the north Norfolk coast between Sea Palling and Wells. Generally, fishers deploy between 200 and 1300 pots per vessel at any one time. The majority of fishers operate within the 3nm limit, as the fishery is generally exploited by single handed, small and open vessels. Other static gear fisheries occur, but on a much smaller scale. These include gill and trammel netting for bass, skate and cod and drift netting for herring (mainly in winter) and cod. A very low level of shrimp trawling occurs outside of the 3nm boundary on soft ground but this is generally impractical due to the concentration of pots in the area.	I	Details on the fishing patterns, species mix, gear configurations and grounds targeted in the vicinity of the Hornsea Three offshore cable corridor have informed section 6.7 of Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 6: Commercial Fisheries and volume 5, annex 6.1: Commercial Fisheries Technical Report. The stock assessment undertaken by Welby (2015) has been of particular importance to the baseline characterisation and assessment of the crab and lobster fishery, including MSAR data. Information provided within the Section 42 consultation and during subsequent meetings with the Eastern IFCA has informed the baseline characterisation of inshore fisheries.
Eastern Inshore Fisheries and Conservation Authority	Dredging for seed mussel has occurred in the past outside of the 3nm boundary (Byelaw 15 restricted area) on an ephemeral mussel bed, previously forming a significant fishery of approximately 10,000 tonnes in 2011. Whilst the value of this fishery was not assessed, the current value of seed mussel is around £100 per tonne for sublittoral mussels and £250 per tonne for intertidal mussels. There is currently no dredge fishery in this area but there is potential for this to occur again in the future. When sublittoral mussel beds occur, Eastern IFCA promotes their harvesting in recognition of the high value of this resource to local fisheries. Eastern IFCA authorises such activity with strict conditions to ensure the surrounding seabed habitats (including designated features of marine protected areas) are not adversely affected by the activity.	I	Information on the mussel seed fishery provided within the Section 42 consultation and during subsequent meetings with the Eastern IFCA has informed the baseline section 6.7 of volume 2, chapter 6: Commercial Fisheries and volume 5, annex 6.1: Commercial Fisheries Technical Report of the Environmental Statement.
Eastern Inshore Fisheries and Conservation Authority	According to the PEIR documentation (Volume 2, Chapter 6.11.1.28) vessels will be temporarily excluded across a '3.1 km <sup>2</sup> area along the cable route corridor' during the construction phase for a total period of 36 months (Three, 12 month periods over 11 years). This will lead to a reduction in access to, or exclusion from, established fishing grounds along the cable corridor route and could lead to gear conflict and increased fishing pressure on adjacent grounds, additional steaming to alternate fishing grounds and a reduction in landings. It is known that the fishermen tend to leave their pots on the ground between catches, only bringing them up for maintenance or when otherwise necessary. Therefore, temporary relocation of pots along the cable corridor route has the potential to be highly significant to the local fishing industry and the local economy.	I	The potential for impact from the construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning of the Hornsea Three offshore cable corridor is considered in section 6.11 of Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 6: Commercial Fisheries. During construction of Hornsea Three offshore cable corridor, a significant adverse impact is assessed for the UK potting fleet, and therefore additional measures are proposed to reduce the residual effect to minor adverse significance.
Eastern Inshore Fisheries and Conservation Authority	In the PEIR environmental assessment, this was outlined as significant in EIA terms and Eastern IFCA agreed with this. The proposed re-route to the inshore section of the cable route will move construction activities further away from more intense areas of fishing activity (Fishermap, 2017). The highest concentrations of potting activity occur over harder ground (rock and chalk features) throughout the summer and are more spread out over softer ground during the rest of year. Whilst impacts on fishermen who fish within the proposed re-route will still be significant, the intensity of activities in this area is lower and therefore the overall significance of impacts will be reduced. Therefore, Eastern IFCA are again in support of the proposed re-route to the inshore section of the cable corridor and this would be our preferred option. However, it is recommended that further assessment is required to determine the area that the fishery will be excluded from and the proportion of the fishing fleet that will be affected. This will allow further assessment of the potential impacts of both cable route options on fishermen's livelihoods and ensure that the correct action is taken to mitigate any impacts.	I	The potential for impact from the construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning of the Hornsea Three offshore cable corridor is considered in section 6.11 of Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 6: Commercial Fisheries. Additional measures are proposed to reduce the impact on UK potters during construction. With respect to any justifiable disturbance payment, the procedures as outlined in the FLOWW guidance (2014 and 2015), will be followed.

<sup>24</sup> Y = Yes change made; N = No change made; I = Incorporated into or considered when producing the assessment or landowner voluntary agreement offer; N/A = Not applicable.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>24</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Eastern Inshore Fisheries and Conservation Authority	Again, the provision of GI shape files showing the locations of proposed works, particularly the original offshore cable corridor and the proposed re-route, would be extremely helpful in identifying the location of proposed works in relation to designated features of MPAs that would be affected. It would also be useful to have more detailed timings of the proposed activities as there is often seasonal variation in the sensitivity of some habitat features and the importance of fisheries can vary though out the year.	I	GIS shapefiles for the proposed works (detailing the export cable route) have been provided to the stakeholder. More detail has been added the Project Description Chapter of the Environmental Statement (see Volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description), however at this stage it is not possible to provide precise timings of the proposed activities to this level of detail.
Marine Management Organisation	<b>2. Are there any additional baseline data sources available that could be used to inform the EIA?</b> 2.1 Key desktop data sources have been identified to characterise fish ecology and commercial fisheries within the potential offshore alternative routes (Table 2.1, 'Section 42 Consultation: Potential Offshore Alternative Routes - Supporting Information'). Table 2.1 references the PEIR fish ecology and commercial fisheries chapters which present sources including survey data collected from Hornsea One and Two projects, in addition to publicly available data sources. They are considered to be sufficient to characterise fish ecology and commercial fisheries within the potential alternative routes.	I	Comments from the MMO are acknowledged.
Marine Management Organisation	2.5. The MMO recommends the use of fisheries data from both landings and Vessel Monitoring Systems (VMS). Fishing effort by the under 21m fleet is often underestimated since VMS use is required for vessels below this size threshold and such vessels may be missed by overflight surveys. Consultation with fishers is recommended to obtain the information needed to inform the ES.	I	Comments acknowledged from the MMO. Landings and VMS data has been used to characterise the baseline environment in Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 6: Commercial Fisheries, although the limitations have also been noted within the chapter (section 6.7.4). VMS data was available from the MMO for vessels greater than or equal to 15m in length. It is noted that VMS is recorded for vessels greater than or equal to 12m, but VMS data is not yet publicly available for 12 to 14.99m vessels. Consultation has been undertaken with UK and non-UK countries covering inshore and offshore commercial fisheries stakeholders and fleets operating in the vicinity of Hornsea Three to inform the baseline environment.
Marine Management Organisation	2.6. The use of Marine Conservation Society SeaSearch data is recommended as an additional source of marine species and habitat data for inshore areas of the export cable corridor.	I	Data from Marine Recorder, including SeaSearch dive surveys within the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ and the Wash and North Norfolk Coast SAC, have been used to characterise the baseline environment of the Hornsea Three offshore cable corridor (see section 2.3 of Environmental Statement volume 5, annex 2.1: Benthic Ecology Technical Report).
Marine Management Organisation	3.2. Attention is drawn to previous MMO advice that should the heat mapping approach be used to support the potential sandeel habitat assessment, the limitations and caveats associated with the proposed Latta et al. (2013) assessment should be acknowledged in the ES.	N	Hornsea Three acknowledges these caveats/limitations however heat mapping was not carried out.
Marine Management Organisation	3.3. Consultation on the proposed export cable corridor routes may highlight potentially adverse impacts for commercial fishing vessels small than 15m through the temporary loss of access to plotting grounds during construction of the development and longer term loss of fishing grounds resulting from cable protection measures. Where appropriate, the MMO recommends that mitigation measures should be established and presented in the ES to help reduce any adverse impacts to fishers, primarily through displacement of gear into other areas which may result in gear conflict.	I	The potential for impact from the construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning of the Hornsea Three offshore cable corridor is considered in section 6.11 of Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 6: Commercial Fisheries. During construction of Hornsea Three offshore cable corridor, a significant adverse impact is assessed for the UK potting fleet, and therefore additional measures are proposed to reduce the residual effect to minor adverse significance. With respect to any justifiable disturbance payment, the procedures as outlined in the FLOWW guidance (2014 and 2015), will be followed. In addition, as part of built in mitigation, Hornsea Three are committed to developing a fisheries co-existence and liaison plan, which would be produced in collaboration with the NFFO and other fisheries representatives.
<b>Section 42: Local Authorities (prescribed under section 43 of the Act)</b>			
No comments were received by local authorities relating to commercial fisheries under Phase 2.B.			
<b>Section 42: Persons with an interest in the land (prescribed under section 44 of the Act)</b>			
No comments were received by landowners or land interests relating to commercial fisheries under Phase 2.B.			

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>24</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 47: Duty to consult local community</b>			
Andrew Roper, Chairman, The Greater Wash Fishing Industries Group	The Greater Wash Fishing Industries Group members are holding objections and concerns with regard to the width of the offshore cable corridor	I	The potential for impact from the construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning of the Hornsea Three offshore cable corridor is considered in section 6.11 of volume 2, chapter 6: Commercial Fisheries.
Andrew Roper, Chairman, The Greater Wash Fishing Industries Group	The Greater Wash Fishing Industries Group members are holding objections and concerns with regard to the size of survey areas	N	The surveys being undertaken in 2018 are not part of the application for Development Consent.
Andrew Roper, Chairman, The Greater Wash Fishing Industries Group	The Greater Wash Fishing Industries Group members are holding objections and concerns with regard to the time of year that are proposed to lay seabed cables	I	The potential for impact from the construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning of the Hornsea Three offshore cable corridor is considered in section 6.11 of volume 2, chapter 6: Commercial Fisheries. Seasonality of commercial fisheries landings are presented in volume 5, annex 6.1: Commercial Fisheries Technical Report.
Andrew Roper, Chairman, The Greater Wash Fishing Industries Group	The Greater Wash Fishing Industries Group members are holding objections and concerns with regard to the impact that this will have upon their businesses.	I	The potential for impact from the construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning of the Hornsea Three offshore cable corridor is considered in section 6.11 of volume 2, chapter 6: Commercial Fisheries.
Andrew Roper, Chairman, The Greater Wash Fishing Industries Group	I understand that there will be meetings between Orsted representatives and representatives of the local fishing industry early in the New Year and we anticipate that the Greater Wash Fishing Industries Group will be invited to send representatives to any such meetings.	N	These meetings did not relate to the application for Development Consent for Hornsea Three.
<b>Section 48: Duty to publicise</b>			
Andrew Roper, Chairman, The Greater Wash Fishing Industries Group	The Greater Wash Fishing Industries Group members are holding objections and concerns with regard to the width of the offshore cable corridor	I	The potential for impact from the construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning of the Hornsea Three offshore cable corridor is considered in section 6.11 of volume 2, chapter 6: Commercial Fisheries.
Andrew Roper, Chairman, The Greater Wash Fishing Industries Group	The Greater Wash Fishing Industries Group members are holding objections and concerns with regard to the size of survey areas	N	The surveys being undertaken in 2018 are not part of the application for Development Consent.
Andrew Roper, Chairman, The Greater Wash Fishing Industries Group	The Greater Wash Fishing Industries Group members are holding objections and concerns with regard to the time of year that are proposed to lay seabed cables	I	The potential for impact from the construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning of the Hornsea Three offshore cable corridor is considered in section 6.11 of volume 2, chapter 6: Commercial Fisheries. Seasonality of commercial fisheries landings are presented in volume 5, annex 6.1: Commercial Fisheries Technical Report.
Andrew Roper, Chairman, The Greater Wash Fishing Industries Group	The Greater Wash Fishing Industries Group members are holding objections and concerns with regard to the impact that this will have upon their businesses.	I	The potential for impact from the construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning of the Hornsea Three offshore cable corridor is considered in section 6.11 of volume 2, chapter 6: Commercial Fisheries.
Andrew Roper, Chairman, The Greater Wash Fishing Industries Group	I understand that there will be meetings between Orsted representatives and representatives of the local fishing industry early in the New Year and we anticipate that the Greater Wash Fishing Industries Group will be invited to send representatives to any such meetings.	N	These meetings did not relate to the application for Development Consent for Hornsea Three.



## 2.7 Shipping and Navigation

Table 2.13: Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.A) relating to shipping and navigation.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>25</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 42: Prescribed consultees (The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009: Schedule 1))</b>			
BP Shipping Ltd	My query is regarding <b>Chapter 7 - Shipping and Navigation</b> , of the recently published <b>PEIR for Hornsea Three</b> . The analysis identifies various impacted vessel types and routes via AIS survey, explicitly naming a few individual vessels. Please can you share with me a list of the vessel names from your AIS surveys, and advise whether you have done any direct consultation with ship operators of those vessels and what that looked like?	I	Amendments have been made to Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 7: Shipping and Navigation and volume 5, annex 7.1: Navigational Risk Assessment; highlighting regular operator consultation which is based on the operators observed in the area. In addition, a letter was sent to BP confirming consultation taken to date and offer of consultation meeting if required.
Cruising Association	Thank you for your letter and USB card. The Cruising Association has approximately 6,000 people in membership with some 4,000 yachts and comments only on the Navigation and Small Vessel Safety aspects of such proposals. Where our members have concerns on other aspects we invite them to make these known through other organisations more suitable. (Members have also expressed concern about Marine Mammals and land-side Visual Amenity). In principle we do not object to the proposal but do have the following concerns:	I	The response is noted and has been included in Table 11.4 of Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 11: Infrastructure and Other Users.
Cruising Association	<b>Cruising Yacht Routes</b> We doubt the very low figures recorded at Para 3.3.3.12 for yachts crossing the cable corridor. Yacht traffic is not heavy but all on passages between the Channel/ East Coast rivers and the Humber northwards including Scotland plus those originating from the continent must cross the corridor somewhere. We have no data but suggest that 5-10 per day during the summer period may be more accurate.	N	Marine traffic surveys for the Hornsea Three offshore cable corridor also consider desktop resources such as the RYA UK Coastal Atlas of Recreational Boating (2016). It is this information which informs the EIA
Cruising Association	<b>Operating Port</b> We reserve comment on your landside operating port since the location of this is not yet known. It is our experience that there is usually no conflict between recreational craft and wind-farm boats but this can occur in the immediate vicinity of some ports. Published fixed routing of construction traffic and construction site may be advisable.	I	Construction traffic will be monitored and managed by a marine coordinator so that vessels do not impact on other users.
Cruising Association	<b>Turbine Layout</b> It is a matter of safety for recreational craft that the layout of turbines should be in straight lines following a rectangular or similar pattern aligned with the prevailing wind thus enabling a 'see-through' passage by small craft. This considerably eases accurate steering in poor weather and largely avoids disorientation of helmsmen. We are sensitive however to the point made at 7.11.2.146 of the PEIR that in this case such a layout would increase cost to the taxpayer. Our point is eased by adoption of a minimum turbine spacing of 1,000m or greater and disorientation of helmsmen can be mitigated to an extent by additional internal marking and lighting as considered at 7.16.15. Turbine towers are an obstruction to free navigation and we would always support fewer, larger, turbines than greater numbers of smaller turbines. Given the choice of layouts offered we opt for Layout A rather than Layout B but would defer to the view of MCA/TH on the matter.	I	Internal navigation impacts are considered in section 7.11 of Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 7: Shipping and Navigation and Environmental Statement section 22 volume 5, annex 7.1: Navigational Risk Assessment.
Cruising Association	<b>Sub-Stations</b> For similar reasons we ask that sub-stations, accommodation platforms, met masts, etc. should be constructed as far as possible in line with turbines.	I	Internal navigation impacts are considered in section 7.11 of Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 7: Shipping and Navigation and Environmental Statement section 22 of volume 5, annex 7.1: Navigational Risk Assessment.

<sup>25</sup> Y = Yes change made; N = No change made; I = Incorporated into or considered when producing the assessment or landowner voluntary agreement offer; N/A = Not applicable.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>25</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Cruising Association	<p><b>Booster Station Area</b> Yachts and other recreational craft in this area of the North Sea most commonly transit north-south typically within 25nm of the coast but occasionally much further offshore. We can confirm your survey data that such traffic is almost nil during winter but your September survey data rather misses the peak summer season when perhaps double the number of recreational craft surveyed may be typically expected. We ask therefore for the Booster Station to be constructed as far north-east towards the turbine field as possible. We reserve on marking and lighting of the structure until more details are available but suspect that additional standard navigation marks may be needed. Para 7.16.1.8 refers</p>	Y	<p>The survey period for the summer season was agreed with the MCA and satisfies the requirements of MGN 543.</p> <p>The survey data is reported in Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 7: Shipping and Navigation. Recreational vessels are discussed in Environmental Statement section 11.7 of volume 2, chapter 11: Infrastructure and Other Users. The location of the offshore HVAC booster station search area has been refined since the publication of the PEIR. The offshore HVAC booster station search area now occupies the central region of the offshore HVAC booster station search area presented in the PEIR. Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives presents further justification for this change. The lighting and marking of the offshore HVAC booster stations is presented in Environmental Statement Table 11.27 of volume 2, chapter 11: Infrastructure and Other Users. Recreational vessels are discussed in section Environmental Statement 11.7 of volume 2, chapter 11: Infrastructure and Other Users.</p>
Cruising Association	<p><b>Collision and Allision Risk</b> Our experience with wind farms is that there is little increase in collision risk for yachts except in areas close to wind farm working harbours where specialised construction traffic may be manoeuvring and areas along the perimeter of wind farms where main routes are diverted thus forcing yachts and large vessels into proximity. We reserve on this until more is known about your proposed local working and storage harbours and frequency of use. We have no experience of offshore structures with floating foundations (Para 7.11.2.85) but think that any horizontal movement of the structures will not be significant to recreational craft and that a maintained minimum water depth above catenaries, etc. of 3m, preferably 4m, will be sufficient. Para 7.16.1.5 goes a long way to meet our concerns.</p>	Y	<p>Construction traffic will be monitored and managed by a marine coordinator so that vessels do not impact on other users. Floating foundations are no longer under consideration.</p>
Cruising Association	<p><b>Cable Landing</b> We have no concerns about cable burial, protection, etc. in depths greater than 10m. In lesser depths we ask that cables are buried 1m with a minimum of 1.5m where yachts may commonly anchor. A smooth bottom with no berms or 'humps' over the cable should be maintained at all times. When more details are available we may also ask for provision of a marker beacon or daymark to indicate the landing point from seaward.</p>	I	<p>Regarding burial depths, a Cable Burial Risk Assessment (or similar) is included as a measure adopted as part of Hornsea Three with detail provided in section 7.10 of Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 7: Shipping and Navigation and section 23 of Environmental Statement volume 5, annex 7.1: Navigational Risk Assessment.</p>
Cruising Association	<p><b>Safety Zones</b> We fully support safety zones of 50m around completed turbine towers and 500m around maintenance procedures (as indicated by presence of work-boats) and accommodation platforms plus 500m moving zones around cable-layers and similar specialised vessels.</p>	I	<p>Comment noted and Safety Zones are discussed in Table 11.27 of Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 11: Infrastructure and Other Users. Further, details on the application and use of safety zones is provided in section 7.10 of Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 7: Shipping and Navigation and section 23 of Environmental Statement volume 5, annex 7.1: Navigational Risk Assessment.</p>
Cruising Association	<p><b>Cumulative Aspects</b> We have a growing concern about the proliferation of offshore wind farms in the southern North Sea. While much yacht traffic is fairly close inshore and thus not badly affected the remaining traffic is normally on long-distance passages confronted with a need to be constantly avoiding wind farms or making through-passages between the towers. It is of increasing importance therefore that consideration is given to cumulative affects with coordination of marking, layout and spacing between neighbouring farms. Hornsea 3 therefore should if possible be coordinated in layout with the other Hornsea farms. The proposed channel between Hornsea 2 and Hornsea 3 will prove valuable in resolving this concern but may be treated as a Narrow Channel under Rule 9 of Colregs and require additional buoyage and lighting</p>	I	<p>The CEA in section 7.12 of Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 7: Shipping and Navigation and section 21 of Environmental Statement volume 5, annex 7.1: Navigational Risk Assessment takes into account the impact associated with Hornsea Three together with other projects and plans. This includes the proposed navigational corridor.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>25</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Cruising Association	<b>General</b> We support your assessment at 7.11.2.35 that recreational craft are likely to use the Hornsea site as a passage waypoint and that they can do so safely. It should be noted that a relatively large proportion of foreign-flagged yachts, strangers to the area, may be expected in the general location and these may not be equipped with local knowledge or up-to-date large-scale charts, etc. Our policy is therefore always to seek consistency in overall design and regulation of all wind farms in north-west Europe.	I	Hornsea Three has committed to developing a wind farm layout with a single line of orientation meaning the turbines will be in development rows. The wind farm will include lighting and marking in accordance with Trinity House.
Ministry of Infrastructure and the Environment, Dutch Government	We would like to get the information about the handling of ferry's (passenger and ro-ro) through the windfarm(s). More specifically: Are the ferry's allowed to pass through the wind-farm, all sizes or limited to a maximum length? Are the adverse weather condition routes analyzed before the installation of HSIII or after? Are alternative routes provided through the farms, e.g. by means of a "channel"? Is the routing of ferry's different through the park and in the vicinity of the HVAC station? I would be grateful if you would take some time to get us familiar with the way DONG is handling the ferry traffic in this windfarm. If possible a meeting by phone would be preferred by me.	I	Main routes including ferry routes have been considered at a base case and future case level in section 16 of Environmental Statement volume 5, annex 7.1: Navigational Risk Assessment, details adverse weather routing for commercial ferry routes. This consultation has been undertaken with the support of the operator DFDS who attended the hazard workshop for the project. Impacts have been considered acceptable given the minor deviations predicted post development of Hornsea Project Three. Given the direction of DFDS routes and the location of the proposed navigation corridor it is considered unlikely that ferry operators will use it. However, it has been designed in close consultation with the Maritime and Coastguard Agency and marine spatial planning guidance to ensure it is of adequate width to safely manage predicted levels of traffic. Given the small development area or the Offshore HVAC Booster Stations there are not expected to be any impacts on ferry or other vessel routing and is considered in section 18.4 of Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 7: Shipping and Navigation
Conoco Phillips (U.K.) Limited	3) Collision Risk Management System (CRMS) - At present, the impact of displacing shipping is uncertain, however, traffic is likely to increase proximate to our assets. This has a number of significant implications to COP's existing Marine Operations arrangements including the Radar Early Warning System (REWS) and Emergency Response and Rescue Vessels (ERRV) used to monitor the approach of errant vessels to COP's assets. COP expects Hornsea Three to acknowledge that it will have an obligation to procure a mitigation solution if required, with parties agreeing to work together in good faith and expeditiously to identify the extent of risk to the CRMS, REWS and ERRV and suitable and proportionate mitigation measures to ensure that such systems are not impaired by the construction and operation of Hornsea Three.	I	The potential impact on ConocoPhillips REWS and the potential effect of displaced shipping routes on ConocoPhillips CPA is assessed in section 11.11.2 of volume 2, chapter 11: Infrastructure and Other Users.  The displacement of shipping routes and the effect on ERRV is assessed in volume 2, chapter 7: Shipping and Navigation.
Maritime & Coastguard Agency	The MCA's remit for offshore renewable energy development is to ensure that safety of navigation is preserved, as progress is made towards government targets for renewable energy. This response is focused on the shipping and navigation elements of the PEIR and will form the basis of our response to the Environmental Statement (ES) in due course.	N	Comment noted
Maritime & Coastguard Agency	Construction scenarios MCA would like to see continuous construction which is progressive across the wind farm with no opportunity for two separate areas to be constructed with a gap in the middle.	I	Comment noted. The project has assessed a phased approach within all chapters of the Environmental Statement including volume 2, chapter 7: Shipping and Navigation, with the assessment allowing for build out in one or two phases.
Maritime & Coastguard Agency	Navigation Risk Assessment and MGN Checklist The full Navigation Risk Assessment (NRA) and MGN Checklist have not been received however we expect to receive them at the ES application stage.	I	A NRA and MGN Checklist were submitted as part of the PEIR for review and the MCA were guided as to where this could be found. These are also provided as part of the final application for Development Consent
Maritime & Coastguard Agency	Hydrographic Survey Data MGN 543 Annex 2 Paragraph 6 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 Manager. This information will need to be submitted, ideally at the ES stage.	I	Hydrographic data will be supplied to the MCA as it becomes available following relevant surveys. This will consist of the Hornsea Three array area and the surrounding 500 m provided pre-consent, the Hornsea Three offshore export cable route provided post-construction, and both the Hornsea Three array area and the surrounding 500 m and the Hornsea Three offshore export cable route provided post-decommissioning.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>25</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Maritime & Coastguard Agency	<b>Cable Routes</b> Export cable routes, cable burial protection index and cable protections are issues that are yet to be fully developed. However due cognisance needs to address cable burial and protection, particularly close to shore where impacts on navigable water depth may become significant. Any consented cable protection works must ensure existing and future safe navigation is not compromised. The MCA would accept a maximum of 5% reduction in surrounding depth referenced to Chart Datum. Existing charted anchorage areas should be avoided.	I	Measures adopted as part of Hornsea Three are outlined in section 7.10 of Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 7: Shipping and Navigation and section 23 of Environmental Statement volume 5, annex 7.1: Navigational Risk Assessment and include a Cable Burial Risk Assessment (or similar), details on the application and use of safety zones and commitment to an ERCoP.
Maritime & Coastguard Agency	<b>Layout Design</b> The turbine layout design will require MCA approval 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. Any additional navigation safety and/or Search and Rescue requirements, as per MGN 543 Annex 5, will be agreed at the approval stage.	I	The Layout Development Principles (Environmental Statement volume 4, annex 3.7) will be used to define the layout post consent and will require the MMO to confirm in writing that they have been met.
Maritime & Coastguard Agency	<b>Safety Zones</b> Safety zones during the construction, maintenance and decommissioning phases 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.	I	Comment noted. A Safety Zone Statement is provided as part of the application for Development Consent
Maritime & Coastguard Agency	<b>Emergency Response Co-operation Plans</b> An Emergency Response Cooperation Plan is required to meet the requirements of MCA guidance. The template is available on the MCA website at <a href="http://www.gov.uk">www.gov.uk</a> . An approved ERCOP will need to be in place prior to construction.	I	Comment noted. This is secured in the draft Development Consent Order that accompanies the application.
Maritime & Coastguard Agency	<b>Mooring arrangements</b> It is noted that floating wind turbines are being considered and information on potential mooring arrangements should be included in the ES. This includes possible anchor and line spread, monitoring during construction and operation, recovery of turbines and Third Party Verification. Reference should be made to recent guidance on regulatory expectations developed by MCA and HSE.	Y	Floating foundations have been removed from the project design envelope following feedback received as part of PEIR
Trinity House	I can confirm that Trinity House is satisfied with the PEIR, the contents of which have been noted.	N	Noted
Trinity House	However, our concerns remain over the structural design of the substations, as well as their locations and also the proposed layout of the array of wind turbines. We would of course welcome the earliest of consultation on these matters once further details become available.	I	A post PEIR meeting was held between Hornsea Project Three and Trinity House where details as the worst case layout taken into the assessment and intended location of substation and search area for HVAC booster stations was presented
UK Chamber of Shipping	Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Hornsea Project Three Offshore Wind Farm development. The UK Chamber has no particular comments to make.	N	Noted



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>25</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Dutch Ministry of Infrastructure and Environment	<p>Shipping: My colleague Pieter Jonker who looked at the situation with regard to ferries has sent you a message on the 11th of September 2017: "... We would like to get the information about the handling of ferry's (passenger and ro-ro) through the windfarm(s). More specifically: Are the ferry's allowed to pass through the wind-farm, all sizes or limited to a maximum length? Are the adverse weather condition routes analyzed before the installation of HSIII or after? Are alternative routes provided through the farms, e.g. by means of a "channel"? Is the routing of ferry's different through the park and in the vicinity of the HVAC station? I would be grateful if you would take some time to get us familiar with the way DONG is handling the ferry traffic in this windfarm. If possible a meeting by phone would be preferred by me. " We have a concern with regard to this topic as we plan our next generation wind farms and look into the possibility and location of corridors for this type of ships through wind farms. An international coherent approach is essential and discussions on this would be appreciated.</p>	N	A response was sent to Pieter Jonker on the 13 November 2017 addressing questions and clarifications requested following the PEIR consultation
Ministry of Defence	The need for the proposed development to be fitted with relevant aviation and maritime warning lighting to maintain navigational safety is recognised. It should be noted that, subject to verifying the precise location and height of structures above sea level, the MOD may request that structures featured in the scheme (such as platforms) are fitted with aviation warning lighting when there is no mandatory requirement for installation. This would serve to maintain safety in relation to defence aviation activities undertaken in the area.	I	Hornsea Three acknowledges that consultation will be required with the MOD once the precise location and height of structures above sea level is known and recognises that the MOD may subsequently request structures (such as turbines and platforms) to be fitted with aviation warning lighting when there is no mandatory requirement for installation.
Centrica	<p>Shipping and Navigation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Vessels supporting Centrica proximate platforms, subsea infrastructure and pipelines require sufficient evaluation to demonstrate having sufficient sea room to operate.</li> <li>· Sailing time from UK is likely to be longer and more complex, requiring navigation around the windfarm and needs detailed evaluation.</li> <li>· Displacement of third party shipping and fishing has potential to be routed closer to Centrica assets and needs further consideration.</li> <li>· Proposed narrow shipping corridor width combined with turbine and buoy exclusions and the intended use as a cable route has the potential to minimise the effectiveness of the route as an effective shipping lane.</li> <li>· Platform and vessel Radar Early Warning Systems are highlighted in the PEIR as likely to be impacted by individual and cumulative wind turbine signatures. This would significantly reduce the likelihood of observation and the reaction time available to manage collision risk with platforms or attendant vessels. Possible mitigation measures mentioned in the PEIR need to be further evaluated.</li> </ul>	I	Assessments of vessel movements and displacement near the wind farm array can be found at Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 7, Shipping and Navigation. Also refer to Environmental Statement Navigation Risk Assessment - volume 5, Annex 7.1. There is a REWS assessment presented in volume 2, chapter 11, Infrastructure and Other Users, see also REWS TR in volume 5, annex 11.1, Radar Early Warning Technical Report.
Peel Ports	I am writing from Great Yarmouth Port Limited (hereinafter referred to as GYPC) on behalf of Great Yarmouth Port Authority and would like to take this opportunity to make a number of comments of relevance to the preparation of your application: GYPC would like to emphasise that our interests are Port related and that DONG Energy Hornsea need to be aware of potential effects upon our operational interests and the statutory interests of the Port Authority which include navigational safety, shipping movements and dredging activities.	I	A response was sent to Mr Gary Doyle on the 27 November 2017 addressing questions and clarifications raised during the PEIR consultation process.
Peel Ports	1. Vessel access to the Port will in no way be fettered as a result of the construction or operation of the wind farm or the presence of the export cable.	I	Measures adopted as part of Hornsea Three are outlined in section 7.10 of Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 7: Shipping and Navigation and section 23 of Environmental Statement volume 5, annex 7.1: Navigational Risk Assessment and include compliance with UK and Flag State regulations and IMO conventions and marine coordination. These mitigations will assist in ensuring that vessel traffic associated with Hornsea Three is safely and effectively managed and does not impact upon third party users.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>25</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Great Yarmouth Borough Council	Policy CS6 of the adopted Great Yarmouth Core Strategy states that port related development proposals will be supported by encouraging a greater presence of higher value technology and energy-based industries in the Borough. It is, therefore, welcomed that Great Yarmouth is acknowledged as having the greatest potential to benefit from the proposed development given our supply chain capacity and capability. Great Yarmouth is the center for the offshore energy industry in England, with a 50 year history of supporting the offshore oil and gas industry and the burgeoning offshore wind sector. The port of Great Yarmouth is currently involved in the construction of two new windfarms, Galloper and East Anglia 1 and is the operations and maintenance base for the original offshore windfarm at Scroby Sands and Statoil's new Dudgeon Windfarm. Great Yarmouth has developed a wide ranging supply chain of local companies to support the oil, gas and offshore wind sectors.	N	Acknowledged.
Marine Management Organisation	1.6. Where the significance of a predicted impact is calculated as "Minor or Moderate", the MMO recommends that the significance is assessed as "Moderate" in accordance with the 'worst case scenario' principle of the 'Rochdale Envelope' appraisal. Such impacts would therefore be significant in terms of the subsequent analysis required under the appropriate Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) regulations, according to the matrix rules used by DONG Energy in the PEIR (paragraph 2.9.1.9, Volume 2, Chapter 2 – Benthic Subtidal and Intertidal Ecology and replicated in subsequent 'Offshore' chapters).	I	<p>Regarding Benthic Ecology, In the Environmental Statement, Paragraph 2.9.2.5 of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Subtidal and Intertidal Ecology clarifies that, in cases where a range is suggested for the significance of effect, there remains the possibility that this may span the significance threshold (i.e. the range is given as minor to moderate). In such cases the final significance is based upon the expert's professional judgement as to which outcome delineates the most likely effect, with an explanation as to why this is the case.</p> <p>Additional explanatory text has been inserted into the relevant assessments in sections 2.11.1 to 2.11.3 of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology to clarify why, in instances where there is a choice in the matrix table, an effect has been considered as minor rather than moderate.</p> <p>For Ornithology, the process used to determine the significance of impacts upon relevant receptors is presented in Section 5.9.4 of Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore Ornithology. Where the significance value falls between two categories (e.g. minor or moderate significance) expert judgement is used to determine the significance value</p> <p>For Marine Mammals the magnitude and sensitivity matrix has been updated and all updates have been communicated to the relevant key stakeholders through the EWG.</p> <p>As discussed in the Marine Processes, Benthic Ecology and Fish and Shellfish EWG meeting of 5 December 2017, impact assessment conclusions have been amended to provide further justification for why a significance of minor (i.e. not significant) has been concluded for species of medium to high sensitivity. These are presented in in the relevant impact assessments in Section 3.11 (for Hornsea Three alone) and Section 3.13 (for Cumulative Effects) of volume 2, chapter 3: Fish and Shellfish Ecology.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>25</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Marine Management Organisation	1.7. The MMO recommends re-examination of the requirements for pre-construction, construction and post-construction monitoring following re-assessment of the magnitude and significance of the potential impacts of the proposed Project. The MMO advises that verification of the impact predictions as set out in the PEIR can, in many cases, only be provided by future monitoring of the relevant receptors. This important consideration should be taken into account when future monitoring requirements are detailed in the 'Offshore' chapters of the PEIR.	I	<p>Consideration of the potential need for monitoring has been considered throughout the offshore chapters of the Environmental Statement. The proposed approach to monitoring for offshore elements of the project is discussed in the In Principle Monitoring Plan that accompanies the application for Development Consent.</p> <p>Explanatory text has been inserted into the relevant assessment sections in the Environmental Statement of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology to clarify why, in instances where there is a choice in the matrix table, an effect has been considered as minor rather than moderate. There are, however, no instances of effects being considered to be of moderate adverse significance. The proposals for future monitoring are outlined in the Environmental Statement in Table 2.25 of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology.</p> <p>The proposed approach to monitoring for offshore ornithology and marine mammals is discussed in the In Principle Monitoring Plan.</p> <p>Monitoring has not been proposed for fish and shellfish ecology, due to the lack of significant effects on fish ecology and the high level of confidence in the assessment presented.</p>
Marine Management Organisation	8. Shipping and Navigation 8.1. Under Section 95 of the Energy Act 2004 (the 2004 Act), the maximum permissible dimensions for a safety zone during construction, major maintenance, possible extension and decommissioning is 500 metres. The 2004 Act also provides for an operational safety zones of 50 metres during the operational phase of an offshore renewable energy installation. Table 7.8 of Volume 2, Chapter 7 – Shipping and Navigation states that an operational safety zone around the substations will be 500 metres. The MMO seek assurance that any operational safety zone will not exceed the 50 metres stipulated within the 2004 Act.	I	Table 7.8 of Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 7: Shipping and Navigation gives provision for the implementation of 500m safety zones for periods of maintenance during the operational phase. There is no provision for 500m operational safety zones.
Marine Management Organisation	8.2. DONG Energy state that "Under a requirement of the DCO, the placement and standard of aids to navigation will be agreed with Trinity House prior to the construction of the wind farm" (Table 7.14, Volume 2, Chapter 7 – Shipping and Navigation). The MMO advises that the placement and standard of aids to navigation would be conditioned as part of the DML.	I	Comment noted, the application meets the requirements for Trinity House
Marine Management Organisation	8.3. With regard to the allision risk to other vessels of Hornsea Three infrastructure, DONG Energy states that "it is considered that impacts relating to the effectiveness of lighting and marking are manageable through post consent consultation to identify additional mitigations" (paragraph 7.11.2.61, Volume 2, Chapter 7 – Shipping and Navigation). The MMO advises that mitigation measures should be outlined prior to consent being sought to ensure that their appropriateness is taken into account in the decision-making process.	I	Comment noted, the application meets the requirements for Trinity House.
Marine Management Organisation	8.4. The MMO requests that clarification is provided in the ES as to what aids to navigation are intended to assist third party navigation "similar to those deployed at the London Array offshore wind farm" (paragraph 7.11.2.86, Volume 2, Chapter 7 – Shipping and Navigation).	I	Measures adopted as part of Hornsea Three are outlined in section 7.10 of Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 7: Shipping and Navigation and section 23 of Environmental Statement volume 5, annex 7.1 Navigational Risk Assessment and include compliance with UK and Flag State regulations and IMO conventions and marine coordination. These mitigations will assist in ensuring that vessel traffic associated with Hornsea Three is safely and effectively managed and does not impact upon third party users.
Marine Management Organisation	8.5. The MMO requests that further evidence is provided in the ES to support the assertion of "the likelihood of fisherman not fishing within the array area with floating foundations in place" (paragraph 7.11.2.128, Volume 2, Chapter 7 – Shipping and Navigation).	N	Comment acknowledged. Floating Foundations have now been excluded from the project envelope and so this comment is no longer relevant

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>25</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 42: Local Authorities (prescribed under section 43 of the Act)</b>			
Great Yarmouth Borough Council	Policy CS6 of the adopted Great Yarmouth Core Strategy states that port related development proposals will be supported by encouraging a greater presence of higher value technology and energy-based industries in the Borough. It is, therefore, welcomed that Great Yarmouth is acknowledged as having the greatest potential to benefit from the proposed development given our supply chain capacity and capability. Great Yarmouth is the center for the offshore energy industry in England, with a 50 year history of supporting the offshore oil and gas industry and the burgeoning offshore wind sector. The port of Great Yarmouth is currently involved in the construction of two new windfarms, Galloper and East Anglia 1 and is the operations and maintenance base for the original offshore windfarm at Scroby Sands and Statoil's new Dudgeon Windfarm. Great Yarmouth has developed a wide ranging supply chain of local companies to support the oil, gas and offshore wind sectors.	N	Acknowledged.
<b>Section 42: Persons with an interest in the land (prescribed under section 44 of the Act)</b>			
<i>No comments were received by landowners or land interests relating to shipping and navigation under Phase 2.A..</i>			
<b>Section 47: Duty to consult local community</b>			
Ann Abbott	2. How many miles out will the Hornsea Project 3 Shoal be and will the 342 windmills be in rows or set up hazardly. Which is the best layout?	N	Hornsea Three has committed to developing a wind farm layout with a single line of orientation meaning the turbines will be in development rows. Hornsea Project Three is approximately 120 km offshore.
<b>Section 48: Duty to publicise</b>			
<i>No comments were received by in response to the public notice issued during Phase 2.A relating to shipping and navigation.</i>			



Table 2.14: Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Further Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.B) relating to shipping and navigation.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>26</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 42: Prescribed consultees (The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009: Schedule 1))</b>			
Maritime Coastguard Agency	The shipping and navigation aspects of the Navigation Risk Assessment should be updated to include the impact of the revised corridor routes, with consideration given to the safety of navigation and the proposed risk mitigation measures.	I	This has been addressed. The Shipping and Navigation chapter, (volume 2, chapter 7 of the Environmental Statement) and the Navigational Risk Assessment (volume 5 annex 7.1 of the Environmental Statement) have both been updated to reflect the amended offshore cable route.
Maritime Coastguard Agency	The export cables routes, cable burial protection index and cable protection will need to be reconsidered, with due cognisance given to address cable burial and protection, particularly close to shore where impacts on navigable water depth may become significant. Any consented cable protection works must ensure existing and future safe navigation is not compromised accepting a maximum of 5% reduction in surrounding depth referenced to chart datum. Existing charted anchorages areas should be avoided.	I	Noted. Regarding burial depths, a Cable Burial Risk Assessment (or similar) is included as a measure adopted as part of Hornsea Three with detail provided in section 7.10 of the Shipping and Navigation chapter, (volume 2, chapter 7 of the Environmental Statement) and section 23 of the Navigational Risk Assessment (volume 5 annex 7.1 of the Environmental Statement). These sections also provide detail on the application and use of safety zones.
Maritime Coastguard Agency	A study should be undertaken/updated which establishes the electromagnetic deviation affecting ships compasses and other navigating system of the cable route to the satisfaction of MCA.	I	Lessons learnt from previous offshore wind farm developments are provided in section 6 of the Navigational Risk Assessment (volume 5 annex 7.1 of the Environmental Statement) and include electromagnetic interference trials undertaken at the North Hoyle offshore wind farm (MCA, 2005). These trials found that offshore wind farm infrastructure did not have any effect on compasses and therefore no further studies are considered necessary. An assessment of under keel clearance has been undertaken as part of the Environmental Statement (see section 18.4 of the NRA) and provides an overview of the key areas of risk identified throughout the export cable route, including the offshore HVAC booster station search area.
ABPorts	I have looked at the documents and due to the location of Hornsea Project Three and where it will make land – it will offer no impact on ABP. However, I can foresee potential issues with regards to our stakeholders and shipping traffic direction when survey operations, trench digging and cable laying etc. operations commence. Therefore, is it possible to be kept up to date with protracted commencement dates so that we can inform our stakeholders?	N	Acknowledged, ABP will be kept up to date with key project updates moving forward.
Trinity House	Trinity House note the potential offshore alternative cable routes and suggest that additional navigation risk assessment work is necessary in order to assess the impact on marine navigation. Particular reference should be made to cable crossings and any necessary cable protection; resulting in a reduction in clearance depths at these locations.	I	This is noted and the Navigational Risk Assessment (Environmental Statement volume 5, annex 7.1) was updated accordingly following the confirmation of the adoption of both alternative routes.
Eastern Inshore Fisheries and Conservation Authority	Eastern IFCA is continually seeking to improve how we respond to consultations, both in terms of efficiency and content. Therefore, if any of the points raised in this response are reflected in the outcome we would appreciate being informed. Following the previous consultation on the PEIR documentation, Eastern IFCA attended a meeting organised by Fiona Nimmo from Poseidon to discuss our comments and inform us of any changes that had been made as a result of this. This was greatly appreciated by ourselves and we felt it was extremely useful and informative for all parties that attended.	I	Comment noted and Hornsea Three also acknowledges that the recent meeting with Eastern IFCA was very useful in informing the Environmental Statement.
<b>Section 42: Local Authorities (prescribed under section 43 of the Act)</b>			
No comments were received by local authorities relating to shipping and navigation under Phase 2.B.			
<b>Section 42: Persons with an interest in the land (prescribed under section 44 of the Act)</b>			
No comments were received by landowners or land interests relating to shipping and navigation under Phase 2.B.			

<sup>26</sup> Y = Yes change made; N = No change made; I = Incorporated into or considered when producing the assessment or landowner voluntary agreement offer; N/A = Not applicable.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>26</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 47: Duty to consult local community</b>			
<i>No comments were received by the local community relating to shipping and navigation under Phase 2.B.</i>			
<b>Section 48: Duty to publicise</b>			
<i>No comments were received by in response to the public notice issued during Phase 2.B relating to shipping and navigation.</i>			

## 2.8 Aviation, military and communication

Table 2.15: Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.A) relating to aviation, military and communication.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>27</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 42: Prescribed consultees (The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009: Schedule 1))</b>			
NATS	I acknowledge receipt of the Statutory Consultation documentation and USB files. NATS anticipates no impact from the Hornsea Project Three wind farm itself as well as from the cable route corridor. Accordingly, it has no objections to the DCO / Project.	N	The response is noted and has been included in Environmental Statement section 8.5 of volume 2, chapter 8: Aviation, Military and Communication.
Belgium Civil Aviation Authority	I can confirm receiving the consultation request by Hornsea Project Three Offshore Wind Farm. The letter and attached electronic documents have been analysed by my department. Since this project is situated outside the Belgium airspace, there is, from an aeronautical perspective, no objection against this project.	N	Ørsted acknowledged there was no impact to the Belgian Civil Aviation Authority. The response is noted and has been included in Environmental Statement section 8.5 of volume 2, chapter 8: Aviation, Military and Communication.
Maritime & Coastguard Agency	<b>Aviation Lighting</b> The boundary turbines, where they are more than 900m apart, must be lit with a single 2000 candela, red aviation light, flashing Morse 'W' in unison with all other boundary turbines. All other turbines must be fitted with a fixed single red 200 candela aviation light for SAR purposes. Further consultation with the CAA and MCA should be sought by the applicant where additional mitigation may be identified.	I	Aviation lighting requirements for turbines are detailed in Environmental Statement Table 8.13 of volume 2, chapter 8: Aviation, Military and Communication.
Norwich Airport	Good Afternoon Mr Livesey, Firstly thank you for your consultation letter relating to the Hornsea Three Offshore Windfarm. Please be aware that all Airport Safeguarding consultation and applications should be addressed directly to the Safeguarding team at Norwich Airport and links to this are also contained on our website: <a href="https://www.norwichairport.co.uk/airfield-pilot-information/">https://www.norwichairport.co.uk/airfield-pilot-information/</a> . Please see attached our initial letter following review of the documents you have attached for your Statutory Consultation with the Airport.	I	This response is acknowledged and the project database has been updated
Norwich Airport	Dear Mr Livesey, Following receipt of your letter dated 25/07/2017 to the Company Director; this has now reached the Airport Safeguarding Department. I would suggest that some form of Pre Planning Consultation is required with the Airport to ensure that the full implications from both sides are discussed. Norwich Airport Ltd. had a list of fees and charges which are applied for this type of consultation. A copy of the fees and charges schedule is on our website: <a href="https://www.norwichairport.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/NorwichAirportFeesCharges-1st-April-2017.pdf">https://www.norwichairport.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/NorwichAirportFeesCharges-1st-April-2017.pdf</a> . The initial charge for a Pre Planning Consultation is £1695.00 (see Section 8.5 – Other Services), if you wish to go ahead please contact the Safeguarding email inbox: <a href="mailto:safeguarding(@)norwichairport.co.uk">safeguarding(@)norwichairport.co.uk</a> and we will get the necessary paperwork raised. You should be aware that any further work that may be required after this meeting for consultants/reports etc., will also chargeable to the developer and will only be completed after payment in full has been received.	N	Hornsea Three acknowledges this response but notes that this consultation was part of formal statutory consultation. Given the distance of the airport from the offshore elements of Hornsea Three turbines and height of onshore infrastructure, there is not considered to be an impact on the activities of Norwich Airport.
Norfolk Vanguard	In order to enable a robust cumulative assessment, we would like to have sight of and share information as soon as possible in relation to the baseline data that is currently being collected and ongoing assessment work pending completion, namely Chapter 3 (Fish and Shellfish Ecology), Chapter 4 (Marine Mammals), Chapter 5 (Offshore Ornithology), Chapter 6 (Commercial Fisheries) and Chapter 8 (Aviation, Military and Communication). We would welcome sight of the HRA Appropriate Assessment and discussions with the project team on the approach being taken, prior to the submission of the DCO application.	N	Hornsea Three has been in regular dialogue with the Vattenfall Vanguard project throughout the pre-application stage for each project.

<sup>27</sup> Y = Yes change made; N = No change made; I = Incorporated into or considered when producing the assessment or landowner voluntary agreement offer; N/A = Not applicable.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>27</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Norfolk Vanguard	In Chapter 8 (Aviation, Military and Communication), we note that further assessment and consultation is proposed with helicopter services and NATs. We would welcome details of the consultation that has been undertaken post publication of the PEIR and any outstanding concerns that these stakeholders may have.	N	Details of consultation undertaken to inform the aviation, military and communications EIA are included in Environmental Statement section 8.5 of volume 2, chapter 8: Aviation, Military and Communication.
Ministry of Defence	The PEIR prepared recognises the principal defence issues that will be of relevance to the progression of the development scheme proposed. The extent of maritime military practice and exercise areas and use of airspace for defence purposes in the vicinity of the project have been recognised. The applicant has also specifically considered the potential effect that the wind farm may have upon the effective operation of defence radars and aviation interests.	N	The response is noted and has been included in Environmental Statement section 8.5 of volume 2, chapter 8: Aviation, Military and Communication.
Ministry of Defence	The need for the proposed development to be fitted with relevant aviation and maritime warning lighting to maintain navigational safety is recognised. It should be noted that, subject to verifying the precise location and height of structures above sea level, the MOD may request that structures featured in the scheme (such as platforms) are fitted with aviation warning lighting when there is no mandatory requirement for installation. This would serve to maintain safety in relation to defence aviation activities undertaken in the area.	I	Hornsea Three acknowledges that consultation will be required with the MOD once the precise location and height of structures above sea level is known and recognises that the MOD may subsequently request structures (such as turbines and platforms) to be fitted with aviation warning lighting when there is no mandatory requirement for installation.
Centrica	Aviation and Communications · Helicopter operations to operational platforms within 5km of the edge of HOW3 are identified in the PEIR as impacted, though the extent to which this would be a significant restriction needs to be thoroughly evaluated by helicopter operators. · Evacuation protocols may be compromised without suitable mitigation due to helicopters being the primary method of transporting personnel in the event of an emergency.	I	Helicopter access to the Spirit Energy operated platforms is assessed in Environmental Statement section 8.11.2 of volume 2, chapter 8: Aviation, Military and Communication. Consultation was also held on the methodology used to assess access requirements to Spirit Energy operated platforms with Spirit Energy (formerly Centrica) and CHC (the helicopter service provider to these platforms for Spirit Energy).
Peel Ports	2. The construction and operation of the wind farm will not interfere with the operation of the Port's radar, navigation or communications systems.	N	The response is noted and has been included in Environmental Statement section 8.5 of volume 2, chapter 8: Aviation, Military and Communication.
<b>Section 42: Local Authorities (prescribed under section 43 of the Act)</b>			
No comments were received by the local authorities relating to aviation, military and communication under Phase 2.A.			
<b>Section 42: Persons with an interest in the land (prescribed under section 44 of the Act)</b>			
No comments were received by landowners or land interests relating to aviation, military and communication under Phase 2.A..			
<b>Section 47: Duty to consult local community</b>			
No comments were received by the local community relating to aviation, military and communication under Phase 2.A.			
<b>Section 48: Duty to publicise</b>			
No comments were received by in response to the public notice issued during Phase 2.A relating to aviation, military and communication.			



Table 2.16: Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Further Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.B) relating to aviation, military and communication.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>28</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 42: Prescribed consultees (The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009: Schedule 1))</b>			
Ministry of Defence (MoD)	However, I will take this opportunity to reiterate that the area of search defined for the onshore cable route at the north Norfolk coast is in proximity to a MOD transmitter located at RAF Weybourne. This technical facility is encompassed by a statutory safeguarding consultation zone in which the MOD must be consulted upon all forms of development or land use change. The safeguarding criteria applicable to the type of transmitter operated at this site would impose constraints of the installation of metallic cabling above or below ground or the creation of earth works in proximity to the transmitter. In addition, constraints are applicable on the siting and design of new structures within the designated safeguarding zone.	I	Response noted, Hornsea Three will consult with the MoD as part of the detailed design development post submission.
Ministry of Defence (MoD)	The extent and relevance of this statutory safeguarding zone needs to be taken into account in the evaluation of the cable and infrastructure development scheme being prepared. The information provided at this stage indicates that cable and associated infrastructure development within the northern part of the re-route corridor and western most part of the area of search identified may not be compatible with MOD statutory safeguarding requirements.	I	Response noted, Hornsea Three will consult with the MoD as part of the detailed design development post submission.
NATS	With regards to the physical obstruction presented by the turbines and the impact on airspace users, while NATS has no comments to make at this time, it wishes to be kept apprised of developments and NATS is currently engaged through other fora with Offshore Operators in respect of the impact on Offshore Helicopter operations and any required mitigation.	N	Hornsea Three acknowledges that NATS wishes to be kept apprised of developments regarding the impact on airspace users.
Norwich Airport	<a href="https://www.norwichairport.co.uk/airfield-pilot-information/">Please be aware that all Airport Safeguarding consultation and applications should be addressed directly to the Safeguarding team at Norwich Airport and links to this are also contained on our website: https://www.norwichairport.co.uk/airfield-pilot-information/.</a>	I	This response is acknowledged and the project database has been updated
Norwich Airport	As in our previous response I would again reiterate our recommendation that some form of Pre Planning Consultation is required with the Airport to ensure that the full implications from both sides are discussed. Norwich Airports Ltd. Has a list of fees and charges which are applied for this type of consultation. A copy of fees can be found website - see full response for link. If you wish to go ahead contact the Safeguarding unit safeguarding( @ )norwichairport.co.uk	N	Hornsea Three acknowledges this response but notes that this consultation was part of formal statutory consultation. Given the distance of the airport from the offshore elements of Hornsea Three turbines and height of onshore infrastructure, there is not considered to be an impact on the activities of Norwich Airport.
<b>Section 42: Local Authorities (prescribed under section 43 of the Act)</b>			
No comments were received by local authorities relating to aviation, military and communication under Phase 2.B.			
<b>Section 42: Persons with an interest in the land (prescribed under section 44 of the Act)</b>			
No comments were received by landowners or land interests relating to aviation, military and communication under Phase 2.B.			
<b>Section 47: Duty to consult local community</b>			
No comments were received by the local community relating to aviation, military and communication under Phase 2.B.			
<b>Section 48: Duty to publicise</b>			
No comments were received by in response to the public notice issued during Phase 2.B relating to aviation, military and communication.			

<sup>28</sup> Y = Yes change made; N = No change made; I = Incorporated into or considered when producing the assessment or landowner voluntary agreement offer; N/A = Not applicable.

## 2.9 Marine Archaeology

Table 2.17: Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.A) relating to marine archaeology.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>29</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 42: Prescribed consultees (The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009: Schedule 1))</b>			
Historic England	Historic England recognises that a considerable amount of work has already been completed to inform the project and that the approach taken has included option appraisals, site selection and the collection of baseline data. We would however like to raise a concern at this about the methodologies that have been used to assess the data and the format in which it is presented. We are particularly concerned about the over reliance on tables and matrices for the analysis of significance and determination of impact. Whilst matrices are recognised as a standard tool, they are no substitute for an informed discussion on significance with a detailed narrative and commentary. This narrative needs to reference to the policy tests established by the National Planning Policy Framework and the Environmental Statement would need to provide sufficient information to explore the ideas of benefit, harm and loss (as described in NPPF) and to set out 'what matters and why' in terms of the heritage assets and their significance and setting. This is also set out in our Good Practice Advice note 3 'The Setting of Heritage Assets' (see <a href="https://content.historicengland.org.uk/imagesbooks/publications/gpa3-setting-of-heritage-assets/gpa3.pdf/">https://content.historicengland.org.uk/imagesbooks/publications/gpa3-setting-of-heritage-assets/gpa3.pdf/</a> ).	I	The impact methodology applied in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 5: Historic Environment is in accordance with the DMRB methodology and is consistent with the assessment approach used on similar linear schemes. The assessment presented in this chapter takes into account the requirements of the NPPF and other relevant guidance and professional judgement has been applied. It provides a narrative commentary, whilst seeking to avoid duplication of information from the baseline section and supporting technical annexes.  Consultation undertaken post section 42 has resolved these concerns (see the Consultation Report which accompanies the DCO) through the expansion of Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 5.1: Desk Based Assessment which provides further narrative.
Historic England	Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project Description Section 3.6.4 - a number of options have been presented for the foundations of the turbines, such as monopiles, piled jacket, gravity base etc. Each of these options has different implications for any archaeology present in the area, such as the ground preparation requirements and the need for scour protection. The impact that they may have on the archaeology needs to be considered, in terms of the worst case scenario or reassessed once the foundation types have been selected, so that an appropriate mitigation strategy can be developed.	I	In assessing the effects of Hornsea Three on marine archaeology, the assessment has been undertaken on the basis of i) the greatest area of near-surface sediments disturbed and ii) the greatest penetration depth of foundations (see Environmental Statement section 9.7 of volume 2, chapter 9: Marine Archaeology). These two assessments are undertaken as they have very different effects on the marine historic environment, making it difficult to identify which option can best be said to represent the greatest effect. The assessment therefore considers both the maximum design scenario on seabed features (i.e. maximum seabed footprint), and the maximum design scenario in terms of buried remains (i.e. maximum volume of material disturbed); see Environmental Statement Table 9.8 in Volume 2, chapter 9: Marine Archaeology.
Historic England	Section 3.6.5.2 - We are aware that it has not been decided if the cable system would use HVAC or HVDC technology. This has implications for the number of cables required and how they are arranged. The maximum design scenario for cable diameter, length of cable and voltage carried has been presented in Table 3.21. It is also not yet known how the cable trenches would be excavated as this would be defined post-consent (Section 3.6.5.5). The worst case scenario has been presented in Table 3.25. In our view the historic environment would need to be taken into account when the cable system and installation approaches have been decided so that an appropriate mitigation strategy is developed. This would need to be reflected in a suitably worded WSI, and no pre-commencement works should be undertaken until the WSI is in place and has been agreed. This is similar for the offshore accommodation platforms (Section 3.6.6), Offshore substations (Section 3.6.8), Offshore export cables (Section 3.6.9).	I	The marine archaeology assessment (Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 9: Marine Archaeology) considers the maximum design scenario for cables and foundation (including substation installation). An outline WSI (Environmental Statement volume 5, annex 9.2: Outline Written Scheme of Investigation) has also been prepared and submitted as part of the application. The procedures set out in the Outline WSI are intended to i) identify archaeologically sensitive remains encountered during the development, ii) to avoid them wherever possible and iii) to enable recording of any remains that are directly affected.  The WSI will be monitored and updated throughout the post-consent process to ensure that the scheme of investigation is appropriate to the final project design.

<sup>29</sup> Y = Yes change made; N = No change made; I = Incorporated into or considered when producing the assessment or landowner voluntary agreement offer; N/A = Not applicable.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>29</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Historic England	The Landfall section (Section 3.6.11) discusses the use of HDD or Thrust Boring in order to bring the cables onshore. It should be noted that internationally significant deposits referred to as the Cromer Forest bed Formation (CF-bF) have been recorded along the Norfolk coast that preserve a range of remains, from large mammal remains such as elephants/mammoths, palaeoenvironmental remains, flint tools and even footprints of early hominids (Homo antecessor). The potential of these deposits and the value of the information that they may hold requires careful considerations to be made about how the archaeology at the landfall site can be evaluated and assessed in order to maximise any opportunities. Likewise there are known to be significant Holocene deposits recorded along the Weybourne cliffs, and these need to be identified and taken mitigated if and where necessary.	I	Environmental Statement Volume 5, annex 9.1: Marine Archaeology Technical Report, provides a baseline review of the known and potential archaeology within the Hornsea Three intertidal area. The impacts from Hornsea Three on known and potential archaeology within the Hornsea Three intertidal area is assessed in section 9.10 of volume 2, chapter 9: Marine Archaeology.
Historic England	In relation to Section 3.6.12 it should be noted that anchorage and jackup/spud legs can damage surface and near-surface archaeology, and that it may be necessary to identify safe areas where vessels can be anchored, and place exclusion zones for archaeology that may be at risk of damage.	I	The comment from Historic England is noted and Archaeological Exclusion Zones (AEZs) (see Environmental Statement volume 5, annex 9.2: Outline Written Scheme of Investigation) are proposed for all high and medium anomalies to avoid direct impacts on sites of identified archaeological significance.
Historic England	<p>Volume 2, Chapter 9: Marine Archaeology</p> <p>Table 9.5 summarises the geophysics that have taken place to date including information on the techniques used and the line spacing selected for the different surveys. The line spacing used is generally much larger than is recommended in the Historic England Marine Geophysics guidance (2013), which considers a spacing of between 500-1000m being used in the NW and SE areas, and 55m to 67m in the cable corridor. We are concerned that the resolution of the resulting surveys would not be able to identify feature/deposits of archaeological interest. A summary of recommended line spacing is presented in the Historic England Marine Geophysics (2013) guidance and are summarised below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Multibeam bathymetry - line spacing of c.30m in water greater than 10m in depth with cross lines at a minimum spacing of 1-10 times the principle line spacing (2013: Section 6.3.2, p20)</li> <li>· Side Scan Sonar -It is stated in the Marine Geophysics guidance that percentage coverage is very important and it is recommended that a line spacing of c.50m is used assessing seabeds for submerged landscapes (2013:Section 6.2.2, p18)</li> <li>· Magnetometer - for large areas with unknown potential, a grid spacing of 30- 50m and cross lines of 1-10 times the principle line spacing. Line spacing may be reduced to c.15m with cross lines of 5 times the principal spacing if areas of high magnetic anomalies are recorded (2013: Section 6.5.2, p28).</li> <li>· Sub-bottom profiler - 30m line spacing with cross lines of 1-10 times the principal line spacing (2013: Section 6.4.2, p25).</li> </ul>	I	It is noted that Historic England has received and approved a WSI for the interpretation of the geophysical surveys undertaken to date. The WSI allows for archaeological input into the design of future surveys. Further discussion on survey methodology has taken place with Historic England's technical advisors, including during a conference call of 16 November 2017. These have indicated that Historic England accept the surveys to date and will be consulted on future scopes of work for Hornsea Three.
Historic England	<p>We accept the 2016 geophysical surveys were intended to be preliminary surveys only, with further higher resolution and full coverage surveys planned for later on in the development process. It would therefore be appropriate to have further discussion with regards to the appropriate level of survey in relation to the above guidance and to ensure that we receive method statements for all surveys undertaken.</p> <p>This is also referenced in the subsequent sections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Volume 5, Annex 9.1, Marine Archaeology Technical Report, section 2.3.2.1</li> <li>· Volume 5, Annex 9.2, Archaeological Monitoring and Mitigation, DBA, Section 7.4.1</li> </ul>	I	It is noted that Historic England has received and approved a WSI for the interpretation of the marine geophysical surveys undertaken to date. The WSI allows for archaeological input into the design of future surveys.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>29</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Historic England	Section 9.6.2.3 summarises some of the topographic features of archaeological interest, such as Markhams Hole and the area in the northern part of the Hornsea Three array. Significant deposits may be present in these areas that preserve information on past activities, landscape and environmental change over time and we agree with the PIER report that that these areas have high archaeological potential and value. The impact of the proposal would have the potential to be significant in EIA terms.	I	Historic England's comment is noted regarding the sensitivity of the receptor. However, given the widespread extent and depth of the palaeochannels and the relatively limited nature of the impacts by comparison, they are predicted to be local in spatial extent. On this basis, the magnitude of impact is considered to be negligible. The overall impact was therefore deemed to be not significant in EIA terms (see Environmental Statement paragraph 9.10.1.15 in volume 2, chapter 9: Marine Archaeology).
Historic England	Section 9.6.3 summarises the potential for prehistoric archaeology, including the importance of the evidence preserved within palaeochannels. We agree with the statements included in this section, and the conclusion that there is strong potential for the survival of sites and material from the post-Devensian and Holocene periods (see Section 9.6.3.7). Deposits that date to this period have the potential to contain evidence of regional, and potentially of national significance, and should therefore be assessed using appropriate methods to ensure that no opportunities are missed or information lost over the course of the proposed development process. The strategy for mitigating this impact would need to be subject to further discussion.	I	Historic England's comment is noted and the measures adopted as part of Hornsea Three (Environmental Statement Table 9.12 in volume 2, chapter 9: Marine Archaeology) and the Outline WSI (Environmental Statement volume 5, annex 9.2: Outline Written Scheme of Investigation) include the provision of archaeological input to future geotechnical surveys where deposits of known archaeological potential are likely to be affected.
Historic England	We agree that there is high potential for maritime archaeology dating to the medieval period within the proposed development area, but it is important to note that some structures/vessels particularly those made of wood may not be as visible within the geophysical survey data compared to more modern vessels.	I	Environmental Statement volume 5, annex 9.1: Marine Archaeology Technical Report and Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 9: Marine Archaeology (see paragraph 9.6.4.10) have been updated to note that wooden shipwrecks, if they are buried, may not be as visible in the survey data as those made of metal.
Historic England	It is stated in Section 9.6.8.5 that no peat or organic deposits have so far been identified in any of the boreholes assessed to date, but that such deposits are known to exist in the wider area. We note that there is a potential that organic-rich deposits may be recovered within the proposed development area. In addition, it is stated that there is potential to record features of heritage interest at the landfall site beneath the 'featureless shingle visible today' (Section 9.6.8.6); we would again agree with this statement. The strategy for mitigating this impact would need to be subject to further discussion.	I	Historic England's comment is noted and the measures adopted as part of Hornsea Three (Environmental Statement Table 9.12 in volume 2, chapter 9: Marine Archaeology) and the Outline WSI (Environmental Statement volume 5, annex 9.2: Outline Written Scheme of Investigation) include the provision of archaeological input to future geotechnical surveys where deposits of known archaeological potential are likely to be affected.
Historic England	Section 9.9 presents the measures adopted as part of the Hornsea Three project to mitigate against any damage to the heritage assets throughout the programme of construction, use and decommissioning. We agree that the proposals summarised in Table 9.12 are sensible and appropriate, and demonstrate an integrated approach to investigate the archaeological potential alongside non-archaeological works that may impact on buried remains/deposits. This supports the joined-up approach presented in this section and we agree that where possible, archaeological remains should be avoided, but where this is not possible, that they would then be preserved by record. The strategy for mitigating this impact would need to be subject to further discussion, and subject to a WSI, which is agreed as part of the DCO.	N	Historic England's comment is noted and the measures adopted as part of Hornsea Three are outlined in Environmental Statement Table 9.12 in volume 2, chapter 9: Marine Archaeology.
Historic England	Sections 9.10.1.4 and 9.10.1.5 summarise the significance of the archaeology that may be present in the development area, stating that the evidence suggests that 'exceptionally well preserved archaeological sites' may be found in the study area. We would agree with this statement and note that exceptionally well preserved sites can record valuable information about past societies, activities and the environment, and therefore need to be evaluated and/or assessed appropriately. Section 9.10 concludes that where possible the assets should be avoided (Archaeological Exclusion Zones) or through recording and investigation where remains are directly affected (Section 9.15.1.2); we would support this approach and would encourage the avoidance of assets/deposits of interest where possible.	I	Historic England's comment is noted and the measures adopted as part of Hornsea Three are outlined in Environmental Statement Table 9.12 in volume 2, chapter 9: Marine Archaeology.
Historic England	Volume 5, Annex 9.1: Marine Archaeology Technical Report Section 2.2.3.1 states the guidance documents that were referred to in the production of the Marine Archaeology Technical Report. It does not include the Historic England Marine Geophysics (2013) guidance, which should be considered and then added to this list.	I	The Historic England Marine Geophysics Data Acquisition, Processing and Interpretation Guidance Notes (2013) has been considered and referenced in Environmental Statement volume 5, annex 9.2: Outline Written Scheme of Investigation.



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>29</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Historic England	It is stated in Section 2.3.2.6 that some archaeological contacts may not be visible within the geophysical survey but the risks to these anomalies can be reduced through a series of methods, such as further geophysical survey, such as UXO and ROV searches. We agree with this statement, and welcome the thorough investigation of the seabed in order to minimise the risk to any buried or near surface deposits/features that may be present within the area of the proposed development.	N	Historic England's comment is noted.
Historic England	It is further stated that where uncertainty existed as to the identification of archaeological potential of a contact the provided dataset was reviewed (Section 2.3.2.7), but it is not stated if any areas were identified that warranted additional survey work even after the review of the data. It is stated in Table 2.2 that infill geophysics would be carried out, but it would be useful to be consulted over the areas that would be targeted. It would also be important to discuss the resolution of these surveys in the light of our earlier comment on the line spacing used in previous surveys.	I	Requirements for pre-construction geophysical surveys are specified in Environmental Statement section 7 of volume 5, annex 9.2: Outline Written Scheme of Investigation.
Historic England	We note that section 3.1.1.1 states that there is considerable variation in the depth of water in the different areas of the survey, from shallow intertidal areas to the ocean 'deeps'. It would be useful to understand if this has any impact of the geophysical techniques used, and if aspects of the survey needed to be modified to accommodate these issues, such as altering the line spacing used in the survey.	N	Requirements for pre-construction geophysical surveys are specified in Environmental Statement section 7 of volume 5, annex 9.2: Outline Written Scheme of Investigation. The exact scope of these surveys will be defined prior to survey commencement and at that point, will consider whether the variation in water depth influences the survey plan
Historic England	We note that the survey and borehole work carried out in the array area has recorded deposits of archaeological interest dating to the Pleistocene, Palaeolithic and Early Holocene periods, such as Markham's Hole and a large lake to the southern edge of the Outer Silver Pit. These areas have high archaeological potential, as discussed in the Marine Archaeology section of the PEIR (Volume 2, Chapter 9, Section 9.6.2.3).	N	Historic England's comment is noted.
Historic England	Section 3.2 summarises the submerged prehistoric archaeology recorded to date in the marine archaeology study area from the Pre-Devensian period through to the Mesolithic period when the area was largely submerged under water. The value of the pre-Devensian CF-bF deposits has been discussed in Section 3.2.2.3 and we would agree with the conclusion that deposit dating to this period may be present in the area of the proposed development, and that they are potentially of international significance if present. We would also agree that the Outer Silver Pit and the associated deposits are of regional importance (Section 3.2.4.9) and are significant in the archaeological landscape (Section 3.2.4.10). An assessment of the previous work carried out in the area, and in particular the work carried out for the Humber REC project determined that deposits of considerable archaeological significance lie at or very close to the surface of the seafloor within an around the Early Holocene palaeochannels. This is important to note as these deposits may be at risk of impact from the development due to the depths at which they are buried.	I	Historic England's comment is noted and potential impacts to buried prehistoric land surfaces from the construction of Hornsea Three are assessed in Environmental Statement section 9.10 of volume 2, chapter 9: Marine Archaeology.
Historic England	It is stated in Section 3.3.1.4 that the precise location of most wrecks in UK waters is not known - this is an important point to note when considering the size of any exclusion zones or the siting of specific elements of the project, as there could be a significant error associated to the location information for a given wreck.	L	Historic England's comment is noted and wrecks will be protected by AEZs with buffers ranging in radius from 15 to 100 m from the maximum known extents of the identified anomalies. These AEZs are listed in Environmental Statement section 10 of volume 5, annex 9.2: Outline Written Scheme of Investigation and illustrated in Environmental Statement Figure 9.5 of volume 2, chapter 9: Marine Archaeology. Scope is allowed for their amendment in light of further evidence and with the involvement of consultees (see Environmental Statement section 10.4 of volume 5, annex 9.2: Outline Written Scheme of Investigation).

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>29</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Historic England	We also note that the potential for Iron Age and Roman maritime vessels to be found in the area is discussed in Section 3.3.4, as well as the potential for evidence to be present relating to trade in this period. It should be noted that it is possible to assess the organic residues preserved within pottery vessels, even those found in marine settings. The residues preserved in the vessels could provide information on the commodities that were being moved and potentially where they were coming from. For example resins were assessed from the Uluburun cargo (Stern et al. 2008 Journal of Archaeological Science), and case studies are discussed in the Historic England guidance (2017): <a href="https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/organicresidue-analysis-and-archaeology/">https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/organicresidue-analysis-and-archaeology/</a> . Similar comments could be made about the potential for maritime archaeological remains and the remains of trade/contact dating to the medieval period, as stated in Section 3.3.5.	I	Environmental Statement volume 5, annex 9.2: Outline Written Scheme of Investigation has been updated to ensure it fully captures this point.
Historic England	The geophysical survey has identified a number of anomalies of interest, ranging from a possible collapsed wreck (Section 3.6.2.4) to anomalies of potential archaeological interest (Section 3.6.2.8). It would be necessary for future documents to present a strategy of how the medium and low potential anomalies would be handled in terms of their mitigation. Additional studies may need to be carried out (e.g. diver surveys) to investigate them further so that the exclusions zones can be defined in full. This would need to be considered in the WSI along with any proposal that would seek to sample any of the anomalies.	I	Environmental Statement volume 5, annex 9.2: Outline Written Scheme of Investigation has been updated to ensure it fully captures this point.
Historic England	Section 3.7.4.2 mentions the borehole survey and that even though no organic deposits were recorded, there was potential for deposits to be present as they have been identified in the wider area. If present, these deposits have the potential to be of international significance.	I	The comment is noted and the measures adopted as part as Hornsea Three (Environmental Statement section 9.9 of volume 2, chapter 9: Marine Archaeology) and the Outline WSI (Environmental Statement volume 5, annex 9.2: Outline Written Scheme of Investigation) include the provision of archaeological input to future geotechnical surveys where deposits of known archaeological potential are likely to be affected.
Historic England	It is concluded that there is substantial potential for prehistoric archaeological deposits in the study area (Section 4.1.1.1) and that any deposits present may be vulnerable to exposure. The impact of the development on these deposits may therefore require a strategy to be developed to ensure that they are investigated and preserved by record where necessary.	I	This comment is noted; this is covered in Environmental Statement Annex 9.2: Archaeological Monitoring and Mitigation: Draft Written Scheme of Investigation
Historic England	Volume 5, Annex 9.2: Archaeological Monitoring and Mitigation: Draft WSI It is stated in Section 3.3.1.3 that AEZs would be considered for all 239 low potential anomalies that were identified following the geophysical survey, in order to ensure their preservation in situ. If it is decided that AEZs are not appropriate for all of the anomalies, additional strategies would need to be developed and approved with Historic England to ensure that the anomalies can be, and are appropriate to be preserved by record. However, it is stated in Table 5.1 that an 'operational awareness' would be maintained for the areas of low archaeological potential, reporting through an agreed protocol should material of potential archaeological interest be encountered. This seems to contradict the statement in Section 3.3.1.3 and therefore needs to be clarified.	I	No AEZs are proposed at this stage around low potential anomalies. Should detailed design indicate potential disturbance of these low archaeological potential anomalies, provision of AEZs around them will be considered prior to construction to ensure their preservation in situ (see section 11 of volume 5, annex 9.2: Outline Written Scheme of Investigation).
Historic England	The contact details in Section 6.3.1.1 need to be changed to the following: · Dr Christopher Pater, Marine Planning Unit, Historic England, Eastgate Court, 195 - 205 High Street, Guildford, Surrey, GU1 3EH · Dr Zoe Outram, Historic England Science Advisor, East of England, 24 Brooklands Avenue, Cambridge, CB2 8BU	I	The contact details presented in Environmental Statement section 6.3 of volume 5, annex 9.2: Outline Written Scheme of Investigation have been updated to reflect this comment.
Historic England	We are pleased that there would be archaeological involvement in the pre-construction Geophysical and Geotechnical Surveys as this sort of joined-up approach allows opportunities to be maximised, and we also support the production of method statements which would be submitted to the archaeological curator for approval.	N	This comment is noted.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>29</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Historic England	Section 6.4.3 'Archaeological Contractors' describes the responsibilities of any archaeological contractors employed by the project (6.4.3.1). It also describes the responsibilities of the Construction Contractors (6.4.3.2). This is best separated into two clear sections to delineate between the different responsibilities of the two groups.	I	Environmental Statement section 6.4 of volume 5, annex 9.2: Outline Written Scheme of Investigation has been updated to reflect this comment.
Historic England	Section 6.4.4 needs to be revised to update the reference to the Historic England Science Advisor, in line with the comments RE: contacts made above.	I	The contact details presented in Environmental Statement section 6.3 of volume 5, annex 9.2: Outline Written Scheme of Investigation have been updated to reflect this comment.
Historic England	Table 7.1 summarises the proposed pre-application and pre-development offshore geophysical survey. Additional information is needed for aspects of this work, such as the line spacing, percentage coverage and expected resolution of the geophysical surveys. In addition, it is not clear if there would be 65 CPTs and vibrocores all together, or 65 of each type collected. It is also stated that only 10 Boreholes would be collected from the cable corridor and questions need to be asked about whether any more would need to be added in the light of the detailed geophysical surveys or to fill in gaps in the knowledge of the area.	I	Environmental Statement section 7 of Volume 5, annex 9.2: Outline Written Scheme of Investigation has been amended to reflect the comment and provide additional information as requested.
Historic England	Section 7.4 should reference the Historic England Marine Geophysics (2013) guidance document. Full coverage or greater should be achieved for side scan and multibeam surveys, and all data should be supplied to the retained archaeologist in raw format for interpretation and analysis.	I	Environmental Statement section 7.4 of volume 5, annex 9.2: Outline Written Scheme of Investigation, has been updated to include reference to the Marine Geophysics Data Acquisition, Processing and Interpretation Guidance Notes (Historic England, 2013).
Historic England	Section 7.5 presents the Geotechnical surveys which states that material would be selected for radiocarbon dating during Stage 3 of the phase's assessment. It is important to note that radiocarbon dating is effective only to c.60,000BP and that alternative dating techniques would need to be applied to deposits expected to be older, such as those associated with Pleistocene and for parts of the Lower Palaeolithic periods. A number of the techniques that can be applied during these periods require a sampling strategy to be developed prior to the cores being collected, such as Optically Stimulated Luminescence (OSL) dating: samples must not be exposed to light during the collection or storage phases and requires certain types of light-proof cores to be used during the collection phases. Specialist involvement is also recommended as early as possible (before the samples are collected) to ensure that all of the necessary samples are collected (sediment samples within the cores, background radiation assessments etc.) and stored in appropriate ways to protect the luminescence signal preserved within the sediments. Furthermore, consideration needs to be given to the retention and appropriate storage of cores to allow for ongoing analysis via the staged approach.	I	Environmental Statement section 7.5 of volume 5, annex 9.2: Outline Written Scheme of Investigation has been amended to reflect comment on OSL dating.
Historic England	Section 8 describes the use of future diver and ROV surveys to further investigate AEZ sites that would be directed impacted by the development. Consideration should also be given to the use of these surveys to examine sample features of medium or low archaeological potential not assigned AEZs in order to 'ground-truth' their archaeological significance.	I	Environmental Statement volume 5, annex 9.2: Outline Written Scheme of Investigation has been amended to reflect comment. It is not intended to carry out additional surveys purely for archaeological purposes, however it is noted that further geophysical surveys will allow more detailed examination of objects on the seabed.
Historic England	We agree with the approaches set out in Section 17.1.1.4, whereby the performance of the WSI would be monitored, allowing for procedures to be reviewed and optimised during the life of the project. We would recommend however that the WSI is fully agreed before any pre-commencement works take place, in order to capture any impact arising from those works.	I	Historic England's comment is noted.
Historic England	Appendix A.9.1.11 states how any artefacts would be stored, but there may also be a requirement to consider how the items would be conserved. Conservation is mentioned as part of the 'discovery of artefacts' section (15.2.2.5), but it also needs to be included in to the appendix.	I	Environmental Statement annex A of volume 5, annex 9.2: Outline Written Scheme of Investigation has been amended to describe the strategy for conservation of artefacts.
Historic England	All archaeological reports (inclusive of geophysical and geotechnical investigations) produced during the course of the development and construction process should be submitted to OASIS.	I	Environmental Statement sections 15 and 16 of volume 5, annex 9.2: Outline Written Scheme of Investigation have been amended to reflect comment and include reference to OASIS.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>29</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Historic England	All references to the IfA throughout the PEIR documents should be amended to ClfA.	I	Text has been amended throughout Environmental Statement volume 5, annex 9.1: Marine Archaeology Technical Report, Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 9: Marine Archaeology and Environmental Statement volume 5, annex 9.2: Outline Written Scheme of Investigation, as appropriate.
Historic England	<p>Summary</p> <p>As discussed above we recognise that a considerable amount of work has already been completed to inform the project. We have however raised some concerns in relation to a number of heritage assets captured within the on-shore chapters, the methodology used to assess these assets and the conclusions reached about the level of harm. This is with reference to the approach to the magnitude and significance of impact as set out in the EIA legislation and with reference to the National Planning Policy Framework. We recognise that further information and discussion would be needed for these sites and would be happy to discuss this further. We would welcome the opportunity to provide further advice on the significance of these heritage assets, the approach to further assessment, as well as the viewpoints for wireframes and photomontages. We have also made a number of recommendations with regards to the text of the off-shore chapters. We would also be happy to discuss these matters further.</p>	I	This comment is noted.
<b>Section 42: Local Authorities (prescribed under section 43 of the Act)</b>			
No comments were received by the local authorities relating to marine archaeology under Phase 2.A.			
<b>Section 42: Persons with an interest in the land (prescribed under section 44 of the Act)</b>			
No comments were received by landowners or land interests relating to marine archaeology under Phase 2.A..			
<b>Section 47: Duty to consult local community</b>			
No comments were received by the local community relating to marine archaeology under Phase 2.A.			
<b>Section 48: Duty to publicise</b>			
No comments were received by in response to the public notice issued during Phase 2.A relating to marine archaeology.			



Table 2.18: Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Further Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.B) relating to marine archaeology.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>30</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 42: Prescribed consultees (The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009: Schedule 1))</b>			
Historic England	<p><b>Offshore</b> Likewise, for the offshore additions, we recognise that these areas are to be seen alongside the existing PEIR. We understand that changes also reflect comments made at the PEIR stage by consultees. We note however from the offshore supporting information document that the level of information presented with Table 2.1 'Summary of key desktop data sources to characterise the baseline environment with the potential offshore alternatives routes' is characteristic of a scoping exercise rather than a PEIR. As such, we request clarification as to whether Historic England will be receiving more detailed information regarding the baseline marine historic environment prior to the submission of the ES. Furthermore, should the applicant proceed directly to the application stage without further consultation with Historic England on a draft EIA for the potential offshore alternative routes, that this approach is used by the applicant as their own risk.</p> <p>We understand from the marine archaeological section of Table 2.1 that it is the intention of the applicant to use data sources as outlined in Table 9.4 of Volume 2: Chapter 9 Marine Archaeology of the Hornsea 3 PEIR. Whilst we acknowledge that Table 9.4 represents a comprehensive, but not exhaustive, list of data sources to contribute towards the characterise of the marine historic environment, no mention is made of the collection and interpretation of existing and/or new geophysical and geotechnical data sets.</p> <p>Consideration for the collection of such data should be included within the project geophysical and geotechnical programme, with method statements produced in consultation with Historic England. Similarly, our comments to the original Hornsea 3 PEIR should also be considered and applied to the potential offshore alternative routes.</p>	I	Updates to the marine archaeology assessment, to reflect the revised offshore cable corridor were made, once the final offshore cable corridor was defined (i.e. following the further section 42 consultation) and submission of the Environmental Statement. Subsequently there was not sufficient time to re-consult on the updated marine archaeology assessment. However, the Environmental Statement has utilised a range of desktop data sources (see Table 9.4 of volume 2, chapter 9: Marine Archaeology), as well site specific data across the Hornsea Three array area and offshore cable corridor (see Table 9.5 of volume 2, chapter 9: Marine Archaeology), to inform the baseline environment. Furthermore, the Outline WSI (volume 5, annex 9.2) provides further information on the additional surveys which will be completed prior to the construction of Hornsea Three.
<b>Section 42: Local Authorities (prescribed under section 43 of the Act)</b>			
No comments were received by the local authorities relating to marine archaeology under Phase 2.B.			
<b>Section 42: Persons with an interest in the land (prescribed under section 44 of the Act)</b>			
No comments were received by landowners or land interests relating to marine archaeology under Phase 2.B..			
<b>Section 47: Duty to consult local community</b>			
No comments were received by the local community relating to marine archaeology under Phase 2.B.			
<b>Section 48: Duty to publicise</b>			
No comments were received by in response to the public notice issued during Phase 2.B relating to marine archaeology.			

<sup>30</sup> Y = Yes change made; N = No change made; I = Incorporated into or considered when producing the assessment or landowner voluntary agreement offer; N/A = Not applicable.

## 2.10 Seascape and Visual Resources

Table 2.19: Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.A) relating to seascape and visual resources.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>31</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 42: Prescribed consultees (The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009: Schedule 1))</b>			
Norfolk County Council	<p>Landscape</p> <p>5.11 The potential landscape impacts associated with the temporary construction compounds; HVAC Booster Station and Substation are only preliminary at this stage and the applicant will need to revisit and expand on this in their Environmental Statement (ES) accompanying the final submission proposal. The ES will also need to include specific elements of mitigation that will be required in order to alleviate any significant adverse effects where these arise. These mitigation measures will be set out within the outline Landscape Scheme and Management Plan (LSMP), which will form part of the EIA/ES. The applicant acknowledges that LSMP will need to be agreed with local planning authorities (LPAs).</p> <p>5.12 Notwithstanding this pending further work (LSMP), the PEIR accepts that on a number of visual receptors, including for example Public Rights of Way (PRoW), it is expected that the onshore infrastructure will have a major adverse significance in EIA terms.</p> <p>5.13 Landscape and visual assessment is to be conducted using the Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (GLVIA) 3rd Edition and other industry best practice guidance. It is noted that the PEIR simply contains viewpoints and wireframes. Viewpoints and visualisations through photomontage are a more useful tool in assessing the likely effects of a proposed development, and the emerging Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) should consider the production of such images, particularly for public consultation at the next stage of the application process. The PEIR indicates that photomontages will be undertaken as part of the Environmental Statement.</p> <p>Comment</p> <p>It is felt that DONG Energy should use photomontages as part of their LVIA and LSMP for assessing the potential impact of onshore infrastructure associated with the above proposal. It is also recommended that any appropriate mitigation measures are agreed with LPAs including the County Council in respect of the HVAC booster station; the proposed new sub-station and any temporary construction compounds</p>	I	<p>Impacts relating to landscape and visual resources are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual resources. Photographic panels along the cable corridor, as well as indicative visualisations have been prepared to inform the assessment of impacts and are provided in Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 4.5: Photographic Panels, Wireframes and Photomontages.</p> <p>Appropriate mitigation measures for visual disturbance are outlined in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources. This includes, for example, the restoration of habitats (including hedgerows) which cannot be avoided and landscape planting around the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.</p>

<sup>31</sup> Y = Yes change made; N = No change made; I = Incorporated into or considered when producing the assessment or landowner voluntary agreement offer; N/A = Not applicable.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>31</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Marine Management Organisation	<p>1.6. Where the significance of a predicted impact is calculated as "Minor or Moderate", the MMO recommends that the significance is assessed as "Moderate" in accordance with the 'worst case scenario' principle of the 'Rochdale Envelope' appraisal. Such impacts would therefore be significant in terms of the subsequent analysis required under the appropriate Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) regulations, according to the matrix rules used by DONG Energy in the PEIR (paragraph 2.9.1.9, Volume 2, Chapter 2 – Benthic Subtidal and Intertidal Ecology and replicated in subsequent 'Offshore' chapters).</p>	I	<p>Regarding Benthic Ecology, In the Environmental Statement, Paragraph 2.9.2.5 of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Subtidal and Intertidal Ecology clarifies that, in cases where a range is suggested for the significance of effect, there remains the possibility that this may span the significance threshold (i.e. the range is given as minor to moderate). In such cases the final significance is based upon the expert's professional judgement as to which outcome delineates the most likely effect, with an explanation as to why this is the case.</p> <p>Additional explanatory text has been inserted into the relevant assessments in sections 2.11.1 to 2.11.3 of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology to clarify why, in instances where there is a choice in the matrix table, an effect has been considered as minor rather than moderate.</p> <p>For Ornithology, the process used to determine the significance of impacts upon relevant receptors is presented in Section 5.9.4 of Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore Ornithology. Where the significance value falls between two categories (e.g. minor or moderate significance) expert judgement is used to determine the significance value</p> <p>For Marine Mammals the magnitude and sensitivity matrix has been updated and all updates have been communicated to the relevant key stakeholders through the EWG.</p> <p>As discussed in the Marine Processes, Benthic Ecology and Fish and Shellfish EWG meeting of 5 December 2017, impact assessment conclusions have been amended to provide further justification for why a significance of minor (i.e. not significant) has been concluded for species of medium to high sensitivity. These are presented in the relevant impact assessments in Section 3.11 (for Hornsea Three alone) and Section 3.13 (for Cumulative Effects) of volume 2, chapter 3: Fish and Shellfish Ecology.</p>
Marine Management Organisation	<p>1.7. The MMO recommends re-examination of the requirements for pre-construction, construction and post-construction monitoring following re-assessment of the magnitude and significance of the potential impacts of the proposed Project. The MMO advises that verification of the impact predictions as set out in the PEIR can, in many cases, only be provided by future monitoring of the relevant receptors. This important consideration should be taken into account when future monitoring requirements are detailed in the 'Offshore' chapters of the PEIR.</p>	I	<p>Consideration of the potential need for monitoring has been considered throughout the offshore chapters of the Environmental Statement. The proposed approach to monitoring for offshore elements of the project is discussed in the In Principle Monitoring Plan that accompanies the application for Development Consent.</p> <p>Explanatory text has been inserted into the relevant assessment sections in the Environmental Statement of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology to clarify why, in instances where there is a choice in the matrix table, an effect has been considered as minor rather than moderate. There are, however, no instances of effects being considered to be of moderate adverse significance. The proposals for future monitoring are outlined in the Environmental Statement in Table 2.25 of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology.</p> <p>The proposed approach to monitoring for offshore ornithology and marine mammals is discussed in the In Principle Monitoring Plan.</p> <p>Monitoring has not been proposed for fish and shellfish ecology, due to the lack of significant effects on fish ecology and the high level of confidence in the assessment presented.</p>
Natural England	<p>2.7.1 Vol. 2 Chapter 10 – Seascape and Visual Impact Assessment 10.3.1.1 Please clarify whether the 25 km buffer for the offshore booster station takes into account visual lighting at night.</p>	I	<p>Light sources potentially visible on the offshore HVAC booster station have been considered up to 25 km from the infrastructure and are assessed in section 10.11.2 of Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 10: Seascape and Visual Resources.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>31</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Natural England	2.7.2 Vol. 2 Chapter 10 – Seascape and Visual Impact Assessment Table 10.2 Any impact on an AONB or sensitive receptor should be considered medium to high and included within this chapter, particularly if existing OWF infrastructure is present	I	Effects on landscape character and land based visual receptors is dealt with in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources. Repetition of receptors and effects in two separate chapters has therefore been avoided
Natural England	2.7.3 Vol. 2 Chapter 10 – Seascape and Visual Impact Assessment 10.7.6 Natural England notes that Oil and Gas infrastructure in this area is organic in design whereas the windfarm turbines and infrastructure is more dense and formulaic. Together with Hornsea Projects One and Two the present project will substantially industrialise this area of the sea fundamentally changing the seascape character. It would be helpful if DONG Energy could work with the relevant people to update the National Seascape Character Area.	I	Cumulative effects on seascape character are considered in section 10.13 of Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 10: Seascape and Visual Resources. GIS data has been made available to Natural England so that the Hornsea Three array area can be mapped for inclusion in any future revision of the National Seascape Character Area database.
Natural England	2.7.4 Vol. 2 Chapter 10 – Seascape and Visual Impact Assessment 10.7.7.9 Natural England advises that changes to the seascape from the offshore booster station and seascape visual impacts to receptors be it offshore or terrestrial should be considered in this chapter rather than Vol. 3 Chapter 4 Landscape and Visual Resources. Impact to the Norfolk Coast Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty should also be considered in this chapter.	N	Seascape - Effects on landscape character and land based visual receptors is dealt with in volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources. Repetition of receptors and effects in two separate chapters has therefore been avoided.
Natural England	2.7.5 Vol. 2 Chapter 10 – Seascape and Visual Impact Assessment 10.7.7.10 The nearshore/costal views and impacts from offshore export cable installation should be considered here.	I	Effects on landscape character and land based visual receptors is dealt with in volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources. Repetition of receptors and effects in two separate chapters has therefore been avoided.



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>31</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 42: Local Authorities (prescribed under section 43 of the Act)</b>			
Norfolk County Council	<p>Landscape</p> <p>5.11 The potential landscape impacts associated with the temporary construction compounds; HVAC Booster Station and Substation are only preliminary at this stage and the applicant will need to revisit and expand on this in their Environmental Statement (ES) accompanying the final submission proposal. The ES will also need to include specific elements of mitigation that will be required in order to alleviate any significant adverse effects where these arise. These mitigation measures will be set out within the outline Landscape Scheme and Management Plan (LSMP), which will form part of the EIA/ES. The applicant acknowledges that LSMP will need to be agreed with local planning authorities (LPAs).</p> <p>5.12 Notwithstanding this pending further work (LSMP), the PEIR accepts that on a number of visual receptors, including for example Public Rights of Way (PRoW), it is expected that the onshore infrastructure will have a major adverse significance in EIA terms.</p> <p>5.13 Landscape and visual assessment is to be conducted using the Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (GLVIA) 3rd Edition and other industry best practice guidance. It is noted that the PEIR simply contains viewpoints and wireframes. Viewpoints and visualisations through photomontage are a more useful tool in assessing the likely effects of a proposed development, and the emerging Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) should consider the production of such images, particularly for public consultation at the next stage of the application process. The PEIR indicates that photomontages will be undertaken as part of the Environmental Statement.</p> <p>Comment</p> <p>It is felt that DONG Energy should use photomontages as part of their LVIA and LSMP for assessing the potential impact of onshore infrastructure associated with the above proposal. It is also recommended that any appropriate mitigation measures are agreed with LPAs including the County Council in respect of the HVAC booster station; the proposed new sub-station and any temporary construction compounds</p>	I	<p>Impacts relating to landscape and visual resources are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual resources. Photographic panels along the cable corridor, as well as indicative visualisations have been prepared to inform the assessment of impacts and are provided in Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 4.5: Photographic Panels, Wireframes and Photomontages.</p> <p>Appropriate mitigation measures for visual disturbance are outlined in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources. This includes, for example, the restoration of habitats (including hedgerows) which cannot be avoided and landscape planting around the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.</p>
<b>Section 42: Persons with an interest in the land (prescribed under section 44 of the Act)</b>			
<i>No comments were received by landowners or land interests relating to seascape and visual resources under Phase 2.A..</i>			
<b>Section 47: Duty to consult local community</b>			
East Lindsey District Council	Before we decide whether to comment can you advise how far it is from the East Lindsey Coast for example to Skegness and how high the turbines are because it maybe that it won't even be visible from East Lindsey	N	Ørsted confirmed that the closest point of the offshore array is approximately 147 km from the East Lindsey coast.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>31</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Robert J Cumber	<p>Hornsea 3 Offshore Wind Farm Proposed Development Consultation. I write to express concerns regarding this proposed development:</p> <p>1) The proposed size, cost and scale of the proposed wind farm My wife and I are finding it hard to understand why it is necessary for this Danish government-owned company (51%) to intrude into UK waters to build what amounts to be an entire city of giant wind turbines. DONG is one of the most expensive suppliers of energy in Denmark with a track record of developing and then disposing of energy companies e.g. it has - or intends to - dispose of all its oil and gas interests.</p> <p>Whilst this development is proposed to impact heavily on both the north Norfolk land and sea scape the local residents will gain no benefit whatsoever from the energy produced- other than paying an energy surcharge towards the cost of this and other "renewable" energy projects.</p>	N	<p>Hornsea Project Three is being developed by Ørsted (formerly DONG Energy). Headquartered in Denmark, Ørsted is the global leader in offshore wind power, with over 25 years of experience developing, constructing and operating offshore wind farms. Over the last decade, we have undergone a truly green transformation, halving our CO2 emissions and focusing our activities on renewable sources of energy. We have recently divested our oil and gas production business and by 2023, we will have replaced coal with sustainable biomass in our power stations across Northern Europe, reducing our carbon emissions by 96%. We are committed to innovation and want to revolutionise the way we provide power to people by developing market leading green energy solutions that benefit the planet and our customers alike.</p> <p>In respect to local benefit, Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 10: Socio-economics assesses the potential socio-economic benefits associated with Hornsea Three. Relevant to this, it is noted that we have established voluntary Community Benefit Funds (CBFs) for a number of our previous projects, which are currently under construction. These funds can make a valuable contribution to the local area, by supporting projects such as community building improvements and recreation facilities, conservation and wildlife projects etc. Any decision to establish a CBF for Hornsea Project Three would be made post financial investment decision (FID), when the Project has been given the green light to go ahead.</p>
Friends of North Norfolk	<p>THE RESPONSE MADE BY THE FRIENDS OF NORTH NORFOLK TO THE HORNSEA PROJECT THREE OFFSHORE WIND FARM DEVELOPMENT PRELIMINARY ENVIRONMENTAL INFORMATION REPORT CONSULTATION.</p> <p>1. The Friends of North Norfolk support green energy and the use of efficient offshore wind farms to produce clean electricity. However, such wind farms and the necessary offshore/onshore infrastructure must not be allowed to result in major cumulative harm to the environment, specifically the landscapes, seascapes and ecology, all of which constitute priceless heritage assets that are designated as of the highest importance both nationally and internationally.</p>	N	<p>Cumulative effects on seascape and visual receptors have been assessed in Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 10: Seascape and Visual Resources. Effects on ecology are considered in volumes 2 and 3 of the Environmental Statement.</p>
Friends of North Norfolk	<p>14. PEIR Volume 2, which deals with offshore, impacts because of inter-relationship and cumulative harm to/ with onshore receptors, notably:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Chapter 4 Marine Mammals. The importance of both grey and common seal colonies, as an ecological and tourist asset.</li> <li>- Chapter 5 Offshore Ornithology.</li> <li>- Chapter 6 Commercial Fisheries.</li> <li>- Chapter 10 Seascape and Visual Resources.</li> </ul>	I	<p>An assessment of the cumulative effects of Hornsea Three with other plans and projects is presented Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 4: Marine Mammals, chapter 5: Offshore Ornithology, chapter 6: Commercial Fisheries and chapter 10: Seascape and Visual Resources as well as throughout the remainder of Environmental Statement chapters. A description of the likely inter-related effects arising from Hornsea Three on receptors is provided in the Environmental Statement in volume 2, chapter 12: Inter-Related Effects (Offshore).</p>
Friends of North Norfolk	<p>15. HVAC Booster Stations will be visible from very important sensitive areas of AONB, Heritage Coast, SSSI, and RAMSAR sites - as evidenced by PEIR Volume 2, Chapter 10, and Figure 10.3 Zone of Theoretical Visibility of Offshore HVAC Booster Stations.</p>	I	<p>The potential visual impacts associated with the onshore and offshore HVAC booster stations are assessed in Environmental Statement, volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources. Particular consideration has been given to the designated sites including the AONB as a sensitive receptor, and it is noted that Hornsea Three has consulted with the Norfolk Coast Partnership to agree viewpoints to inform the assessment of impacts on this particular receptor.</p> <p>Appropriate mitigation measures for visual disturbance are outlined in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources. This includes, for example, the restoration of habitats (including hedgerows) which cannot be avoided and landscape planting around the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>31</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Friends of North Norfolk	20. Panoramic sea views of the Coastal Edge, and the interaction between the landscape and sea are an essential part of its unique character made up by the dynamic coastal landforms and processes, ecological interdependences, biodiversity and cultural, architectural, economic, historic and archaeological features.	I	The visual impacts of Hornsea Three offshore and onshore are addressed in Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 10: Seascape and Visual Resources and volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources respectively. Impacts on coastal landforms and processes, ecology, cultural heritage and socio-economics are assessed in the relevant topic chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 2 and volume 3).
William J Horabin	The PEIR is quite obviously a deficient desk based assessment with inadequate weight given to the significance of the Seascape, Landscape and Heritage Receptors within North Norfolk.	N	The PEIR presented only preliminary assessments and this was acknowledged throughout the consultation materials. The final Environmental Statement has updated all assessments and the effects on seascape character and visual resources from Hornsea Three have been considered within section 10.11 of Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 10: Seascape and Visual Resources, and alongside other projects, plans and activities in section 10.13 of Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 10: Seascape and Visual Resources. The assessment has been based on present day best practice guidance (Visual Representation of Wind farms: Good Practice Guidance – Version 3 (SNH, 2014)) as outlined in section 10.3 of Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 10: Seascape and Visual Resources.
William J Horabin	The cumulative and inter relational impacts of recent development and proposed development within the proposed landfall and cabling routes have failed to be correctly recognised/identified - namely Dudgeon and Sheringham Shoal Offshore Wind Farms (which make landfall at Weybourne), Race Bank Offshore Wind Farm (which despite being presented as being beyond the horizon/hardly visible from onshore is in reality clearly visible from within very sensitive and significant parts of the Norfolk Coast AONB, Heritage Coast, English National Trail SSSI's etc.), Norfolk Vanguard & Boreas Offshore Wind Farms and Bodham and Selbrigg Onshore Wind Turbine Developments (which are currently under appraisal). PEIR Volumes 2 & 3 are particularly deficient in this regard.	I	The potential for impacts arising as a result of Hornsea Project Three to combine with other planned developments (including the Vattenfall projects) is assessed in each respective Environmental Statement topic chapter, under the heading 'Cumulative Effect Assessment'. Environmental Statement volume 3, Chapter 11: Inter-related effects provides an assessment of the likely effects should the same type of impact affect the same receptor group during each of the three key project phases (i.e. construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning), and therefore have the potential to combine and result in an overall effect of greater significance. It also provides an assessment of the likely effects should multiple impact types occur on the same receptor group (e.g. noise and landscape and visual impacts may affect the same residential properties); impacts may individually be considered insignificant, but when considered together, could amount to a significant cumulative effect.
<b>Section 48: Duty to publicise</b>			
No comments were received by in response to the public notice issued during Phase 2.A relating to seascape and visual resources.			

Table 2.20: Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Further Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.B) relating to seascape and visual resources.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>32</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 42: Prescribed consultees (The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009: Schedule 1))</b>			
<i>No comments were received by prescribed consultees relating to seascape and visual resources under Phase 2.B.</i>			
<b>Section 42: Local Authorities (prescribed under section 43 of the Act)</b>			
<i>No comments were received by the local authorities relating to seascape and visual resources under Phase 2.B.</i>			
<b>Section 42: Persons with an interest in the land (prescribed under section 44 of the Act)</b>			
<i>No comments were received by landowners or land interests relating to seascape and visual resources under Phase 2.B..</i>			
<b>Section 47: Duty to consult local community</b>			
<i>No comments were received by the local community relating to seascape and visual resources under Phase 2.B.</i>			
<b>Section 48: Duty to publicise</b>			
<i>No comments were received by in response to the public notice issued during Phase 2.B relating to seascape and visual resources.</i>			

<sup>32</sup> Y = Yes change made; N = No change made; I = Incorporated into or considered when producing the assessment or landowner voluntary agreement offer; N/A = Not applicable.



## 2.11 Infrastructure and other users

Table 2.21: Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.A) relating to infrastructure and other users.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>33</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 42: Prescribed consultees (The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009: Schedule 1))</b>			
The Coal Authority	The Coal Authority has reviewed the proposals and can confirm that the proposed development would be located outside the defined coalfield. Accordingly, the Coal Authority has no issues that it would wish to see considered as part of the Environmental Statement for this proposal.	I	The response is noted and has been included in Table 11.4 of Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 11: Infrastructure and Other Users.
Shell International Limited	She is requesting the shape files of the Hornsea Three route (onshore and offshore) on behalf of her technical team. [REDACTED]	N/A	Ørsted provided Shell International Limited with shapefiles of the Hornsea Three export cable corridor for information.
Mainline Pipelines Ltd	Further to your letters dated 25 <sup>th</sup> July 2017 (Ref:HOW03_s42_25072017) and 2 <sup>nd</sup> August 2017(Ref:HOW03_s42_02082017), I confirm that Mainline Pipelines Ltd.'s pipelines are not located within 100 miles of your proposed development.	N/A	The response is noted and has been included in Table 11.4 of volume 2, chapter 11: Infrastructure and Other Users.
Oil & Gas Authority	Would it be possible for you to send us the attached map again but with our Offshore Petroleum Licensing Quadrants and Blocks grid references overlaid on it please? That will help us understand the petroleum licensing issues that we may need to make you are of. Would you need shape files from us to be able to do that?	N/A	Ørsted acknowledged comments and a shapefile was shared with the Oil & Gas Authority to inform their consultation response.
Cruising Association	Thank you for your letter and USB card. The Cruising Association has approximately 6,000 people in membership with some 4,000 yachts and comments only on the Navigation and Small Vessel Safety aspects of such proposals. Where our members have concerns on other aspects we invite them to make these known through other organisations more suitable. (Members have also expressed concern about Marine Mammals and land-side Visual Amenity). In principle we do not object to the proposal but do have the following concerns:	I	The response is noted and has been included in Table 11.4 of Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 11: Infrastructure and Other Users.
Cruising Association	<b>Cruising Yacht Routes</b> We doubt the very low figures recorded at Para 3.3.3.12 for yachts crossing the cable corridor. Yacht traffic is not heavy but all on passages between the Channel/ East Coast rivers and the Humber northwards including Scotland plus those originating from the continent must cross the corridor somewhere. We have no data but suggest that 5-10 per day during the summer period may be more accurate.	N	Marine traffic surveys for the Hornsea Three offshore cable corridor also consider desktop resources such as the RYA UK Coastal Atlas of Recreational Boating (2016). It is this information which informs the EIA
Cruising Association	<b>Operating Port</b> We reserve comment on your landside operating port since the location of this is not yet known. It is our experience that there is usually no conflict between recreational craft and wind-farm boats but this can occur in the immediate vicinity of some ports. Published fixed routing of construction traffic and construction site may be advisable.	I	Construction traffic will be monitored and managed by a marine coordinator so that vessels do not impact on other users.

<sup>33</sup> Y = Yes change made; N = No change made; I = Incorporated into or considered when producing the assessment or landowner voluntary agreement offer; N/A = Not applicable.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>33</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Cruising Association	<p><b>Turbine Layout</b> It is a matter of safety for recreational craft that the layout of turbines should be in straight lines following a rectangular or similar pattern aligned with the prevailing wind thus enabling a 'see-through' passage by small craft. This considerably eases accurate steering in poor weather and largely avoids disorientation of helmsmen. We are sensitive however to the point made at 7.11.2.146 of the PEIR that in this case such a layout would increase cost to the taxpayer. Our point is eased by adoption of a minimum turbine spacing of 1,000m or greater and disorientation of helmsmen can be mitigated to an extent by additional internal marking and lighting as considered at 7.16.15. Turbine towers are an obstruction to free navigation and we would always support fewer, larger, turbines than greater numbers of smaller turbines. Given the choice of layouts offered we opt for Layout A rather than Layout B but would defer to the view of MCA/TH on the matter.</p>	I	Internal navigation impacts are considered in section 7.11 of Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 7: Shipping and Navigation and Environmental Statement section 22 volume 5, annex 7.1: Navigational Risk Assessment.
Cruising Association	<p><b>Sub-Stations</b> For similar reasons we ask that sub-stations, accommodation platforms, met masts, etc. should be constructed as far as possible in line with turbines.</p>	I	Internal navigation impacts are considered in section 7.11 of Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 7: Shipping and Navigation and Environmental Statement section 22 of volume 5, annex 7.1: Navigational Risk Assessment.
Cruising Association	<p><b>Booster Station Area</b> Yachts and other recreational craft in this area of the North Sea most commonly transit north-south typically within 25nm of the coast but occasionally much further offshore. We can confirm your survey data that such traffic is almost nil during winter but your September survey data rather misses the peak summer season when perhaps double the number of recreational craft surveyed may be typically expected. We ask therefore for the Booster Station to be constructed as far north-east towards the turbine field as possible. We reserve on marking and lighting of the structure until more details are available but suspect that additional standard navigation marks may be needed. Para 7.16.1.8 refers</p>	Y	<p>The survey period for the summer season was agreed with the MCA and satisfies the requirements of MGN 543.</p> <p>The survey data is reported in Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 7: Shipping and Navigation. Recreational vessels are discussed in Environmental Statement section 11.7 of volume 2, chapter 11: Infrastructure and Other Users. The location of the offshore HVAC booster station search area has been refined since the publication of the PEIR. The offshore HVAC booster station search area now occupies the central region of the offshore HVAC booster station search area presented in the PEIR. Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives presents further justification for this change. The lighting and marking of the offshore HVAC booster stations is presented in Environmental Statement Table 11.27 of volume 2, chapter 11: Infrastructure and Other Users. Recreational vessels are discussed in section Environmental Statement 11.7 of volume 2, chapter 11: Infrastructure and Other Users.</p>
Cruising Association	<p><b>Collision and Allision Risk</b> Our experience with wind farms is that there is little increase in collision risk for yachts except in areas close to wind farm working harbours where specialised construction traffic may be manoeuvring and areas along the perimeter of wind farms where main routes are diverted thus forcing yachts and large vessels into proximity. We reserve on this until more is known about your proposed local working and storage harbours and frequency of use. We have no experience of offshore structures with floating foundations (Para 7.11.2.85) but think that any horizontal movement of the structures will not be significant to recreational craft and that a maintained minimum water depth above catenaries, etc. of 3m, preferably 4m, will be sufficient. Para 7.16.1.5 goes a long way to meet our concerns.</p>	Y	Construction traffic will be monitored and managed by a marine coordinator so that vessels do not impact on other users. Floating foundations are no longer under consideration.
Cruising Association	<p><b>Cable Landing</b> We have no concerns about cable burial, protection, etc. in depths greater than 10m. In lesser depths we ask that cables are buried 1m with a minimum of 1.5m where yachts may commonly anchor. A smooth bottom with no berms or 'humps' over the cable should be maintained at all times. When more details are available we may also ask for provision of a marker beacon or daymark to indicate the landing point from seaward.</p>	I	Regarding burial depths, a Cable Burial Risk Assessment (or similar) is included as a measure adopted as part of Hornsea Three with detail provided in section 7.10 of Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 7: Shipping and Navigation and section 23 of Environmental Statement volume 5, annex 7.1: Navigational Risk Assessment.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>33</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Cruising Association	<b>Safety Zones</b> We fully support safety zones of 50m around completed turbine towers and 500m around maintenance procedures (as indicated by presence of work-boats) and accommodation platforms plus 500m moving zones around cable-layers and similar specialised vessels.	I	Comment noted and Safety Zones are discussed in Table 11.27 of Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 11: Infrastructure and Other Users. Further, details on the application and use of safety zones is provided in section 7.10 of Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 7: Shipping and Navigation and section 23 of Environmental Statement volume 5, annex 7.1: Navigational Risk Assessment.
Cruising Association	<b>Cumulative Aspects</b> We have a growing concern about the proliferation of offshore wind farms in the southern North Sea. While much yacht traffic is fairly close inshore and thus not badly affected the remaining traffic is normally on long-distance passages confronted with a need to be constantly avoiding wind farms or making through-passages between the towers. It is of increasing importance therefore that consideration is given to cumulative affects with coordination of marking, layout and spacing between neighbouring farms. Hornsea 3 therefore should if possible be coordinated in layout with the other Hornsea farms. The proposed channel between Hornsea 2 and Hornsea 3 will prove valuable in resolving this concern but may be treated as a Narrow Channel under Rule 9 of Colregs and require additional buoyage and lighting	I	The CEA in section 7.12 of Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 7: Shipping and Navigation and section 21 of Environmental Statement volume 5, annex 7.1: Navigational Risk Assessment takes into account the impact associated with Hornsea Three together with other projects and plans. This includes the proposed navigational corridor.
Cruising Association	<b>General</b> We support your assessment at 7.11.2.35 that recreational craft are likely to use the Hornsea site as a passage waypoint and that they can do so safely. It should be noted that a relatively large proportion of foreign-flagged yachts, strangers to the area, may be expected in the general location and these may not be equipped with local knowledge or up-to-date large-scale charts, etc. Our policy is therefore always to seek consistency in overall design and regulation of all wind farms in north-west Europe.	I	Hornsea Three has committed to developing a wind farm layout with a single line of orientation meaning the turbines will be in development rows. The wind farm will include lighting and marking in accordance with Trinity House.
ConocoPhillips (U.K.) Limited	Thank you for the detail provided to date on Project Three, much appreciated. ConocoPhillips are currently trying to determine proximities and potential impact to our infrastructure surrounding the Windfarm and its cable corridors. I would be most grateful if you could provide the latest shapefiles of the 2 cable export routes, or alternatively a list of coordinates defining the two cable routes. A response as soon as is practicable would be much appreciated, in order to establish whether or not we would like to comment on the proposed application by the deadline set of the 20th September	N/A	Ørsted provided ConocoPhillips (U.K.) Limited with the shapefiles of the Hornsea Three export cable corridor for information.
Conoco Phillips (U.K.) Limited	COP has considered the proposed application and as the Operator and one of the owners of assets in the vicinity of the proposed Hornsea Project 3 development, wishes to register the following key issues. 1.) COP must be able to fully consider all possible implications and to ensure satisfactory mitigations are in place for the continued safety and integrity of COP pipelines and infrastructure. Crossings of COP pipelines should be kept to a minimum through bundling or other appropriate methods where possible.	I	Ørsted acknowledged the request for bundling and discussed future plans for offshore crossings with ConocoPhillips (U.K.) Limited. Ørsted confirmed that bundling will be taken into consideration for future crossings.
Conoco Phillips (U.K.) Limited	2) There should be no impediment to access to COP facilities that may compromise or complicate COP decommissioning activity.	I	Pipeline proximity and crossing agreements are discussed in paragraph 11.7.15.2 of Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 11, Infrastructure and Other Users.
Conoco Phillips (U.K.) Limited	3) Collision Risk Management System (CRMS) - At present, the impact of displacing shipping is uncertain, however, traffic is likely to increase proximate to our assets. This has a number of significant implications to COP's existing Marine Operations arrangements including the Radar Early Warning System (REWS) and Emergency Response and Rescue Vessels (ERRV) used to monitor the approach of errant vessels to COP's assets. COP expects Hornsea Three to acknowledge that it will have an obligation to procure a mitigation solution if required, with parties agreeing to work together in good faith and expeditiously to identify the extent of risk to the CRMS, REWS and ERRV and suitable and proportionate mitigation measures to ensure that such systems are not impaired by the construction and operation of Hornsea Three.	I	The potential impact on ConocoPhillips REWS and the potential effect of displaced shipping routes on ConocoPhillips CPA is assessed in section 11.11.2 of volume 2, chapter 11: Infrastructure and Other Users.  The displacement of shipping routes and the effect on ERRV is assessed in volume 2, chapter 7: Shipping and Navigation.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>33</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Conoco Phillips (U.K.) Limited	4) Potential crossing/proximity Issues - COP needs to be able to assess the proximity of wind farm construction and maintenance operations to infrastructure as well as any construction or maintenance vessels to determine if any additional protection measures will be required.	I	Pipeline proximity and crossing agreements are discussed in paragraph 11.7.15.2 of Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 11, Infrastructure and Other Users.
Conoco Phillips (U.K.) Limited	5) Crossing points should be designed such that the crossing angle be as close to 90 degrees as possible and have a 300 mm physical separation between the cable and pipeline at the mid-point between anodes. This is to minimise the potential for adverse mechanical loads and electrical interference with the pipeline CP system.	I	Ørsted acknowledged the technical requirements for cable/pipeline crossings and confirmed that this will feed into any future crossing methodologies.
Conoco Phillips (U.K.) Limited	6) There is additional concern surrounding electrical interference from HVDC / HVAC current flows through proximate cabling. In order to reserve Cathodic Protection and minimise interference, a minimum 50m proximity zone has been identified in order to ensure the safety of COP pipelines.	I	Pipeline proximity and crossing agreements are discussed in paragraph 11.7.15.2 of Volume 2, Chapter 11, Infrastructure and Other Users.
Conoco Phillips (U.K.) Limited	COP is willing to act reasonably and enter into commercial discussions with DONG in good faith. The execution of Offshore Crossing/Proximity Agreements may be required to appropriately address all the important issues raised in this consultation including those outlined above. These agreements will also require to be reviewed and accepted by the other infrastructure owners, on behalf of whom COP operates.	I	Ørsted acknowledged ConocoPhillips (U.K.) Limited's request for crossing and proximity agreements with regards to Hornsea Three, where required. Ørsted will develop the relevant agreements in conjunction with ConocoPhillips (U.K.) Limited once more detailed design has been conducted, post DCO application.
Conoco Phillips (U.K.) Limited	COP plans to register as an interested party when the opportunity arises during the planning process and would be most grateful to DONG for informing COP when this option is available. Please note that concerns raised at this time are based on headline issues currently captured, and further concerns may be raised following review of technical detail as it becomes available.	N	Comment from ConocoPhillips noted.
Royal Yachting Association	Thank you for notification of the statutory consultation and the opportunity to respond. The RYA met with DONG ( ) and Anatec ( ) on 01 Feb 2017 to discuss navigational issues. During that meeting the RYA expressed its opinion that, from the RYA's perspective, the HOW03 array area did not present any significant problems. This is largely based on the fact that there is very little recreational activity that far offshore and anyone who is transiting that far offshore would be very experienced and well equipped.	N	Response noted.
Royal Yachting Association	The RYA's main concern relates to the cable landfall where the cable comes within the 10m contour and any resulting reduction in water depth. It was pointed out that there could be issues where the cable crosses inland waterways and it was agreed that DONG would discuss this with the onshore team to ensure that the RYA was consulted with respect to this.	I	A full assessment has been undertaken in relation to cable burial and associated protection within the 10m contour, included in Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 7, Shipping and Navigation. Also see Environmental Statement volume 5, annex 7.1: Navigational Risk Assessment. In relation to crossing of inland waterways, following consultation on the PEIR, the project has committed to crossing all major rivers using HDD so no navigational issues are anticipated in this regard.
Royal Yachting Association	With respect to layouts, the RYA did not have any concerns regarding the indicative layouts presented by DONG Energy. The RYA considered the corridor between the projects to be more than adequate with respect to use by recreational craft.	I	Hornsea Three has committed to developing a wind farm layout with a single line of orientation meaning the turbines will be in development rows. The wind farm will include lighting and marking in accordance with Trinity House requirements.
Royal Yachting Association	RYA maintains its position with respect to not seeing the need for operational safety zones for floating offshore winds turbines. They respect the use of safety zones during construction as well as for manned structures during operation.	I	Comment noted. The project has removed floating foundations from the project envelope.
Sheringham Shoal, Statoil	Sheringham Shoal Offshore Wind Farm is owned by Statoil, Statkraft and The Green Investment Bank through a joint-venture company Scira Offshore Energy Limited ("Scira"). Scira is generally supportive of your Hornsea Project Three Offshore Wind Farm ("Hornsea") application as the wind farm would be an important contribution to help meet the government's commitment to renewable energy. Nevertheless, we have undertaken a preliminary review of the application and would like to take the opportunity to express our initial primary concerns in relation to Hornsea Three.	N/A	Comment noted and responses to each of the individual comments are provided.



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>33</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Sheringham Shoal, Statoil	Firstly, we are concerned about the potential export cable cross-over between Sheringham Shoal and Hornsea. This must be managed so that Scira's asset integrity, availability and production capacity are maintained. Sheringham Shoal's export cables are owned by Blue Transmission Sheringham Shoal Limited ("Blue Transmission") and it is Scira's expectation that Dong Energy are in direct dialogue with Blue Transmission to find an acceptable solution for all parties.	N/A	Hornsea Three engaged with Frontier Power to discuss concerns regarding the export cable route. Updated plans showing the potential interactions were sent to Frontier Power.  Hornsea Three refers Statoil to the Blue Transmission response.
Sheringham Shoal, Statoil	Secondly, due to the expected scale of Hornsea, we fear potential grid outages or curtailments caused by the construction of Hornsea and potential loss of production at Sheringham Shoal. Scira would therefore welcome mitigation measures aiming to minimise or compensate any disruption to Scira's business.	N	In regard to grid outages, Hornsea Three will be connected to an entirely different substation and both parties have entirely separate contractual and regulated agreements with National Grid governing grid access. Curtailment (compensated with the bid/offer mechanism in the market) falls outside the scope of the Environmental Statement.
Sheringham Shoal, Statoil	The comments above are non-exhaustive and without prejudice to any further submissions that Scira may wish to make as more information becomes available. Furthermore, please keep us informed with respect to any plans for engineering and environmental survey work in proximity to Scira's assets.	N/A	Comment noted and responses to each of the individual comments are provided.
Wintershall	In contrary of what has been stated in the relevant documents currently under consultation please be advised that the status of the well 49/08c-4 is plugged and abandoned. <a href="https://itportal.ogauthority.co.uk/edufox5live/fox/edu/">https://itportal.ogauthority.co.uk/edufox5live/fox/edu/</a> <a href="https://itportal.ogauthority.co.uk/edufox5live/fox/edu/">https://itportal.ogauthority.co.uk/edufox5live/fox/edu/</a>	I	Section 11.7.13 of Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 11: Infrastructure and Other Users has been updated to reflect the fact that well 49/08c-4, formerly operated by Wintershall, is plugged and abandoned. Hornsea Three notes that there are no completed or drilling wells within the Hornsea Three array area.
Ministry of Defence	The potential for the offshore development area to contain unexploded ordnance has been identified in relation to the construction of foundations for turbines, accommodation blocks and inverter platforms. However, this potential hazard has not been directly identified as a relevant consideration in relation to the installation of sea cables to the shore.	I	UXO within the Hornsea Three array area and offshore cable corridor has been considered in a historical context in volume 2, chapter 9: Marine Archaeology of the Environmental Statement. The potential hazard related to UXO during construction will be considered in the Construction Method Statement which is developed post consent.
Dudgeon Offshore Wind Ltd	In principle Dudgeon Offshore Wind Ltd is supportive of the Hornsea Three application in so far as it will provide an important contribution to help meet the government's commitment on renewable energy.	N/A	Ørsted acknowledged Dudgeon Offshore Wind Ltd.'s comments. No further action is required.
Dudgeon Offshore Wind Ltd	Dudgeon Offshore Wind Ltd has undertaken a preliminary review of the application and has identified three initial areas of concern based on the information provided regarding the Hornsea Project Three Offshore Wind Farm. The first topic is how the potential export cable cross over sections between Dudgeon Offshore Wind farm and Hornsea Three will be managed to ensure Dudgeon Offshore Wind Ltd asset integrity, availability and production capacity. Dudgeon Offshore Wind Ltd.'s export cables is currently subject for the OFTO sale process, and will during next year be owned by the OFTO off-taker. It is expected that Dong Energy will be in direct dialogue with the relevant owner for negotiating an acceptable cable crossing agreement.	N/A	Hornsea Three engaged with Dudgeon Offshore Wind Limited and discussed potential cable interactions.  The impact of Hornsea Three on Dudgeon export cables is considered in section 11.11 of volume 2, chapter 11: Infrastructure and Other Users.
Dudgeon Offshore Wind Ltd	Secondly, we are also concerned about potential grid outages or curtailments due to the construction of Hornsea Three will impact Dudgeon's production output.	N/A	In regard to grid outages, Hornsea Three will be connected to an entirely different substation and both parties have entirely separate contractual and regulated agreements with National Grid governing grid access. Curtailment (compensated with the bid/offer mechanism in the market) falls outside the scope of the Environmental Statement.
Dudgeon Offshore Wind Ltd	Thirdly, Dudgeon Offshore Wind Ltd expect to be duly notified and consulted before any engineering and environmental survey work near the Dudgeon cable landfall takes place. This includes any onshore and offshore soil investigations close to Dudgeon Offshore Wind Ltd.'s assets.	N/A	Ørsted confirmed that Dudgeon Offshore Wind Limited would be kept informed of any onshore or offshore work in the vicinity of its assets.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>33</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
DONG Energy	<p>DONG Energy is grateful for the opportunity to comment on Hornsea Project Three's PEIR consultation and would like to emphasise its support for the project. Hornsea Project Three is proximate to Hornsea Project One, Two, and Four Offshore Wind Farms.</p> <p>Page 2/3 Doc. no. 2920797</p> <p>Hornsea Project Three has actively engaged with Hornsea Project One, Two and Four during the development of the project and Hornsea Project One, Two and Four look forward to this continuing throughout the development of Hornsea Project Three.</p> <p>The text below is divided into project specific responses and any questions and further updates should be directed to Ditte Bilde</p> <p><b>Hornsea Project One Offshore Wind farm</b> The Hornsea Project One Order came into force on 31 December 2014. The Project One Companies applied for a correction order which came into force on 1 May 2015, and two Amendment Orders have also been granted in March 2016 and March 2017 respectively.</p> <p>Hornsea Project One has also been awarded a Contract for Difference under the Final Investment Decision Enabling for Renewables process. The Project took Final Investment Decision in February 2016 and construction works are well underway. Onshore construction works commenced in January 2016 and offshore construction works started earlier this month (September 2017). Hornsea Project One supports the development of Hornsea Project Three and looks forward to ongoing engagement between these two projects.</p> <p><b>Hornsea Project Two Offshore Wind Farm</b> This submission is made jointly on behalf of Optimus Wind Limited and Breesea Limited, the "Project Two Companies".</p> <p>Hornsea Project Two was awarded a Development Consent Order by the Secretary of State for Energy on 16 August 2016.</p> <p>Hornsea Project Two was awarded a Contract for Difference on 11 September 2017 and is fully committed to building the wind farm to programme.</p> <p>Hornsea Project Two supports the development of Hornsea Project Three and looks forward to continuing the engagement already underway.</p> <p><b>Hornsea Project Four Offshore Wind farm</b> DONG Energy holds an Agreement for Lease dated 13 March 2016 for Hornsea Project Four.</p> <p>Hornsea Project Four supports the development of Hornsea Project Three and looks forward to continuing the engagement already underway.</p>	I	Ørsted acknowledged the comments with regard to the other Hornsea projects and no further action was required.
Centrica	<p>Proximity and crossing of assets</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Further consultation is required to understand what formal agreements would be required should there be any crossings or proximities to Centrica E&amp;P asset infrastructure and pipelines including the potential need for exclusion zones.</li> <li>Wireline drawings have been produced for a number of locations but those most impacted platforms Chiswick and Grove have not been produced. Whilst these are not normally manned, helicopter transported maintenance interventions take place on each for over 40 days per year. Vessel based campaigns are periodically scheduled throughout the life and eventual decommissioning that significantly increase the number of days.</li> </ul>	I	Pipeline crossings are assessed in section 11.11 of Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 11: Infrastructure and Other Users, and are to be included in the cooperation agreement being prepared between Hornsea Three and Centrica E&P. Helicopter access to the Chiswick and Grove platforms is assessed in section 8.11 of Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 8: Aviation, Military and Communication. Vessel access to oil and gas infrastructure is assessed in section 11.11 of Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 11: Infrastructure and Other Users.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>33</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Centrica	Risk assessment methodology · Discussion is needed on the approach and conclusions reached. Concerns that we may consider intolerable from a safety perspective are incorrectly evaluated as not posing a significant impact.	I	A safety assessment is included in Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 8 Aviation, Military and Communications, volume 2 and in Environmental Statement chapter 7 Shipping and Navigation. An assessment on the REWS performance is provided in Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 11: Infrastructure and Other Users.
Centrica	Maximising Economic Recovery · Discussion is needed on impacts of the proposed development on oil and gas companies' legal obligation to take the steps necessary to secure the maximum value of economically recoverable petroleum from the strata beneath UK waters.	I	A discussion of oil and gas licencing is presented in section 11.7.9 of Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 11: Infrastructure and Other Users, and a discussion on what information has been included in the assessments is also presented in section 11.11.1 of Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 11: Infrastructure and Other Users.
Peel Ports	3. We have yet to see satisfactory information to assure GYPC that the construction or operation of the wind farm will not impede or otherwise adversely affect the dredging regime, infrastructure or operation of the Port.	N	Hornsea Three notes that the Great Yarmouth Port is located approximately 60 km from the Hornsea Three offshore cable corridor and intertidal area. Hornsea Three will therefore not adversely affect the dredging regime, infrastructure or operation of the port.
Peel Ports	We therefore would require reassurances that the impact upon the Port, its operations and those of its customers is safeguarded during the construction and operational phases of the development.	N	Hornsea Three notes that the Great Yarmouth Port is located approximately 60 km from the Hornsea Three offshore cable corridor and intertidal area. Hornsea Three will therefore not adversely affect the dredging regime, infrastructure or operation of the port.
Tampnet	Our response will be exclusively linked to the offshore part of the development. Tampnet operates the world's largest offshore subsea fibre, microwave and 4G/LTE network serving the Energy industry. In addition to serving our Energy clients, we provide high speed and low latency connectivity between Scandinavia and the UK and Europe through our redundant subsea fibre optic network. The map below shows our basic infrastructure of subsea fibre cables and microwave links. The Hornsea Three wind farm is planned to be in close vicinity of the Tampnet cable system. The export cable(s) will cross our cable, and the offshore windfarm area is planned in close vicinity of our cable. Our response to the consultation will be kept brief in this letter, as we would like to request a face-to-face meeting to discuss the details of the below issues as soon as practical. Our issues are as follows:	I	Crossing and proximity agreements are discussed in section 11.7.15 of volume 2, chapter 11: Infrastructure and Other Users. Cable crossings and proximities are assessed in section 11.11 of volume 2, chapter 11: Infrastructure and Other Users.  Ørsted acknowledged Tampnets interest in Hornsea Three and held a meeting to discuss their response further.
Tampnet	·A crossing by one or more of the export cables, and one or more of your inter-array cables, of our fibre optic cable is in general accepted, pending our agreement and acceptance of a suitable crossing design. A Crossing Agreement based on standard industry format will be preferred. We are open to include more than one crossing in a single Agreement if that is preferable. Our main goal in Crossing Agreements is to maintain our ability to repair our cable, and make sure that the crossing happens in a safe way.	I	Crossing and proximity agreements are discussed in section 11.7.15 of volume 2, chapter 11: Infrastructure and Other Users.  Hornsea Three has engaged with Tampnet to discuss crossings and agreed a high level approach for engagement.
Tampnet	The placement of wind-turbines or sub-stations (or any other infrastructure) in close proximity of our fibre optic cable may be a problem for us. We need to be able to repair our cable if it is cut or damaged, and a cable repair ship will need some space to perform such a repair. As such we will request that an agreed safety zone is put in place around our cable, based on an agreed distance from our cable, and that no turbines, or other structures that may limit the movement a cable repair ship will require, within this zone. This is excluding crossings, as explained above	I	Crossing and proximity agreements are discussed in section 11.7.15 of volume 2, chapter 11: Infrastructure and Other Users.  Hornsea Three has engaged with Tampnet and noted their concerns regarding safety zones around assets. Suitable buffers have been applied when considering turbine layouts.
Tampnet	A meeting to present our cable and our company to go through our concerns would be preferable. Please advise if this can happen soon.	I	Ørsted organised a meeting between Hornsea Three and Tampnet to discuss potential future interactions. As a result, a letter of agreement was drafted and signed by both parties.
Tampnet	Tampnet is in dialogue with Dong Energy on the HOW01 and HOW02 related to communications services to the windfarm(s). We can provide internal references for this work if needed.	N/A	Ørsted replied to Tampnet regarding communications services and agreed to a potential meeting to discuss this further.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>33</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Shell U.K. Limited	Following a review of these shapefiles, we have identified nine Shell pipelines (listed below) which the proposed route will affect. I am therefore writing to request that each of these pipelines and the pipeline corridor (the area 200 metres either side of each pipeline) are avoided in developing final designs and in carrying out any sampling, investigations or works in connection with Hornsea 3.	N	Ørsted responded to Shell with an email to confirm interaction of the proposed works for Hornsea Three within 200m of any Shell assets.  Pipelines are listed in Table 11.16 of volume 2, chapter 11: Infrastructure and Other Users. Pipeline crossings and proximities are assessed in section 11.11 of volume 2, chapter 11: Infrastructure and Other Users.
Shell U.K. Limited	I would also be grateful if you could please notify me of any sampling, investigations or works to be undertaken within 300 metres either side of each pipeline corridor. To the extent you are unable to accommodate our requests, please do contact me on [REDACTED] or [REDACTED] or Raju Vullla on [REDACTED] or [REDACTED] before commencing any activity to discuss your proposals with us.	I	Ørsted acknowledged the requirement for notification of any sampling or investigative activities in proximity to Shell assets and will ensure such notification is given prior to any works.
Marine Management Organisation	1.6. Where the significance of a predicted impact is calculated as "Minor or Moderate", the MMO recommends that the significance is assessed as "Moderate" in accordance with the 'worst case scenario' principle of the 'Rochdale Envelope' appraisal. Such impacts would therefore be significant in terms of the subsequent analysis required under the appropriate Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) regulations, according to the matrix rules used by DONG Energy in the PEIR (paragraph 2.9.1.9, Volume 2, Chapter 2 – Benthic Subtidal and Intertidal Ecology and replicated in subsequent 'Offshore' chapters).	I	Regarding Benthic Ecology, In the Environmental Statement, Paragraph 2.9.2.5 of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Subtidal and Intertidal Ecology clarifies that, in cases where a range is suggested for the significance of effect, there remains the possibility that this may span the significance threshold (i.e. the range is given as minor to moderate). In such cases the final significance is based upon the expert's professional judgement as to which outcome delineates the most likely effect, with an explanation as to why this is the case.  Additional explanatory text has been inserted into the relevant assessments in sections 2.11.1 to 2.11.3 of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology to clarify why, in instances where there is a choice in the matrix table, an effect has been considered as minor rather than moderate.  For Ornithology, the process used to determine the significance of impacts upon relevant receptors is presented in Section 5.9.4 of Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore Ornithology. Where the significance value falls between two categories (e.g. minor or moderate significance) expert judgement is used to determine the significance value  For Marine Mammals the magnitude and sensitivity matrix has been updated and all updates have been communicated to the relevant key stakeholders through the EWG.  As discussed in the Marine Processes, Benthic Ecology and Fish and Shellfish EWG meeting of 5 December 2017, impact assessment conclusions have been amended to provide further justification for why a significance of minor (i.e. not significant) has been concluded for species of medium to high sensitivity. These are presented in in the relevant impact assessments in Section 3.11 (for Hornsea Three alone) and Section 3.13 (for Cumulative Effects) of volume 2, chapter 3: Fish and Shellfish Ecology.



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>33</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Marine Management Organisation	<p>1.7. The MMO recommends re-examination of the requirements for pre-construction, construction and post-construction monitoring following re-assessment of the magnitude and significance of the potential impacts of the proposed Project. The MMO advises that verification of the impact predictions as set out in the PEIR can, in many cases, only be provided by future monitoring of the relevant receptors. This important consideration should be taken into account when future monitoring requirements are detailed in the 'Offshore' chapters of the PEIR.</p>	I	<p>Consideration of the potential need for monitoring has been considered throughout the offshore chapters of the Environmental Statement. The proposed approach to monitoring for offshore elements of the project is discussed in the In Principle Monitoring Plan that accompanies the application for Development Consent.</p> <p>Explanatory text has been inserted into the relevant assessment sections in the Environmental Statement of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology to clarify why, in instances where there is a choice in the matrix table, an effect has been considered as minor rather than moderate. There are, however, no instances of effects being considered to be of moderate adverse significance. The proposals for future monitoring are outlined in the Environmental Statement in Table 2.25 of volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology.</p> <p>The proposed approach to monitoring for offshore ornithology and marine mammals is discussed in the In Principle Monitoring Plan.</p> <p>Monitoring has not been proposed for fish and shellfish ecology, due to the lack of significant effects on fish ecology and the high level of confidence in the assessment presented.</p>
National Grid	<p>Gas Transmission National Grid Gas has high pressure gas transmission pipelines and above ground installations (AGI's) within or in close proximity to the onshore scoping area. The transmission pipelines and AGI's form an essential part of the gas transmission network in England, Wales and Scotland: Above Ground Installations: · Little Barning · Felthorpe Gas Transmission Pipelines: · Feeder Main 02 - Bacton to Brisley · Feeder Main 03 - Bacton to Roudham Heath · Feeder Main 04 - Bacton to Gt Ryburgh · Feeder Main 27 - Bacton to Kings Lynn Please find enclosed plans showing the location of National Grid's transmission infrastructure.</p>	N/A	<p>Ørsted acknowledged the relevant locations of the gas infrastructure and has been in discussions with National Grid Gas regarding asset interactions.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>33</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
National Grid	<p>The following points should be taken into consideration:</p> <p>Electricity Infrastructure:</p> <p>§ 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</p> <p>§ 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) and also shown in the following National Grid Document: <a href="http://www2.nationalgrid.com/WorkArea/DownloadAsset.aspx?id=6169">http://www2.nationalgrid.com/WorkArea/DownloadAsset.aspx?id=6169</a></p> <p>§ 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.</p> <p>§ 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.</p> <p>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 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> <p>§ 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.</p> <p>§ 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</p> <p>§ 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.</p> <p>§ 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.</p>	I	<p>Ørsted acknowledged the points raised by National Grid and discussed them further in follow up meetings. The relevant points have been taken into consideration during route design and the minimum clearance distances and proximity limits have been adhered to where possible. Bespoke protective provisions have also been included within the DCO</p>

<p>National Grid</p>	<p>Gas Infrastructure: The following points should be taken into consideration: § National Grid 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. Pipeline Crossings: · Where existing roads cannot be used, construction traffic should ONLY cross the pipeline at previously 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 National Grid prior to installation. · No protective measures including the installation of concrete slab protection shall be installed over or near to the National Grid pipeline without the prior permission of National Grid. National Grid 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 National Grid. · Please be aware that written permission is required before any works commence within the National Grid easement strip. · A National Grid representative shall monitor any works within close proximity to the pipeline to comply with National Grid specification T/SP/SSW22. · A Deed of Consent is required for any crossing of the easement Cables Crossing: · Cables may cross the pipeline at perpendicular angle to the pipeline i.e. 90 degrees. · A National Grid representative shall supervise any cable crossing of a pipeline. · Clearance must be at least 600mm above or below the pipeline. · Impact protection slab should be laid between the cable and pipeline if cable crossing is above the pipeline. · A Deed of Consent is required for any cable crossing the easement. · 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. General Notes on Pipeline Safety: · You should be aware of the Health and Safety Executives guidance document HS(G) 47 "Avoiding Danger from Underground Services", and National Grid's specification for Safe Working in the Vicinity of National Grid High Pressure gas pipelines and associated installations - requirements for third parties T/SP/SSW22. · National Grid will also need to ensure that our pipelines access is maintained during and after construction. · 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 National Grid representative. Ground cover above our pipelines should not be reduced or increased. · If any excavations are planned within 3 metres of National Grid 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 National Grid 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. · Excavation works may take place unsupervised no closer than 3 metres from the pipeline once the actual depth and position has been confirmed on site under the supervision of a National Grid representative. Similarly, excavation with hand held power tools is not permitted within 1.5 metres from our apparatus and the work is undertaken with NG supervision and guidance. To view the SSW22 Document, please use the link below: <a href="http://www2.nationalgrid.com/WorkArea/DownloadAsset.aspx?id=33968">http://www2.nationalgrid.com/WorkArea/DownloadAsset.aspx?id=33968</a></p>	<p>I</p>	<p>Ørsted acknowledged the relevant locations of the gas infrastructure and has been in discussions with National Grid Gas regarding asset interactions. Bespoke protective provisions have also been included within the DCO.</p>
----------------------	--	----------	--

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>33</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>To view the National Grid Policy's for our Sense of Place Document. Please use the link below:  <a href="http://www2.nationalgrid.com/uk/services/land-and-development/publications/">http://www2.nationalgrid.com/uk/services/land-and-development/publications/</a>            To download a copy of the HSE Guidance HS(G)47, please use the following link:  <a href="http://www.hse.gov.uk/pubns/books/hsg47.htm">http://www.hse.gov.uk/pubns/books/hsg47.htm</a>            Further information in relation to in proximity to National Grid's apparatus can be found at:  <a href="http://www2.nationalgrid.com/UK/Safety/Library/">http://www2.nationalgrid.com/UK/Safety/Library/</a></p>		
National Grid	<p>Further advice:            We would request that the potential impact of the proposed scheme on National Grid's existing assets as set out above and including any proposed diversions is considered in any subsequent reports, including in the Environmental Statement, and as part of any subsequent application.</p> <p>Where any diversion of apparatus may be required to facilitate a scheme, National Grid is unable to give any certainty with the regard to diversions until such time as adequate conceptual design studies have been undertaken by National Grid. Further information relating to this can be obtained by contacting the email address below.</p> <p>Where the promoter intends to acquire land, extinguish rights, or interfere with any of National Grid apparatus protective provisions will be required in a form acceptable to it to be included within the DCO.</p> <p>National Grid 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. All consultations should be sent to the following: <a href="mailto:box.landandacquisitions@nationalgrid.com">box.landandacquisitions( @ )nationalgrid.com</a>            or by post to the following address:            The Company Secretary            1-3 The Strand            London            WC2N 5EH</p>	I	<p>Ørsted acknowledged National Grid's advice regarding diversions and has been in further discussions regarding both gas and electrical infrastructure. Further to this consultation, bespoke protective provisions have been included in the DCO.</p>
<b>Section 42: Local Authorities (prescribed under section 43 of the Act)</b>			
No comments were received by the local authorities relating to infrastructure and other users under Phase 2.A.			



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>33</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 42: Persons with an interest in the land (prescribed under section 44 of the Act)</b>			
National Grid	<p>Further advice: We would request that the potential impact of the proposed scheme on National Grid's existing assets as set out above and including any proposed diversions is considered in any subsequent reports, including in the Environmental Statement, and as part of any subsequent application.</p> <p>Where any diversion of apparatus may be required to facilitate a scheme, National Grid is unable to give any certainty with the regard to diversions until such time as adequate conceptual design studies have been undertaken by National Grid. Further information relating to this can be obtained by contacting the email address below.</p> <p>Where the promoter intends to acquire land, extinguish rights, or interfere with any of National Grid apparatus protective provisions will be required in a form acceptable to it to be included within the DCO.</p> <p>National Grid 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. All consultations should be sent to the following: box.landandacquisitions( @ )nationalgrid.com or by post to the following address: The Company Secretary 1-3 The Strand London WC2N 5EH</p>	I	Ørsted acknowledged National Grid's advice regarding diversions and has been in further discussions regarding both gas and electrical infrastructure. Further to this consultation, bespoke protective provisions have been included in the DCO.
Simon Willcox	<p><b>Construction methods</b> - You have not consulted with other utility companies and organisations such as BT, National Grid, and other offshore wind providers to coordinate and integrate sources. TO mitigate the impact of your proposals, why cannot the proposed cable corridor include for a fibre optic cable to provide remote settlements to access fast broadband?</p>	I	<p>Response is noted, however there are a number of complexities which would be associated with co-locating other cables or assets with the Hornsea Three cables, these are summarised below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The OFTO owner is unlikely to be comfortable with the activity of laying an additional cable or asset within such close proximity to the Hornsea Three cables due to the extremely high insurance caps which could make the transmission asset unsaleable or jeopardise the business case and increase project risk;</li> <li>- The consent for the installation and operation of any other assets e.g. broadband cables, would need to be obtained by another party (it cannot be obtained as part of the Hornsea Three infrastructure as it has not been stated, consulted on, or incorporated into the Environmental Statement).; and</li> <li>- Finally, the owner/operator of any other assets would be required to source its own agreements with all landowners linearly along the onshore cable corridor route.</li> </ul> <p>On the basis of the above, no such infrastructure is proposed as part of Hornsea Three.</p>
<b>Section 47: Duty to consult local community</b>			

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>33</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Simon Willcox	<p><b>Construction methods</b> - You have not consulted with other utility companies and organisations such as BT, National Grid, and other offshore wind providers to coordinate and integrate sources. TO mitigate the impact of your proposals, why cannot the proposed cable corridor include for a fibre optic cable to provide remote settlements to access fast broadband?</p>	I	<p>Response is noted, however there are a number of complexities which would be associated with co-locating other cables or assets with the Hornsea Three cables, these are summarised below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The OFTO owner is unlikely to be comfortable with the activity of laying an additional cable or asset within such close proximity to the Hornsea Three cables due to the extremely high insurance caps which could make the transmission asset unsaleable or jeopardise the business case and increase project risk;</li> <li>- The consent for the installation and operation of any other assets e.g. broadband cables, would need to be obtained by another party (it cannot be obtained as part of the Hornsea Three infrastructure as it has not been stated, consulted on, or incorporated into the Environmental Statement).; and</li> <li>- Finally, the owner/operator of any other assets would be required to source its own agreements with all landowners linearly along the onshore cable corridor route.</li> </ul> <p>On the basis of the above, no such infrastructure is proposed as part of Hornsea Three.</p>
<b>Section 48: Duty to publicise</b>			
Marcus Gore	<p>Myself and hundreds of other people surf the waves off the north Norfolk coast and I would be grateful of any information you have regarding your wind farm project that might affect the size of the waves hitting our coast, thus stop our surfing waves. We have a few surf schools as well so are concerned of the impact that the building of your turbines at sea could have on our coastline. I look forward to your reply, regards Marcus gore</p>	I	<p>Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 1, Marine Processes has undertaken a detailed assessment of the potential changes to the wave regime due to the presence of Hornsea Three, both in isolation and cumulatively with other proposed and operational offshore wind farms. The assessment has found that no measurable reductions in wave height are anticipated to occur along adjacent shorelines.</p>

Table 2.22: Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Further Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.B) relating to infrastructure and other users.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>34</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 42: Prescribed consultees (The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009: Schedule 1))</b>			
Faroe Petroleum	Thank you for your communication regarding the further consultation. The map contained within your attachments does not show enough detail for us to comment on your proposals. I understand from our helicopter operator (NHV) that you do have a map that shows all three of the Hornsea developments, and the gas infrastructure within the area, in particular our Schooner and Ketch platforms. Could you please forward a copy of that map to me, and we will then be able to comment on your proposals. It would also be beneficial to have sight of a high level project schedule for these developments, because timing for us is a key factor due to our known life-of-field for the Schooner and Ketch assets.	I	Further to Faroe Petroleum's response, the requisite map and project timeline were sent for further consideration
Shell	I hereby notify you that I am no longer the contact person for the below topic. Please connect with my colleague Malte Schulenburg (see cc) on the below going forward, and appreciate if you can please remove me from your distribution list.	N/A	Hornsea Three acknowledged that Janneke Stuijzand was no longer the correct contact and was removed from the distribution list
BBL Company/Atkins	However, we would appreciate if you address any future corresponding regarding the project to both BBL and Atkins. Contact details are (as in column L)	N/A	Hornsea Three acknowledged BBL's desire for any further updates to be sent to both BBL and Atkins in future
Spirit Energy (combined with Centrica)	Centrica recently combined its exploration and production business with Bayergas Norge AS to form the joint venture "Spirit Energy". Spirit Energy has assets and prospects located in the Southern North Sea including platforms, pipelines and seabed infrastructure; including logistical support to them. Spirit Energy currently owns assets, solely or with partners, and has interests within or in close proximity to the proposed windfarm and offshore cable route corridors. We refer you to Centrica's response dated 20 September 2017 which responded to your formal consultation carried out between 27 July and 20 September 2017 (copy attached). We have reviewed the documents submitted with your recent consultation letter of 16 November 2017 in relation to the onshore elements of the proposed cable route. We do not have any points to add in addition to those detailed in Centrica's letter of 20 September 2017 in relation to the onshore elements. We note that you have extended the deadline to respond to the potential offshore alternative routes detailed in your letter of 16 November 2017 to 7 January 2018. We shall respond on the potential offshore alternative routes separately.		Hornsea Three acknowledges that Centrica/Spirit Energy does not have any additional comments to those made in their response dated 20 September 2017 in relation to the onshore elements. Hornsea Three acknowledges that Centrica/Spirit Energy will respond on the offshore elements separately. No further action was required.
British Marine Aggregate Producers Association	The distribution of commercially viable marine sand and gravel resources is highly limited, constrained by their geological distribution and their geographical position relative to the markets location. Consequently, with the growing pressures and demands being placed on marine space, it is essential that existing marine aggregate interests (production licences, applications and option areas) are provided adequate protection against new developments that may interfere with their ongoing safe operation through the policies provided in the relevant marine plans that are in place. Equally, given the limited spatial extent of marine sand and gravel deposits, it is also important that areas of potential future resource are clearly identified and flagged so they can equally be considered through the relevant safeguarding policy provisions provided in marine plans – particularly given future resource demands and requirements will inevitably evolve and change over the 20 year plan period and beyond. In this respect, we consider that the background marine mineral resource data prepared by the British Geological Survey represents an incredibly valuable dataset, not only in terms of defining where the industry may want to go in the future, but also in highlighting where it is unlikely to go.	N	Hornsea Three acknowledges this context. No further action required.

<sup>34</sup> Y = Yes change made; N = No change made; I = Incorporated into or considered when producing the assessment or landowner voluntary agreement offer; N/A = Not applicable.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>34</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
British Marine Aggregate Producers Association	We note that the supporting information provided for alternative offshore routes makes no reference to potential interactions with existing marine aggregate interests (licensed/application/optioned), in accordance with Policies AGG1 and AGG2 of the East Inshore/Offshore Marine Plan. Where any potential interactions are identified, reference should be made to the offshore cable proximity guidance that has been jointly developed by BMAPA and the European Subsea Cables Association (February 2016).	I	The purpose of the Hornsea Three Section 42 Consultation, Potential Offshore Alternative Routes - Supporting Information (November 2017) document was to provide an opportunity for relevant stakeholders to comment on the potential offshore alternative routes; to describe the data sources that are proposed to be used within the Environmental Statement if these are taken forwards; and to outline any pertinent changes in the approach to the Environmental Statement assessment methodology which would need to be applied if the potential offshore alternative routes were taken forwards. As noted in the document, Hornsea Three will further refine the Project Description to be included in the Environmental Statement (including Hornsea Three offshore cable corridor) based upon the consultation responses received from this Section 42 consultation. The final results of the EIA are presented in the Environmental Statement, which includes an assessment of the refined Hornsea Three offshore cable corridor in relation to existing aggregate interests (licensed/application/optioned) (see volume 2, chapter 11: Infrastructure and Other Users).
British Marine Aggregate Producers Association	We also note that no consideration has been given to the potential for impact of the new route options on those areas of marine sand and gravel resource that may be considered for use in the future.	I	As noted above, the final results of the EIA will be presented in the Environmental Statement. Table 11.5 within volume 2, chapter 11: Infrastructure and Other Users presents the key data sources used to inform the baseline for marine aggregate extraction, which includes The Crown Estate Marine Aggregate Agreements, BMAPA dredger reports and the East (Inshore and Offshore) Marine Plans. Figure 11.4 within volume 2, chapter 11: Infrastructure and Other Users presents the aggregate extraction sites in the vicinity of Hornsea Three, together with the defined areas of high potential aggregate resource identified within Policy AGG3 of the East (Inshore and Offshore) Marine Plans. As the Hornsea Three offshore cable corridor only occupies an area of 1.5% of the optimal aggregate resource, Hornsea Three is considered not to preclude any potential future aggregate extraction from this area (see section 11.7.8 within volume 2, chapter 11: Infrastructure and Other Users).
British Marine Aggregate Producers Association - Mark Russell	Para.403 of the East Inshore/Offshore Marine Plan (HM Government, 2014) states as follows: The Marine Policy Statement (3.5.6) states that, amongst other considerations, marine plan authorities and decision-makers should: '...take into account the need to safeguard [aggregate] reserves for future extraction'. Policy AGG3 applies the Marine Policy Statement taking account of the regional and national importance of the East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plan Areas for marine aggregate supply and of the spatially discrete areas in which commercially viable deposits of sand and gravel are found. The policy is intended to enable public authorities to consider how proposals (for a definition of proposals see paragraph 88) for marine development and activities within areas of high potential aggregate resource, as defined by British Geological Survey, may impact the ability to access commercially viable marine sand and gravel resources in the future. This will help to secure access to sufficient supply of aggregate resources.	I	As noted above, the final results of the EIA will be presented in the Environmental Statement. Table 11.5 within volume 2, chapter 11: Infrastructure and Other Users presents the key data sources used to inform the baseline for marine aggregate extraction, which includes The Crown Estate Marine Aggregate Agreements, BMAPA dredger reports and the East (Inshore and Offshore) Marine Plans. Figure 11.4 within volume 2, chapter 11: Infrastructure and Other Users presents the aggregate extraction sites in the vicinity of Hornsea Three, together with the defined areas of high potential aggregate resource identified within Policy AGG3 of the East (Inshore and Offshore) Marine Plans. As the Hornsea Three offshore cable corridor only occupies an area of 1.5% of the optimal aggregate resource, Hornsea Three is considered not to preclude any potential future aggregate extraction from this area (see section 11.7.8 within volume 2, chapter 11: Infrastructure and Other Users).
British Marine Aggregate Producers Association - Mark Russell	Therefore, in order to comply with the marine mineral safeguarding policies in the East Inshore/Offshore Marine Plans (particularly policy AGG3), which in turn reflect the requirements of the UK Marine Policy Statement, we consider it necessary for the proposed cable route to take full and proper account of the potential for marine mineral interests (licensed interests, applications and resources) to be affected by the changes being suggested.	I	As noted above, the final results of the EIA will be presented in the Environmental Statement, which will include an assessment of the refined Hornsea Three offshore cable corridor in relation to existing aggregate interests (licensed/application/optioned). Figure 11.4 within volume 2, chapter 11: Infrastructure and Other Users presents the aggregate extraction sites in the vicinity of Hornsea Three, together with the defined areas of high potential aggregate resource identified within Policy AGG3 of the East (Inshore and Offshore) Marine Plans. As the Hornsea Three offshore cable corridor only occupies an area of 1.5% of the optimal aggregate resource, Hornsea Three is considered not to preclude any potential future aggregate extraction from this area (see section 11.7.8 within volume 2, chapter 11: Infrastructure and Other Users).



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>34</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
British Marine Aggregate Producers Association - Mark Russell	Where any potential interactions with marine sand and gravel resources and/or marine aggregate interests are identified, appropriate assessments should take place in accordance with the requirements defined by the relevant marine plan policies to demonstrate the steps taken to mitigate, manage or remove any potential negative interactions.	I	As noted above, the final results of the EIA will be presented in the Environmental Statement, which will include an assessment of the refined Hornsea Three offshore cable corridor in relation to existing aggregate interests (licensed/application/optioned). Figure 11.4 within volume 2, chapter 11: Infrastructure and Other Users presents the aggregate extraction sites in the vicinity of Hornsea Three, together with the defined areas of high potential aggregate resource identified within Policy AGG3 of the East (Inshore and Offshore) Marine Plans. As the Hornsea Three offshore cable corridor only occupies an area of 1.5% of the optimal aggregate resource, Hornsea Three is considered not to preclude any potential future aggregate extraction from this area (see section 11.7.8 within volume 2, chapter 11: Infrastructure and Other Users).
Conoco Phillips	Following the latest Hornsea Pr3 email below, I would be most grateful for the updated latest shapefiles for the potential alternative offshore routes at your earliest convenience.	N/A	The relevant shapefiles were shared with Conoco Phillips electronically to help inform their response to the consultation.
Conoco Phillips	ConocoPhillips have undertaken a review of the additional information provided, and at this time have no additional concerns over and above those already identified and previously documented in our letter dated 13 <sup>th</sup> September 2017 (attached for your reference).	N/A	Hornsea Three acknowledged that Conoco Phillips has no further concerns other than those listed in their response dated 13th September 2017. No further action was required
Independent Oil and Gas Plc	From the Figures and details provided in the consultation documents, it appears that there may be areas of interaction with our Offshore Blythe and Vulcan Satellite Gas Hub Development (outline map below).	I	A meeting between Hornsea Three and IOG was held on the 1st February to discuss the interactions between the Blyth and Vulcan developments in more detail. Specific consideration was given to the potential interactions between well locations and the Hornsea Three export cable corridor. Both parties agreed to keep each other informed of their respective activities going forward.
Independent Oil and Gas Plc	In particular there may be considerations of sea bed disturbance, surface vessel access and subsea infrastructure location, along the route of planned and contingent offshore power cabling and associated substations.	I	A meeting between Hornsea Three and IOG was held on the 1st February to discuss the interactions between the Blyth and Vulcan developments in more detail. Specific consideration was given to the potential interactions between well locations and the Hornsea Three export cable corridor. Both parties agreed to keep each other informed of their respective activities going forward
Shell U.K. Limited	Thank you for your letter of 5 December 2017 (received on 18 December 2017), for supplying shapefiles for the proposed route of Hornsea 3 on 3 January and for extending the response deadline to 15 January 2018.	N/A	Hornsea Three acknowledged Shell's response, no further action was required
Shell U.K. Limited	Following the review of these shapefiles, we have identified ten Shell Pipelines (listed below) which the proposed route will affect. S0603 12/14" GAS GALLEON PN - CLIPPER PM S0204 24" GAS CLIPPER PT - BACTON S1013 2" MEG LINE CLIPPER PM - SKIFF S1005 3.5" GLYCOL BACTON - CLIPPER PT S0810 2" ELECTRICAL CABLE CLIPPER PM - GALLEON PN S1006 2" MEG CLIPPER PM - GALLEON PN N0208 34 INCH GAS SHEARWATER - BACKTON SEAL LINE S0611 12" GAS SKIFF - CLIPPER PM S0613 20" GAS EXPORT CARRACK QA TO CLIPPER PR S1015 4" MEG CLIPPER PR TO CARRACK QA	N/A	Hornsea Three acknowledged the asset interactions provided by Shell. No further action was required
Shell U.K. Limited	I am therefore writing to request that each of these pipelines and the pipeline corridor (the area 200 metres either side of each pipeline) are avoided in developing final designs and in carrying out any sampling, investigations or works in connection with Hornsea 3.	I	Hornsea Three replied to Shell regarding the 200m buffer request around Shell assets and confirmed that in some instances the export cable corridor would need to cross these assets and therefore come within 200m. It was made clear that crossing agreements would be entered prior to any works in order to give Shell the necessary comfort and protection
Shell U.K. Limited	I would also be grateful if you could please notify me of any sampling, investigations or works that you propose to undertake within 300 metres either side of each pipeline corridor.	I	Hornsea Three confirmed that Shell would be notified of any sampling taking place within 300m of its assets

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>34</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Shell U.K. Limited	To the extent you are unable to accommodate our requests, please do contact me before commencing any activity to discuss your proposal with us.	I	Hornsea Three replied to Shell regarding the 200m buffer request around Shell assets and confirmed that in some instances the export cable corridor would need to cross these assets and therefore come within 200m. It was made clear that crossing agreements would be entered into prior to any works in order to give Shell the necessary comfort and protection
<b>Section 42: Local Authorities (prescribed under section 43 of the Act)</b>			
No comments were received by local authorities relating to infrastructure and other users under Phase 2.B.			
<b>Section 42: Persons with an interest in the land (prescribed under section 44 of the Act)</b>			
No comments were received by landowners or land interests relating to infrastructure and other users under Phase 2.B.			
<b>Section 47: Duty to consult local community</b>			
Curley	<p><b>Helicopter Flights over Sheringham</b></p> <p>He was getting increasingly annoyed by the number of flights going directly over the town during the day and evening and wanted to know why the helicopters were not crossing over the Weybourne gap. He had browsed through the available consultation materials but had found nothing related to the offshore part of construction and was concerned that the currently helicopter activity would only increase as construction began fully.</p> <p>I advised that someone from Ørsted would be the most likely able to help supply the information about these routes (though I was not sure if this was also the domain of Air Traffic control). I am also not sure the extent to which this is exclusively down to Ørsted and HOW3 operations.</p>	N	Hornsea Three confirmed that the helicopter activity did not relate to Hornsea Three, and advised the stakeholder to contact Norwich International Airport for further information. Hornsea Three acknowledges that the stakeholder wishes this request for information on air traffic routes be logged, so that it can be revisited in the future if/when this element of the project is determined.
<b>Section 48: Duty to publicise</b>			
No comments were received by in response to the public notice issued during Phase 2.B relating to infrastructure and other users.			

## 2.12 Inter-related Effects Offshore

Table 2.23: Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.A) relating to inter-related effects offshore.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>35</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 42: Prescribed consultees (The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009: Schedule 1))</b>			
No comments were received by prescribed consultees relating to inter-related effects offshore under Phase 2.A.			
<b>Section 42: Local Authorities (prescribed under section 43 of the Act)</b>			
No comments were received by the local authorities relating to inter-related effects offshore under Phase 2.A.			
<b>Section 42: Persons with an interest in the land (prescribed under section 44 of the Act)</b>			
No comments were received by landowners or land interests relating to inter-related effects offshore under Phase 2.A..			
<b>Section 47: Duty to consult local community</b>			
Ray & Diane Pearce	You submitted your PEIR document on 27th July 2017. We had had no meaningful direct contact from you prior to the submission of the PEIR except for the provision of a set of FAQs which were already in the public domain; this is despite having asked you specific questions relevant to our property being within close proximity to the crossing point of your transmission cables, with those proposed by Vattenfall's Norfolk Vanguard and Boreas. On 18th July 2017, we submitted an email with detailed referencing containing questions regarding your project and the (now titled) "Inter-related effects" of the cable crossing point impacting our residence (location details above). However, you did not reply and only after your submission of the PEIR were we emailed by Emily Woolfenden (Stakeholder Relations). Ms Woolfenden merely referred us to the PEIR Document in order that we search for our own answers and she did not answer any of the specifics.	N/A	Ørsted initially directed the consultee to the FAQ document on the Hornsea Three website that provided responses to commonly asked questions on Electro-Magnetic Fields (EMFs). Once the PEIR was published in July 2017, Ørsted directed the consultee to volume 4, annex 3.3: EMF Compliance Statement of the PEIR. Representatives from Ørsted subsequently met with the consultee in August 2017 to discuss their concerns in more detail. The difference between inter-related and cumulative effects was clarified and it was noted that a full assessment of the cumulative impact with the two Vattenfall schemes had not been possible, as they were yet to publish their PEI. The Electrical Manager for Hornsea Three and an independent EMF advisor then met with the consultee at the September 2017 community consultation events.
<b>Section 48: Duty to publicise</b>			
No comments were received by in response to the public notice issued during Phase 2.A relating to inter-related effects offshore.			

<sup>35</sup> Y = Yes change made; N = No change made; I = Incorporated into or considered when producing the assessment or landowner voluntary agreement offer; N/A = Not applicable.

Table 2.24: Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Further Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.B) relating to inter-related effects offshore.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>36</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 42: Prescribed consultees (The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009: Schedule 1))</b>			
No comments were received by prescribed consultees relating to inter-related effects offshore under Phase 2.B.			
<b>Section 42: Local Authorities (prescribed under section 43 of the Act)</b>			
No comments were received by the local authorities relating to inter-related effects offshore under Phase 2.B.			
<b>Section 42: Persons with an interest in the land (prescribed under section 44 of the Act)</b>			
No comments were received by landowners or land interests relating to inter-related effects offshore under Phase 2.B..			
<b>Section 47: Duty to consult local community</b>			
No comments were received by the local community relating to inter-related effects offshore under Phase 2.B.			
<b>Section 48: Duty to publicise</b>			
No comments were received by in response to the public notice issued during Phase 2.B relating to inter-related effects offshore.			

### 3. Onshore

#### 3.1 Geology and Ground Conditions

Table 3.1: Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.A) relating to geology and ground conditions

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>37?</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 42: Prescribed consultees (The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009: Schedule 1))</b>			
Little Melton Parish Council	<b>Heat from the cable</b> - The cables will raise the temperature of the soil above them, this can lead to drying out of the soil.	I	The potential impact relating to thermal effects of the cables on surrounding soil has been assessed in Environmental Statement Volume 3, chapter 1: Geology and Ground Conditions. The thermal impact is predicted to be of local spatial extent within the immediate vicinity of each cable within the ground and any shallow aquifer unit, but of long term duration, of continual occurrence and high reversibility. The potential impact will be minimised by the use of a thermal stabilising layer (i.e. stabilised backfill) which will limit heat transference to the surrounding soil and shallow groundwater.  This concludes at most, a minor adverse effect, which is not significant in EIA terms.

<sup>36</sup> Y = Yes change made; N = No change made; I = Incorporated into or considered when producing the assessment or landowner voluntary agreement offer; N/A = Not applicable.

<sup>37</sup> Y = Yes change made; N = No change made; I = Incorporated into or considered when producing the assessment or landowner voluntary agreement offer; N/A = Not applicable.



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>37</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Norfolk County Council	Minerals and Waste 5.21 There is a typographical error in the quote in section 1.7.3.2 which requires correction to remove 'isn't' and insert 'is' so that the quote reads, "those areas where there is an underlying mineral resource which may be of economic interest, which should be protected from unnecessary sterilisation by non-mineral development".	I	Response noted, this has been addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 1: Geology and Ground Conditions.
Norfolk County Council	<b>Minerals and Waste</b> 2.32 The County Council considers that the PEIR correctly assesses the magnitude, sensitivity and significance of the effect of the project on Mineral Safeguarding Areas. The further mitigation suggested in the PEIR is considered to be effective. Therefore, the County Council in its capacity as the Mineral Planning Authority does not object to this proposal provided that the applicant continues to work with the County Council regarding the mitigation of impacts on the Mineral Safeguarding Areas as the final scheme design continues.	I	The refinement of the onshore cable corridor, has resulted in a reduction in the area of Mineral Safeguarding Area that would be occupied by Hornsea Three. Hornsea Three will continue to consult with Norfolk County Council Mineral Planning Authority regarding the Mineral Safeguarding Areas located along the Hornsea Three onshore cable corridor and the onshore HVAC booster station area during the detailed design phase.  Impacts on Mineral Safeguarding Areas are assessed in Environmental Statement Volume 3, Chapter 1: Geology and Ground Conditions, and concludes a minor adverse effects during construction which is not significant in EIA terms. No effects are predicted during operation and maintenance or decommissioning.
Holt County Division	<b>SSSI AONB and MCZ</b> Significant concerns have been raised about the SSSI along sections of the proposed cable corridor.	Y	Through the design development process, the route of the onshore cable corridor has been refined to avoid direct impacts on all Sites of Special Scientific Interest. Therefore there is no potential for significant impacts on SSSIs as a result of the construction, operation and maintenance or decommissioning of Hornsea Three (see Environmental Statement Volume 3, Chapter 1: Geology and Ground Conditions).
Holt County Division	Kelling Heath is an almost unique SSSI, in that it is not only designated for its biological interest but also its geomorphology. In its reasons for notification Natural England states that - 'Kelling Heath provides perhaps the best example of a glacial outwash plain in England..... and are geomorphological sites of national importance.'	Y	The importance and sensitivity of Kelling Heath SSSI is noted. Through the design development process, the route of the onshore cable corridor has been refined to avoid direct impacts on all Sites of Special Scientific Interest, including Kelling Heath SSSI. Therefore there is no potential for significant impacts on Kelling Heath SSSI as a result of the construction, operation and maintenance or decommissioning of Hornsea Three (see Environmental Statement Volume 3, Chapter 1: Geology and Ground Conditions).
Holt County Division	We cannot rebuild these natural landscapes once they have been damaged or destroyed the impact on our environment will be permanent.	I	Through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including landscapes. Mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project are outlined in topic specific chapters, of particular relevance would be Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 1: Geology and Ground Conditions, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation and chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Effects.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>37</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Environment Agency	<p>In particular, we are concerned about how WFD is to be assessed, the protection of groundwater resources, safeguarding white clawed crayfish (WCC) populations, beach processes where the cable makes landfall and, assessment of the potential for contaminated land. In addition, we have provided advisory notes in respect of flood risk assessments and flood risk activity permits.</p>	I	<p>A WFD Groundwater Assessment has been carried out and is provided in Environmental Statement Volume 6, Annex 1.4. It contains WFD specific details, in particular it makes a clear link between the construction activities of Hornsea Three and the WFD receptors.</p> <p>According to the Groundsure records, there are no sites recorded as contaminated land under Part IIA of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 within the Hornsea Three geology and ground conditions study area.</p> <p>In respect to white-clawed crayfish populations, results of the Hornsea Three surveys are provided in Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 3.4: White Clawed Crayfish Survey. Potential impacts on white clawed crayfish are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation, which concludes no significant effects. In terms of the WFD, they are considered in volume 6, annex 2.5: Water Framework Directive Surface Water Assessment.</p> <p>Potential impacts from the construction of Hornsea Three on beach processes is assessed in Environmental Statement Volume 2, chapter 1: Marine Processes.</p> <p>Flood Risk Assessments have been carried out for the HVAC booster station, HVDC converter/HVAC substation, and where relevant, the onshore cable corridor. These are provided as Environmental Statement Volume 6, Annex 2.1, and conclude that Hornsea Three meets the requirements of NPS EN-1 and the NPPF.</p>
Environment Agency	<p>Water Framework Directive: PEIR assessment of main and ordinary waterbodies will be based on precautionary 'Good' status in line with EA objectives (see para 2.7.8.3). This appears to assume that all the affected waterbodies will achieve 'Good' status because this is the aim and appears to conclude that the affected waterbodies do not require assessment. This is an unreasonable assumption and goes against the general ethos of the WFD, which is about constant improvement of waterbodies. We would also remind you that although the Environment Agency sets and monitors objectives, the obligations of WFD extend to all public bodies and decision makers. Whilst many of the waterbodies are considered high sensitivity, more WFD-specific detail will be required in the final WFD assessment. In particular the assessment needs to make a clear link between activities and WFD receptors, quantifying the likely impacts and assessing the risk of deterioration. Also, data used appears to be from 2012; we ask that more recent baseline is used.</p>	I	<p>A WFD Groundwater Assessment has been carried out and is provided in Environmental Statement, Volume 6, Annex 1.4. It contains WFD specific details, in particular it makes a clear link between the construction activities of Hornsea Three and the WFD receptors. A Water Framework Directive Surfacewater Assessment has also been carried out and is provided in Environmental Statement Volume 6, Annex 2.5.</p> <p>At the time of writing, the most recent data from 2016 was used to assess as a baseline for ground water bodies and surface water bodies.</p>
Environment Agency	<p><b>Groundwater Resources:</b> (volume 1, chapter 3) It would be useful if the chapter contained information as to whether there are any designated geological sites or Regionally Important Geological and Geomorphological Sites in the search area.</p>	I	<p>Designated sites within the Hornsea Three Geology and Ground Conditions study area have been identified in Section 1.7 of Environmental Statement Volume 3, Chapter 1: Geology and Ground Conditions.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>37</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Environment Agency	<p>Source Protection Zones:As previously advised the location/boundaries for SPZs is under review and will be published shortly. The SPZs shown in Figure 1.4 Sheet 1 for Sheringham are out of date (there's now an additional borehole at Mace Hill and a new bore near Bodham), it may extend further to the west and may overlap with the proposed cable corridor – although probably not the SPZ1. We will be pleased to advise further once the new data is released. S1.7.5.23 notes that there are three chalk groundwater abstractions within or adjacent to the proposed cable corridor but there is no ongoing discussion as to how their supplies would be secured.</p> <p>Fig 1.4 Sheet 5 indicates that the cable corridor will run close to the groundwater levels borehole at Weston Longville. This is a key borehole in our groundwater levels network; data from this bore are used to assess whether or not cessation conditions should be imposed on numerous abstraction licences within the Wensum catchment. It is important that there is no significant disturbance to groundwater flow in this area and should be considered in any further reports.</p> <p>Table 1.3 – this should explicitly include potential changes to groundwater flow and impact on any local groundwater abstractors in terms of achieving yield/water quality (including suspended sediment).</p> <p>Table 1.13 – this should include consideration of the need to preclude any significant changes to groundwater flow and how these will be avoided together with the protection of any local groundwater abstractors in terms of groundwater flow as well as quality. We should be consulted on the methodologies for any site investigations at watercourse crossing points along with those for HDD work.</p> <p>Table 1.16. This should include consideration of changes in groundwater flow and potential impacts on any local abstractors.</p> <p>We cannot allow any deterioration in WFD status. So, for activities where a potential change in status is mooted, there needs to be in depth consideration of how this will be avoided. Consideration must be given and demonstrated how current groundwater flow directions and hydraulic connections (or lack thereof) between shallow and deep aquifers and aquifers and watercourses will be protected and preserved.</p>	I	<p>During the pre-application phase, the Environment Agency has provided details of the revised Source Protection Zone boundaries and these are shown in Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 1.2: Abstraction Licences. The potential impacts of Hornsea Three in terms of disruption of groundwater flow and the yields and quality of groundwater abstractions have been included in the assessment presented in Environmental Statement Volume 3, chapter 1: Geology and Ground Conditions. The Environment Agency will be consulted on the methodologies of the site investigations at watercourse crossing points (particularly where HDD is used) as secured through the Outline Code of Construction Practice. The purpose of these investigations will be to characterise the ground conditions and to provide information for the hydrogeological risk assessment.</p>
Environment Agency	<p>Contaminated Land: We agree with paragraph 1.7.5.29 that there will be features within the search corridor which may have caused contamination or have the potential to cause contamination. Whilst the proposal to provide a written scheme for dealing with contamination of land and groundwater will be required to deal with unexpected contamination, the Preliminary Risk Assessment (PRA) should look to identify potential contamination within the search area prior to work being undertaken. This should include the presence of historical landfills as well as permitted sites. There are a number within the search corridor. Table 1.9 Maximum design scenario considered for the assessment of potential impacts on geology and ground conditions identifies the potential impacts of construction on both secondary and principal aquifers but doesn't consider the potential impacts on groundwater/surface water should land contamination be present. This scenario should be considered.</p> <p>Section 1.15.1.2 – Note the Crag Formation present in the southern half of the route corridor is also principal aquifer.</p>	I	<p>Historic and active landfills have been identified within Environmental Statement Volume 3, chapter 1: Geology and Ground Conditions (see Figure 1.4).</p> <p>The potential for contamination to have occurred as a result of other historic and current land uses within the Hornsea Three geology and ground conditions study area has also been considered. The mitigation measures include a commitment to undertake Preliminary Risk Assessment where appropriate before construction commences. The risk assessment will identify areas of contaminated land and where this has impacted on groundwater/surface water.</p> <p>It is noted in volume 3, chapter 1: Geology and Ground Conditions that the Crag Formation is a principal aquifer.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>37</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
River Glaven Conservation Group (RGCG) and CPRE Norfolk	The documentation does have an impressive range of methods of approaches in order mitigate to against the adverse impacts which could potentially occur. Much of this is based on a very thorough desk research, but is being supplemented by field surveys in selected areas, and this continues. It is clear that Dong is aware of the high degree of heterogeneity in the geology derived from glacial deposits in the Glaven catchment. We therefore for the requirement for a more detailed study through field studies in the fine tuning of the cabling corridor down to 80 m plus the buffer area to reach the EIA stage which supports the Environmental Statement. We would also add that the geology is more likely to present an unexpected problem along the cabling route, and there is a greater need for awareness of this as regards a response to this in taking mitigation measures.	Y	Potential sensitivities associated with geology and ground conditions has been considered during the refinement of the onshore cable corridor. The project has, for example avoided the Kelling Heath and Weybourne Cliffs SSSI, and committed to undertaking a preliminary risk assessments during the detailed design stage in order to identify any localised areas of contamination. Furthermore additional site specific surveys will be undertaken during detailed design to inform construction methodologies (see Environmental Statement, Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project Description, section 3.7.2).



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>37</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
River Glaven Conservation Group (RGCG) and CPRE Norfolk	<p><b>SPECIFIC COMMENTS ON THE NON-TECHNICAL SUMMARY:</b>  The Non-Technical Summary makes a very useful overview, but also a 'way in' to reading the specialist chapters, which go in to considerable detail and length on a wide range of topics; and provide an overview of the specialist topics of particular interest. We make some comment on N-TS by referring to the numbered paragraph. We look to be brief and pick on points where we might either want to just note, support what we say above, and/or come back to later in the consultation process. We do this also with the ecology and nature conservation chapter, and the landscape chapter. We start with the NTS, and work down in order of paragraph number, and quote in full, abbreviate or paraphrase what Dong say to relate to the point we wish to make, or just note.</p> <p>3.5.1.1: The two primary transmission types are HVAC and HVDC for off-shore windfarms; the UK has traditionally used HVAC. With interconnectors between countries HVDC will become more technically and/or economically viable as such are used on a number of projects in Germany. We assume there are more problems in connecting the UK to a wider European system. We understand the need for Dong to take both systems through all planning stages, but hope by then they will be in a position to use HVDC. We also assume that as wind energy is more variable and less predictable than 'conventional' energy production, there is a greater need and opportunity for flexibility to 'chase' demand if inter-connection between countries is widespread.</p> <p>4.9.1.1: We note and welcome the statement: Hornsea Three will continue to develop and refine the project as it progresses towards a final application to Development Consent and beyond as it moves towards construction. The process will be informed by further stakeholder engagement and interpretation of the outputs from ongoing engineering, commercial and environmental investigations.</p> <p>5.1.1.1: In discussing the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Methodology dealing with the construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning of the project we have: Where significant effects are predicted, where possible it identifies mitigation to reduce the significance of these effects where that is practicable. The bold emphasis is ours, as this seems unduly negative in relation to what we say above. The technical term significant as associated with an EIA requires it must be determined in the Environmental Statement, but an issue deemed to be below this level gets less scrutiny. The word 'practicable' is capable of being interpreted in a range of ways, and can be taken as reluctance to deal with anything less than moderate/major adverse adverse significant.</p> <p>5.4.1.5: We welcome: Onshore surveys taken to date include ecological field surveys (bird, bat, badger, invertebrate and reptile), archaeological desktop and geophysical surveys, baseline noise surveys and landscape and visual assessments.</p> <p>5.4.1.6: We welcome: In addition to the surveys which have already been undertaken, a number of surveys are ongoing (such as aerial surveys of birds and marine animals, and onshore ecological surveys) or are proposed (e.g. geophysical survey of the nearshore extent of the Hornsea Three offshore cable corridor) and will inform the EIA presented in the Environmental Statement.</p> <p>5.5.1.1: We welcome: The Hornsea Three assessment uses an iterative approach. This has been employed in order to demonstrate mitigation of project-related impacts. The process of EIA has therefore been used as a means of informing the Hornsea Three design.</p>	I	<p>This response is noted.</p> <p>In respect to the comments made, through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive ecological receptors. Potential impacts which remain on ecological receptors are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation. This assessment considers the interactions between the project and ecological receptors, and is informed by the relationship between hydrogeology, hydrology and water-dependant habitats which are described in the Hydrological Characterisation Note which forms Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 2.4. This approach was discussed and agreed with the onshore ecology expert working group which comprised Natural England, the Wildlife Trust, Environment Agency and the RSPB amongst others.</p> <p>Mitigation measures have been identified to the creation of preferential pathways for groundwater flow, minimise flood risk, minimise the generation of silt and prevent runoff entering the watercourses. These measures are set out in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapters 1 and 2: Geology and Ground Condition and Hydrology and Flood Risk chapters respectively, as well as in the Outline Code of Construction Practice which forms part of the DCO application. Drainage provisions at the HVAC booster station and HVDC converter/HVAC substation will be further developed during detailed design in agreement with the Norfolk County Council as LLFA.</p> <p>The Glaven Valley Conservation Area is considered in Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 5.5: Screening Assessment - Onshore HVAC Booster Station, as well as annex 5.1: Desk Based Assessment.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>37</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
River Glaven Conservation Group (RGCG) and CPRE Norfolk	<p>5.6.1.2: We note: The PEIR sets out all aspects on the environment likely to be significantly affected by the project (as required by the EIA Directive). Only effects in general judged to be of moderate to major significance are 'significant' in EIA terms (where this differs for specific assessments, this is explained within the appropriate PEIR chapters). Where effects are considered significant in EIA terms, this will normally trigger additional analysis, consultation and possibly further mitigation measures, where practicable. When the determining authority makes a decision for consent, it therefore does so in the knowledge of all likely significant effects on the environment. We comment: In this context we include on the latter that this should include an ecological network factor.</p> <p>7.2.1.1: We note: The geology and ground conditions study area comprises of a 1 km buffer around the onshore elements of Hornsea Three. There are three geological SSSI within the search area; Weybourne Cliffs, Weybourne Town Pit, Kelling Heath.</p> <p>7.3.1.3: The hydrology and flood risk study area includes a number of catchments and associated surface watercourses. These include the rivers Yare, Tud, Wensum Bure River Glaven (Gunthorpe Stream). We comment: Gunthorpe Stream is not affected by the cabling route, but is one source of flooding and accompanied by arable run-off. Arable run-off is a major problem within the catchment, including the upper Glaven. We are concerned that this is not exacerbated by open trenching operations.</p> <p>7.3.1.6: The potential use of open cut trenching, Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD) and other site activities, may impact surface water quality due to increases in turbid (murky) run-off, spillages and leaks of fuel, oil etc and an alteration in surface in surface water pathways. With the inclusion of design measures such as the use of HDD at the Landfall the effects of these impacts have been assessed to be of minor adverse significance (not significant in EIA terms). We comment: this may be true for HDD at the Landfall, but in our view is NOT true for open cut trenching, particularly given the heterogeneity of the terrain throughout the Glaven catchment, and the long time that may elapse with excavated soil waiting to be back-filled. Turbid, mucky water contains sediment, as repeated many times a major problem in the Glaven catchment (and many others, not least the Wensum SAC).</p> <p>7.4.1.3: Twenty statutory designated sites, including SSSIs, SACs and Ramsar sites were identified within 2 km of the development, with 126 non-statutory designated sites also identified. The desk top study and site specific surveys indicated the presence of protected or otherwise notable species including bluebell, holly-leaved naiad, sandy stillball, white-clayed crayfish, whorl snail species, common lizard, great crested newt, grass snake, slow worm, breeding birds, wintering birds, migratory birds, badger, otter bats and water vole. We comment: near all are present in the upper Glaven, some in abundance, We will be adding more to this list, and also see the attached paper on the upper Glaven Ecological Network.</p> <p>7.4.1.4: There are a number of possible impacts on onshore habitats with the open cut trenching required to install the export cable. The impacts include potential habitat loss, for example in designated sites, hedgerows and sensitive water courses, as well as disturbance to notable species. The significance of the effects of these impacts is assessed to be in the range moderate to major adverse. With the actions quoted it is claimed they would mitigate the effects of impacts on potentially sensitive habitats and species. Therefore, with the proposed mitigation in place the significance of these effects would be reduced to negligible or minor adverse (not significant in EIA terms). We comment: This is a sweeping and ill-considered statement, which generalises a wide number of situations; it would if taken at face value surely see an unacceptable impact on some species, some habitats, and most certainly result in considerable damage to the ecological network that is provided by the Glaven catchment.</p>	I	As above

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>37</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
River Glaven Conservation Group (RGCG) and CPRE Norfolk	<p>7.6.1.3: This paragraph relates to the Historic Environment and states that in the cable search area there are 13 scheduled monuments whose settings may be affected by the proposal there are 167 listed buildings, of which seven are listed at Grade I, 23 at Grade II* and 137 at Grade II. Many of these are in the North Norfolk district. There are 11 Conservation Areas, which in North Norfolk are Weybourne, Hempstead, Baconsthorpe Upper Sheringham and Glaven Valley. We comment: This is the only mention we can find of the Glaven Valley Conservation Area in the Dong documentation. It is a very large rural area, designated primarily on landscape grounds, but also the vernacular architecture and cultural associations such as the churches within it. The area is almost as large as the river catchment, and we will propose to the Council that the GVCA boundary of this could be overlain by the ecological network boundary, which essentially is the Glaven watershed boundary. This would recognise and bring together landscape and wildlife, to be incorporated in the Local Plan.</p> <p>7.11.1.2/3 and 4: This relates to the activities of the New Anglia Local Enterprise Partnership (NALEP) and other major developments that might interact with Hornsea Three. There is much activity in Greater Norwich as a Growth Area. As such the Northern Distributor Road (NDR) is to be completed next year. There is a proposal for a Norwich Western Link (NWL) road to take the NDR across the Wensum Valley to the A47 west, on which dualling will start in 2020, and a Food Hub site has been given consent for a site to the west of Easton Village, and the purpose of which is to bolster and justify the county council aspiration for a NWL road. The timescale for any NWL road would be beyond that for Hornsea Three, but the cabling route crosses the A47 and run through the middle of the Food Hub site, the Local Development Order being made within the context of the Greater Norwich Food Enterprise Zone (FEZ) in which the Hub is located.</p>	I	As above
Natural England	<p>Section 3.1 – Geology and Hydrology</p> <p>Without details of the pollution prevention measures in terms of run-off from the cable route activities it is not possible to comment on the assessment of the magnitude and significance of its effect.</p>	I	<p>An Outline CoCP forms part of the DCO application and contains management measures that the Undertaker and its construction contractors will be required to adopt and implement for all construction activities associated with Hornsea Three. This includes measures to minimise pollution, including a commitment to prepare Pollution Prevention and Emergency Response Plans.</p> <p>The CoCP is a 'living' document that will be updated as required post submission of the Development Consent Order (DCO) application, during the Examination Period following more detailed engagement with stakeholders and post examination by way of instruction of the Examining Authority and Secretary of State.</p>
Natural England	<p>Section 3.1 – Geology and Hydrology</p> <p>With regard to the impact of pollution and run off all wet receptors should be recognised as part of a wider catchment that ultimately leads to designated rivers, the sea and priority habitats. As such any pollutants, nutrients and sediment are likely to have greater spatial and temporal impacts than implied in the PEI. Their removal from catchment watercourses is also difficult so the reversibility appears to have been underestimated. Run off and any sediment it contains is likely to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- smother aquatic substrates, flora and fauna;</li> <li>- carry nutrients, particularly phosphates – a key water quality issue for the River Wensum;</li> <li>- carry pollutants such as agricultural pesticides.</li> </ul> <p>These issues need to be recognised and addressed, particularly when dealing with run off from exposed soils and subsoils. Water quality testing for key nutrients and pollutants should be undertaken before permitting run off to enter surface water receptors or ground supplies.</p>	I	<p>The Water Framework Directive Groundwater and Hydrology Assessments (Environmental Statement Volume 6, Annexes 1.4 and 2.5 respectively) consider the potential impacts of Hornsea Three to groundwater and watercourses on a catchment basis.</p> <p>Appropriate mitigation measures would be implemented during construction to minimise flood risk, minimise the generation of silt and prevent runoff entering the watercourses. These measures are included in the Outline Code of Construction Practice which forms part of the DCO application.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>37</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Natural England	Section 3.1 – Geology and Hydrology Natural England's advice on hydrological assessment provided to the EIA Scoping consultation (25 November 2016) still applies. The hydrological characterisation will need to consider effects on groundwater supplies and flows in addition to all surface waters, and not just Environment Agency main rivers. All surface waters form part of interconnected wider catchments and many sites and habitats are dependent on groundwater, in particular the River Wensum and the ponds at Alderford Common.	I	Environmental Statement, volume 3, chapter 1: Geology and Ground Conditions assesses the impact of Hornsea Three on groundwater flows in terms of supporting abstractions and groundwater fed watercourses. The relationship between hydrogeology, hydrology and water-dependant habitats are described in the Hydrological Characterisation Note which forms Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 2.4.
Natural England	Section 3.1 – Geology and Hydrology The cable trenches and lines may act as preferential flow paths for ground water and effects of this needs consideration and mitigation.	I	Potential impacts of Hornsea Three in respect to creating preferential pathways have been included in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 1: Geology and Ground Conditions (paragraphs 1.11.3.1 to 1.11.3.10.) Mitigation measures have been identified to the creation of preferential pathways for groundwater flow, minimise flood risk, minimise the generation of silt and prevent runoff entering the watercourses. These measures are set out in Geology and Ground Condition chapter as well as in the Outline Code of Construction Practice which forms part of the DCO application.
<b>Section 42: Local Authorities (prescribed under section 43 of the Act)</b>			
Norfolk County Council	Minerals and Waste 5.21 There is a typographical error in the quote in section 1.7.3.2 which requires correction to remove 'isn't' and insert 'is' so that the quote reads, "those areas where there is an underlying mineral resource which may be of economic interest, which should be protected from unnecessary sterilisation by non-mineral development".	I	Response noted, this has been addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 1: Geology and Ground Conditions.
Norfolk County Council	Minerals and Waste 2.32 The County Council considers that the PEIR correctly assesses the magnitude, sensitivity and significance of the effect of the project on Mineral Safeguarding Areas. The further mitigation suggested in the PEIR is considered to be effective. Therefore, the County Council in its capacity as the Mineral Planning Authority does not object to this proposal provided that the applicant continues to work with the County Council regarding the mitigation of impacts on the Mineral Safeguarding Areas as the final scheme design continues.	I	The refinement of the onshore cable corridor, has resulted in a reduction in the area of Mineral Safeguarding Area that would be occupied by Hornsea Three. Hornsea Three will continue to consult with Norfolk County Council Mineral Planning Authority regarding the Mineral Safeguarding Areas located along the Hornsea Three onshore cable corridor and the onshore HVAC booster station area during the detailed design phase.  Impacts on Mineral Safeguarding Areas are assessed in Environmental Statement Volume 3, Chapter 1: Geology and Ground Conditions, and concludes a minor adverse effects during construction which is not significant in EIA terms. No effects are predicted during operation and maintenance or decommissioning.
<b>Section 42: Persons with an interest in the land (prescribed under section 44 of the Act)</b>			
Christopher Bond, Bidwells, on behalf of Evans-Lombe Trust & Great Melton Farms	North of the Marlingford/Bawburgh Road To the north of the Marlingford/Bawburgh Road, we note that the proposed route crosses the old gravel workings and recommend that this area is investigated further to check the stability of the land for cable laying purposes.	I	This and previous information on this area has been noted. This is currently proposed to be crossed via HDD. It is likely ground investigation surveys will be undertaken post DCO award in order to investigate ground conditions further, as advised.
Christopher Bond, Bidwells, via Cozens-Hardy LLP (general comments)	Soil Management Plan It is essential a Soil Management plan is put in place before any works start and an independent soil expert appointed to monitor and oversee the works	I	Soil management will be covered in more detail in the Heads of Terms to Landowners and in the DCO application
Jane Kenny, Savills (general comments)	Soil – greater clarity is required on how are the soils to be treated? What is the weed control programme? How will the soil be stored? Under what conditions will you undertake reinstatement? How do you propose to reinstate?	I	Further information regarding soil storage will be provided in the Environmental Statement and more detail will be worked-up as the scheme progresses towards construction.



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>37</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
The Trustees of the Gurloque Settlement (submitted by Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co)	A. It is important that DONG carry out full soil surveys prior to entry to enable proper restoration to take place. Such tests should assess (as a minimum): i. Mineral and Nutrient content ii. Soil composition iii. Pathogen content	I	Soil management will be covered in more detail in the Heads of Terms to Landowners and in the Environmental Statement
The Trustees of the Gurloque Settlement (submitted by Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co)	B. Construction works can result in topsoil 'loss' due to compaction and wash. DONG will need to identify potential donor sites for soils of matching quality.	I	Soil management will be covered in more detail in the Heads of Terms to Landowners and in the Environmental Statement
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co on behalf of CJC Lee and Peter Seaman	Construction works can result in topsoil 'loss' due to compaction and wash. DONG will need to identify potential donor sites for soils of matching quality in advance of carrying out works.	I	Any additional topsoil required to be imported following completion of construction will be done so in liaison with the landowner and be of the appropriate type and condition.
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co on behalf of Simon Back	Construction works can result in topsoil 'loss' due to compaction and wash. DONG will need to identify potential donor sites for soils of matching quality.	I	Any additional topsoil that needs to be imported following completion of construction will be done so in liaison with the landowner and be of the appropriate type and condition.
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co on behalf of Kelling Estate	<p>Terrain &amp; Soil</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The northern end of the route passes through the same field as where the DOW cables were installed. Putting another set of cables through the field will cause more disturbance to the soil structure and it will be on such a scale as to potentially render a highly productive field compromised for long term agricultural use.</li> <li>• The route from the coast road through to Holgate Hill sees a contour change from 15m ASL to 60m ASL – this is a 45m change in terrain over a 1,400m run.</li> <li>• The soils over this route are sandy with low bonding coefficient, thus creating a very high risk of soil runoff/wash.</li> <li>• Stripping a corridor of potentially more than 80m in width of its topsoil will create a large area of highly unstable and vulnerable surface that will be prone to surface runoff and wash.</li> <li>• In the event of soil runoff the likely course will be along the route and down the west face of the Cromer Ridge.</li> <li>• If water flows along the route it will erode at an accelerated rate due to the lack of any vegetative cover.</li> <li>• Incidences of runoff down the west face of the ridge will be far higher due to the lack of natural structure and vegetation to aid infiltration over the route.</li> <li>• Soil washing down to the west face will follow a course that leads directly into the domestic properties in the village that line The Street.</li> <li>• Soil wash may also drain to stream that runs parallel to The Street, which in turn will lead to diffuse soil pollution in the local surface water network.</li> <li>• Soil wash may also drain to the ponds to the west of the corridor and east of Kelling Hall. These ponds have high historic, amenity and ecological value and inundation with soil wash could have significant negative impacts on these factors.</li> </ul> <p>The following questions arise:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. How DONG will address/manage soil damage?</li> <li>2. How DONG will protect soils, waterways and property from erosion and runoff?</li> <li>3. Why this route is less damaging to the environment than the principle route?</li> </ol>	Y	<p>The existing Dudgeon (DOW) electricity cable route is proposed to be crossed via HDD, and therefore has no direct impact on the same land.</p> <p>Regarding the specific questions proposed by Kelling Estate:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 &amp; 2. Concern for disruption due to topography is noted. This will be managed by the construction contractor, once appointed, with appropriate mitigation measures being implemented as required. The cables are proposed to be installed under the woodland via HDD.</li> <li>3. This route was not proposed or adopted solely due to environmental constraints, but due to technical concerns and issues with the initially proposed route.</li> </ol>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>37</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co (generic comments)	<p>Generic comments 4: The proposed working methodology is to strip a corridor and install circuits before reinstatement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o What methods will be used to ensure the subsoil is not damaged during installation?</li> <li>o Will also soils be tested prior to works starting?</li> <li>o What methods will be deployed in the event of inundation with rainwater?</li> <li>o Will there be appropriate means to deal with large volumes of surface water ponding?</li> <li>o Will there be appropriate means to manage large volumes of water borne soil runoff?</li> <li>o What provisions will be made to source additional topsoil that is a close match to the destination land?</li> </ul>	I	<p>Soil protection measures will be part of the project's Code of Construction Practice. Soils are not proposed to be tested prior to work commencing.</p> <p>An agricultural Liaison Officer will be appointed during construction to oversee the works and resolve any issues, regarding working on land following extreme weather conditions for example.</p> <p>The construction corridor will likely have to be de-watered in some locations, the terms of the agreement we will look to allow for this within the landowners estate, where appropriate, into adjacent drains and watercourses.</p> <p>Any additional top soil required for reinstatement will be sourced in liaison with the landowner.</p>
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co (generic comments)	<p>Generic comments 5: Biosecurity during works period is very important for farmers with clean farms and those who have high value crop contracts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o How will biosecurity be managed during the works process?</li> <li>o How will biosecurity be managed if the event of soil import</li> <li>o Will full pre-works surveys be carried out to establish disease status of land?</li> </ul>	I	<p>Construction on land subject to bio-security measures will follow procedures set out in the project's Code of Construction Practice, although once the construction corridor has been installed, this would be a separate work area and measures would be reduced, if appropriate.</p> <p>Any additional topsoil required to be imported following completion of construction will be done so in liaison with the landowner and be of the appropriate type and condition.</p> <p>Surveys to assess potential disease of land will not be undertaken prior to construction, this is the landowners obligation.</p>
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co (generic comments)	<p>Generic comments 6: Installation works will severely disrupt soil profiles with potential long-term impact</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Will full soil profile surveys be carried out before works are undertaken?</li> <li>o What is the proposed specification of soil surveys?</li> </ul>	N	Soils will not be tested prior to work commencing.
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co (generic comments)	<p>Generic comments 7: Installation of cables will potentially disrupt in field drainage schemes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Please confirm that full pre-scheme drainage investigations will take place?</li> <li>o Landowners will in many cases wish to use their 'normal' drainage contractor to advise on and carry out remedial works. Please confirm that this will be acceptable?</li> </ul>	I	An independent drainage consultant will be appointed to assess pre and post drainage solutions. It is possible then that local drainage contractors will be appointed in order to undertake the relevant works.
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co (generic comments)	<p>Generic comments 8: Many fields have services underground including water and electricity supplied</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Will full pre-works surveys be carried out to establish the infrastructure that is in place?</li> <li>o Can it be confirmed that any interruption to services and any associated losses incurred, if any, will be compensated at the time?</li> </ul>	I	<p>Full utility searches along the corridor have been undertaken, these records will be maintained and updated up to and during construction.</p> <p>Compensation will be paid on a proven loss basis and on receipt of a claim.</p>
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co on behalf of Kelling Estate	<p>Topography As can be seen from the topographic map shown (Left), the proposed pipeline is set to cut through terrain which steeply rises from 20m above sea level to 55m above sea level within 250m. Removing this amount of soil will not only totally change the landscape itself, but also significantly increase the potential for sediment mobilisation. This will impact the lower lying residents of Kelling as well as localised watercourses and features through increased risk of flooding and pollution. The image below gives an indication of the steep topography in parcel 5339. Taken 10th September 2017. SEE FIGURE IN KELLING ENVIRONMENTAL REPORT</p>	Y	The sections of woodland where there is a larger change in topography will be crossed via HDD.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>37</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Tom Corfield (on behalf of Lady M A Prince-Smith Morton Hall Estate)	v) Land drainage The cable corridor will have a significant impact on and drainage over the entire length of the cable corridor which needs to be addressed and proposals put forward to address this. Currently there does not appear to be any consideration to the effect upon or remedies for land drainage within the PEIR. Many fields will have land drains, some old clay land drains, others more modern systems but it is vital that drainage is given considerable thought especially with such a wide cable corridor. Drainage may also be required from the junction bays/link boxes. My client would require both pre and post construction drains to be installed. All proposals to be prepared by a local drainage consultant for the approval of my client. Specifically, at Morton Hall Estate there is a large soakaway taking water from Marl Hill which needs to form part of any design proposals and drainage solutions.	I	Any land drainage plans will be requested, in addition to details of the soakaway mentioned at Marl Hill. An independent land drainage consultant will be appointed in order to consider and design pre and post drainage solutions where required.
Tom Corfield (on behalf of Lady M A Prince-Smith Morton Hall Estate)	vi) Soil Structure At present no details have been provided in respect of how soils are to be 'handled' during the works - care and attention must be given to soil structures; Depths of top soil must be recorded at regular intervals across the length of the corridor in each field. This is necessary to make sure reinstatement is completed correctly. Topsoil must be stripped and stored to the side of the cable corridor away from subsoils. Absolutely no topsoil to be removed from my clients land without their prior permission. Stored topsoil must be regularly sprayed to control weeds throughout the programme of works. A plan for reinstatement of the land (once the works are completed) must be agreed by my client From experience with other schemes we require clarification that during times of heavy rainfall that the contractors carrying out the works will cease works until ground conditions are dry enough to continue. My client reserves the right to be able to give this order should they consider conditions are too wet for works to continue.	Y	A pre-construction photographic record of condition will be undertaken, with reinstatement being carried out in accordance with this, and in liaison with landowners, where reinstatement is not possible compensation will be paid on a proven loss basis and on receipt of a claim. An agricultural Liaison Officer will be appointed during construction to oversee the works and resolve any issues, regarding working on land following extreme weather conditions for example.
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co (generic comments)	Generic comments 6: Installation works will severely disrupt soil profiles with potential long-term impact o Will full soil profile surveys be carried out before works are undertaken? o What is the proposed specification of soil surveys?	N	Hornsea Three confirmed that soils will not be tested prior to work commencing.
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co (generic comments)	Generic comments 7: Installation of cables will potentially disrupt in field drainage schemes. o Please confirm that full pre-scheme drainage investigations will take place? o Landowners will in many cases wish to use their 'normal' drainage contractor to advise on and carry out remedial works. Please confirm that this will be acceptable?	I	An independent drainage consultant will be appointed to assess pre and post drainage solutions. It is possible then that local drainage contractors will be appointed in order to undertake the relevant works.
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co (generic comments)	Generic comments 8: Many fields have services underground including water and electricity supplied o Will full pre-works surveys be carried out to establish the infrastructure that is in place? o Can it be confirmed that any interruption to services and any associated losses incurred, if any, will be compensated at the time?	I	Full utility searches along the corridor have been undertaken, these records will be maintained and updated up to and during construction. Compensation will be paid on a proven loss basis and on receipt of a claim.
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co (generic comments)	Generic comments 4: The proposed working methodology is to strip a corridor and install circuits before reinstatement. o What methods will be used to ensure the subsoil is not damaged during installation? o Will also soils be tested prior to works starting? o What methods will be deployed in the event of inundation with rainwater? o Will there be appropriate means to deal with large volumes of surface water ponding? o Will there be appropriate means to manage large volumes of water borne soil runoff? o What provisions will be made to source additional topsoil that is a close match to the destination land?	I	Soil protection measures will be part of the project's Code of Construction Practice. Soils will not be tested prior to work commencing. An agricultural Liaison Officer will be appointed during construction to oversee the works and resolve any issues, regarding working on land following extreme weather conditions, for example. The construction corridor will likely have to be de-watered in some locations and the terms of the option agreement will look to allow for this within the landowners estate, and, where appropriate, into adjacent drains and watercourses. Any additional top soil required for reinstatement will be sourced in liaison with the landowner.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>37</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co (generic comments)	Generic comments 5: Biosecurity during works period is very important for farmers with clean farms and those who have high value crop contracts o How will biosecurity be managed during the works process? o How will biosecurity be managed if the event of soil import o Will full pre-works surveys be carried out to establish disease status of land?	I	Construction on land subject to bio-security measures will follow procedures set out in the project's Code of Construction Practice, although once the construction corridor has been installed, this would be a separate work area and measures would be reduced, if appropriate. Any additional topsoil that needs to be imported following completion of construction will be done so in liaison with the landowner and be of the appropriate type and condition. Surveys to assess potential disease of land will not be undertaken prior to construction, this is the landowners obligation.
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co (generic comments)	Generic comments 6: Installation works will severely disrupt soil profiles with potential long-term impact o Will full soil profile surveys be carried out before works are undertaken? o What is the proposed specification of soil surveys?	N	Hornsea Three confirmed that soils will not be tested prior to work commencing.
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co (generic comments)	Generic comments 7: Installation of cables will potentially disrupt in field drainage schemes. o Please confirm that full pre-scheme drainage investigations will take place? o Landowners will in many cases wish to use their 'normal' drainage contractor to advise on and carry out remedial works. Please confirm that this will be acceptable?	I	An independent drainage consultant will be appointed to assess pre and post drainage solutions. It is possible then that local drainage contractors will be appointed in order to undertake the relevant works.
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co (generic comments)	Generic comments 8: Many fields have services underground including water and electricity supplied o Will full pre-works surveys be carried out to establish the infrastructure that is in place? o Can it be confirmed that any interruption to services and any associated losses incurred, if any, will be compensated at the time?	I	Full utility searches along the corridor have been undertaken, these records will be maintained and updated up to and during construction. Compensation will be paid on a proven loss basis and on receipt of a claim.
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co (generic comments)	Generic comments 4: The proposed working methodology is to strip a corridor and install circuits before reinstatement. o What methods will be used to ensure the subsoil is not damaged during installation? o Will also soils be tested prior to works starting? o What methods will be deployed in the event of inundation with rainwater? o Will there be appropriate means to deal with large volumes of surface water ponding? o Will there be appropriate means to manage large volumes of water borne soil runoff? o What provisions will be made to source additional topsoil that is a close match to the destination land?	I	Soil protection measures will be part of the project's Code of Construction Practice. Soils will not be tested prior to work commencing. An agricultural Liaison Officer will be appointed during construction to oversee the works and resolve any issues, regarding working on land following extreme weather conditions for example. The construction corridor will likely have to be de-watered in some locations, the terms of the option agreement will seek to allow for this within the landowner's estate, and, where appropriate, into adjacent drains and watercourses. Any additional top soil required for reinstatement will be sourced in liaison with the landowner.
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co (generic comments)	Generic comments 5: Biosecurity during works period is very important for farmers with clean farms and those who have high value crop contracts o How will biosecurity be managed during the works process? o How will biosecurity be managed if the event of soil import o Will full pre-works surveys be carried out to establish disease status of land?	I	Construction on land subject to bio-security measures will follow procedures set out in the project's Code of Construction Practice, although once the construction corridor has been installed, this would be a separate work area and measures would be reduced, if appropriate. Any additional topsoil that needs to be imported following completion of construction will be done so in liaison with the landowner and be of the appropriate type and condition. Surveys to assess potential disease of land will not be undertaken prior to construction, this is the landowners obligation.
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co (generic comments)	Generic comments 4: The proposed working methodology is to strip a corridor and install circuits before reinstatement. o What methods will be used to ensure the subsoil is not damaged during installation? o Will also soils be tested prior to works starting? o What methods will be deployed in the event of inundation with rainwater? o Will there be appropriate means to deal with large volumes of surface water ponding? o Will there be appropriate means to manage large volumes of water borne soil runoff? o What provisions will be made to source additional topsoil that is a close match to the destination land?	I	Soil protection measures will be part of the project's Code of Construction Practice. Soils will not be tested prior to work commencing. An agricultural Liaison Officer will be appointed during construction to oversee the works and resolve any issues - such as working on land following extreme weather conditions, for example. The construction corridor will likely have to be de-watered in some locations, the terms of the option agreement will seek to allow for this within the landowners estate, and, where appropriate, into adjacent drains and watercourses. Any additional top soil required for reinstatement will be sourced in liaison with the landowner.



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>37</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co (generic comments)	<p>Generic comments 5: Biosecurity during works period is very important for farmers with clean farms and those who have high value crop contracts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o How will biosecurity be managed during the works process?</li> <li>o How will biosecurity be managed if the event of soil import</li> <li>o Will full pre-works surveys be carried out to establish disease status of land?</li> </ul>	I	Construction on land subject to bio-security measures will follow procedures set out in the project's Code of Construction Practice, although once the construction corridor has been installed, this would be a separate work area and measures would be reduced, if appropriate. Any additional topsoil that needs to be imported following completion of construction will be done so in liaison with the landowner and be of the appropriate type and condition. Surveys to assess potential disease of land will not be undertaken prior to construction, this is the landowners obligation.
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co (generic comments)	<p>Generic comments 6: Installation works will severely disrupt soil profiles with potential long-term impact</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Will full soil profile surveys be carried out before works are undertaken?</li> <li>o What is the proposed specification of soil surveys?</li> </ul>	N	Hornsea Three confirmed that soils will not be tested prior to work commencing.
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co (generic comments)	<p>Generic comments 7: Installation of cables will potentially disrupt in field drainage schemes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Please confirm that full pre-scheme drainage investigations will take place?</li> <li>o Landowners will in many cases wish to use their 'normal' drainage contractor to advise on and carry out remedial works. Please confirm that this will be acceptable?</li> </ul>	I	An independent drainage consultant will be appointed to assess pre and post drainage solutions. It is possible then that local drainage contractors will be appointed in order to undertake the relevant works.
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co (generic comments)	<p>Generic comments 8: Many fields have services underground including water and electricity supplied</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Will full pre-works surveys be carried out to establish the infrastructure that is in place?</li> <li>o Can it be confirmed that any interruption to services and any associated losses incurred, if any, will be compensated at the time?</li> </ul>	I	Full utility searches along the corridor have been undertaken, these records will be maintained and updated up to and during construction. Compensation will be paid on a proven loss basis and on receipt of a claim.
D.N Gray	<p><b>PEIR</b> - My only knowledge of assessments are those that have affected me i.e. bat survey. I would like a hard copy of results. Am satisfied with action involving my involvement</p>	N	During the pre-application phase, extensive environmental surveys have been undertaken to identify sensitive habitats and species to inform the route refinement process. Details of the surveys undertaken, as well as their findings are provided in Environmental Statement, volume 6, Annex 3.1 - 3.14. The bat surveys are reported in annex 3.8. Where reasonably possible to do so, Hornsea Three has avoided sensitive areas through routing, or the use of trenchless technologies (e.g. HDD).

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>37</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 47: Duty to consult local community</b>			
Ray & Diane Pearce	<p>You have therefore failed to consider the cumulative effects and have not provided information on how the effects of the applicants [Dong's] proposal will combine and interact with the effects of other development [ Vattenfall Vanguard &amp; Boreas]. Also, the cross referencing and detail within the PEIR document is misleading and fundamentally flawed. For instance, PEIR Volume 3, Chapter 1 - 1.14.1.2 states that: "A description of the likely inter-related effects arising from Hornsea Three geology and ground conditions is provided in volume 3, chapter 12: Inter-Related Effects (onshore)" but there is no chapter 12 and the onshore inter-related effects in chapter 11 do not even mention Vanguard or Boreas! The ground conditions and environment will undoubtedly be effected at the cable crossing point and there is nothing in the PEIR to the contrary. Considering the content and quality of the data and inter-related research within the PEIR for the off-shore environment, we have to question why this has been omitted for the onshore environment.</p>	N	<p>For any significant environmental impacts, cumulative assessments are undertaken where the impacts that result from incremental changes caused by other past, present or reasonably foreseeable actions together with the project in question could lead to a significant impact. When combined, cumulative EMF sources do not create incremental changes i.e. two equal EMF sources do not double the field strength, rather peak EMFs in effect over lay on one another. Therefore, the combination of Hornsea Project Three with any other EMF source does not result in an incremental change and therefore combined it is forecast to continue to be well below established standards.</p> <p>Volume 3, Chapter 11: Inter-related effects of the Environmental Statement (and corresponding chapter in the PEIR) provides an assessment of the likely effects should the same type of impact affect the same receptor group during each of the three key project phases (i.e. construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning), and therefore have the potential to combine and result in an overall effect of greater significance. It also provides an assessment of the likely effects should multiple impact types occur on the same receptor group (e.g. noise and landscape and visual impacts may affect the same residential properties); impacts may individually be considered insignificant, but when considered together, could amount to a significant cumulative effect. The potential for impacts arising as a result of Hornsea Project Three to combine with other planned developments (including the Vattenfall projects) is assessed in each respective topic chapter, under the heading 'Cumulative Effect Assessment'. In relation to geology and ground conditions, the cumulative effect assessment is therefore included in Environmental Statement Volume 3, Chapter 1.</p>
Ray & Diane Pearce	<p>On 6th December 2016 you were directed by the Planning Inspectorate as a result of the Scoping Opinion - PEIR Volume 3, Chapter 1, Table 1.3 (Page 7) as follows: "Careful consideration should be given to the potential for overlapping cable corridors with the Norfolk Vanguard offshore wind farm and any resultant cumulative impacts." Your response in the PEIR to the issue raised is as follows: "Cumulative impacts are discussed in section 1.12." However, there is no mention in Section 1.12, whatsoever, of the overlapping cable corridors despite you having been specifically directed by the Planning Inspectorate to take it into careful consideration. Furthermore, Section 1.12, discusses: mineral safeguards, principle and secondary aquifers, substations, surface groundwater, and thermal effects. We put it to you that: the thermal effects on the ground water and surrounding environment from up to 6GW of power radiating from up to 54 cables will be significant and worthy of note, especially as one of the projects will have to bury their cables deeper to remain within scope. Astonishingly, you have decided that the overall effect will be from your cables alone and have graded the environmental issue as "minor adverse."</p>	I	<p>Volume 3, Chapter 1: Geology and Ground Conditions of the Environmental Statement provides a cumulative effects assessment based on the methodology and cumulative schemes identified in Volume 1, Chapter 5: Environmental Impact Assessment Methodology. These schemes include the Vattenfall projects. As such, the assessment presented in Environmental Statement Volume 3, Chapter 1 (section 1.12) has considered the potential for impacts from both projects to combine, including at the crossing points.</p> <p>At the time of production of the PEIR, there was only limited information available in the public domain in relation to the potential impacts of the Vattenfall projects to allow for a more detailed assessment. However, these assessments have been updated for the Environmental Statement to take into account the latest information from Vattenfall which is available in the public domain. Additional justification has also been incorporated into the Environmental Statement.</p>
Andrew Cannon	<p>I was concerned to see from the consultation document that the proposed cable routes for Hornsea Three may impinge upon the Kelling Heath Site of Special Scientific Interest. Unlike most SSSIs, Kelling Heath was not designated primarily for biological interest but for its geomorphology. To quote from the notification (which you can read in full here <a href="http://www.sssi.naturalengland.org.uk/citation/citation_photo/1002812.pdf">http://www.sssi.naturalengland.org.uk/citation/citation_photo/1002812.pdf</a>): "Reasons for Notification: Kelling Heath, together with Salthouse Heath, are two distinct outwash plains dating from different halt stages of the same glaciation. Kelling Heath provides perhaps the best example of a glacial outwash plain in England. Both sites have steep ice-contact slopes and are dissected by deep dry valleys, and are geomorphological sites of national importance". It follows that absolutely no disturbance, however temporary, to the soil and sediment structure of a 'geomorphological site of national importance' is acceptable, and I will be grateful to receive your reassurance on this point.</p>	Y	<p>Through the design development process, the onshore cable corridor now avoids Kelling Heath Site of Special Scientific Interest. Therefore there is no potential for significant impacts on this particular designated site.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>37?</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Dr Moss Taylor (Honorary Warden of the Weybourne Camp Reserve)	2. I have been keeping detailed records of the birdlife in the area since 1972 and the longer such records are kept, the more valuable they become. If the area is used as the Landfall Zone this long sequence of records will be interrupted, and the area will <u>never</u> be as important to migrating birds again. It has taken over 30 years for the trees that I planted to develop into the current valuable wildlife reserve that is there now.	Y	Through design development, the area which will be directly impacted by the landfall works associated with construction of Hornsea Three has been reduced. The potential impacts of the construction works at landfall are addressed in topic specific chapters, with impacts on birds considered specifically in Environmental Statement Volume 3, Chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation. Where practicable, Hornsea Three has sought to avoid or minimise impacts on ecological receptors through the development of an Outline Environmental Management Plan which accompanies the DCO application.
Friends of North Norfolk	19. The majority of the North Norfolk Coastline is recognised, both nationally and internationally, for its exceptional landscape and ecological value with a number of overlapping Designations including the Norfolk Coast AONB, the North Norfolk Heritage Coast, many SSSI, SAC, RAMSAR sites and Marine Protection Areas/ MCZs.	I	A full assessment of the effects of Hornsea Three on benthic ecology, including on features of designated sites, is presented in volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology. Conclusions on the effects of Hornsea Three on the conservation objectives of the North Norfolk Coast and Saturn Reef SAC and The Wash and North Norfolk Coast SAC are presented in full within the RIAA for Hornsea Three. Discussions on the effects of Hornsea Three on the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ and the Markham's Triangle rMCZ are presented in full within volume 5, annex 2.3: Marine Conservation Zone Assessment.
National Farmers Union (NFU)	Soils Details of how soils will be treated and where stored during construction must be provided. Along with how sub and top soils will be kept separate and kept clean during the construction period. Due to the damage to soils during construction works must only take place when conditions are acceptable. During very wet conditions and if soils are waterlogged construction should be stopped. Further it is important for Dong Energy to set out after soil has been reinstated what measures will be put in place to bring the soil back to its condition and quality before the works took place. An after care plan should be included in a code of construction.	I	Hornsea Three noted the NFU's comments regarding soils. Greater detail on soil management will be presented in the Environmental Statement.
National Farmers Union (NFU)	Heat Our member are concerned about the effects of the heat generated from the cables and would like to know how Dong Energy is intending to minimise the impacts of heat on the soil which will affect the yield of the crop.	N/A	Hornsea Three does not envisage any heat impacts having a detrimental impact on agricultural practices, however a claim will be considered if received with sufficient supporting evidence.
National Farmers Union (NFU)	Land (Field) Drainage and Soils The major potential lasting damage is to land drainage systems and soils structure. One of the main reasons for the productive land the cable duct route is going through is that the farms are very well drained by a network of clay or plastic land drains laid in parallel every 20 metres or so across the field at depths of up to 1.8 metres draining into a field edge ditch or dyke. These drainage systems prevent water pooling in fields and increase the productive capacity of the agriculture in the area. Good land drainage increases farm productivity by keeping waterlogging to a minimum, increasing soil strength by reducing water content, gives higher soil temperatures and leads to more efficient use of applied fertilisers. According to the Agricultural Notebook the yield advantage for most crops when comparing drained and undrained treatments is typically 10 to 25 per cent. Assuming land drains are laid every 20 metres in farmland (they are laid more closely in some cases) and assuming the whole route is farmland, which it is not, but it mainly is, the cable ducts/trenches will cut thousands of land drains in six places for each land drain. Major pipeline constructors will cut a trench and the land drains then place the pipeline in the trench and re-connect the land drains above the pipe. It is a drainage rule of thumb that with a major pipeline one in every six land drains does not work after the soil is replaced around the pipe. This will not just affect the 60 metre working width but could potentially affect the whole field where the cable duct goes through and therefore every arable field along the route.	I	An independent land drainage consultant will be appointed in order to consider and design pre and post drainage solutions where required.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>37</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Ray & Diane Pearce	<p>Cumulative Effects Assessment: There will be a cumulative effect from the Hornsea Three cables crossing the Vanguard and Boreas cables. The cumulative effects of co-locating up to 54 high voltage cables, carrying up to 6 GW of electrical energy, should not be underestimated and the PEIR does not address the environmental issues. Notwithstanding the potential cumulative EMF, the PEIR Volume 4 Annex 5.1, only acknowledges that there are other projects in 'Planning Application'; this is despite acknowledgement from Dong Energy that there have been specific discussions with Vattenfall regarding their projects. These discussions have purposefully not been included in the PEIR.</p> <p>By its own admission, the PEIR should discuss the cumulative impact of projects, plans and activities with which Hornsea Three may interact. Regarding the crossing point, it is, once again, deficient. We contest that Dong Energy does not have a design proposal for the crossing of the Hornsea three cables with those of Vanguard and Boreas. The PEIR makes it clear that the minimum depth of the cables will be 1.2m and the maximum 2.0m. The significant number of cables and limited depth to which high voltage cables can be buried, before they are unable to efficiently dissipate heat, will have a significant and potentially detrimental impact on the local environment for soils, principle and secondary aquifers, substrates and groundwater, especially regarding thermal effects. Considering the depth and comprehension of the cumulative effects assessment for the off-shore environment, why has the on-shore environment not been afforded the same level of detail in the PEIR? Accordingly, there is a requirement for there to be a coordinated plan which will affect the relative depth of either Dong's cable trench or Vattenfall's, which will have a consequence for the environment.</p> <p>We draw your attention to the Planning Inspectorates directive, as follows: "... the Overarching NPS [National Policy Statement] for Energy (EN-1) paragraph 4.2.5 states that: 'When considering cumulative effects, the ES [Energy Supplier] should provide information on how the effects of the applicant's proposal would combine and interact with the effects of others already in existence'."</p> <p>We contest that the crossing of the Hornsea three cables with the Vanguard and Boreas cables, will have detrimental effects on the environment, the ecology, the population and potentially human health (see EMFs). However, most importantly, there will be a cumulative effect. Astonishingly, the PEIR states that the overall effect will be solely be from the Hornsea Three cables, and, have graded the environmental impact of the cables as "minor adverse".</p>	I	<p>The potential for impacts arising as a result of Hornsea Project Three to combine with other planned developments (including the Vattenfall projects) is assessed in each respective topic chapter, under the heading 'Cumulative Effect Assessment'. In relation to geology and ground conditions, the cumulative effect assessment is therefore included in Environmental Statement Volume 3, Chapter 1: Geology and Ground Conditions, section 1.13.</p> <p>This assessment concludes that there are no significant cumulative effects associated with Hornsea Three in combination with other cumulative developments.</p>
Ray & Diane Pearce	<p>Cross Referencing: The cross referencing and detail within the PEIR document is misleading and fundamentally flawed. For instance, PEIR Volume 3, Chapter 1 - 1.14.1.2 states that: "A description of the likely inter-related effects arising from Hornsea Three geology and ground conditions is provided in volume 3, chapter 12: Inter-Related Effects (onshore)" ... but there is no chapter 12 and the onshore inter-related effects in chapter 11 do not mention Vanguard or Boreas.</p> <p>In PEIR Volume 3, Chapter 1, Table 1.3 (Page 7), as a result of the Scoping Opinion Dong Energy was directed by the Planning Inspectorate - as follows: "Careful consideration should be given to the potential for overlapping cable corridors with the Norfolk Vanguard offshore wind farm and any resultant cumulative impacts." Your response in the PEIR to the issue raised is as follows: "Cumulative impacts are discussed in section 1.12." However, there is no mention in Section 1.12 of the PEIR, whatsoever, of the "...overlapping cable corridors..." despite having been specifically directed by the Planning Inspectorate to take it into "careful consideration".</p>	I	<p>Errors in cross referencing have been corrected within the Environmental Statement.</p> <p>As noted in previous comments relating to cumulative effects vs. inter-related effects, Volume 3, Chapter 11: Inter-related effects of the Environmental Statement provides an assessment of the likely effects should the same type of impact affect the same receptor group during each of the three key project phases (i.e. construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning), and therefore have the potential to combine and result in an overall effect of greater significance. It also provides an assessment of the likely effects should multiple impact types occur on the same receptor group (e.g. noise and landscape and visual impacts may affect the same residential properties); impacts may individually be considered insignificant, but when considered together, could amount to a significant cumulative effect. The potential for impacts arising as a result of Hornsea Project Three to combine with other planned developments (including the Vattenfall projects) is assessed in each respective topic chapter, under the heading 'Cumulative Effect Assessment'.</p>



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>37</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Dominic Everett	National Grid have offered the project a connection point that is so far from the coast that it requires excessive disruption and cost. The cost will be significant to DONG and be paid for by electricity consumers. The disruption will effect many people.	N	The location of any onshore infrastructure is largely determined by the grid offer we discuss and agree with National Grid. This is assessed by both National Grid and the developer from an economic, efficient and strategic perspective, in relation to additional costs and investments required based on the capacity and timing of energy production sought by the developer. One key element of this assessment is the perceived costs that may be passed on to the end user (the public and businesses) and hence both parties seek to minimise this. Hornsea Project Three received the single offer of Norwich Main National Grid Substation and as such, this is the grid connection point which is described in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description.
R. Richards, (G E Carman, Timber Merchant)	<b>Cable corridor</b> - I am concerned about the proximity of the proposed alternative in relation to Kelling Heath	Y	Through the design development process, the onshore cable corridor now avoids Kelling Heath Site of Special Scientific Interest. Therefore there is no potential for significant impacts on this particular designated site.
R. Richards, (G E Carman, Timber Merchant)	<b>80m Refinement</b> - As Kelling Heath is an SSSI area and important for its wildlife, specifically rare birds, reptiles, insects I would hope disturbance of the area could be kept to an absolute minimum and very little of the 80m corridor width used for excavation	Y	Through the design development process, the onshore cable corridor now avoids Kelling Heath Site of Special Scientific Interest. Therefore there is no potential for significant impacts on this particular designated site.
R. Richards, (G E Carman, Timber Merchant)	<b>PEIR</b> - I would hope the ecological surveys will highlight areas important for wildlife, especially breeding areas and avoidance of these areas made a priority	Y	During the pre-application phase, extensive environmental surveys have been undertaken to identify sensitive habitats and species to inform the route refinement process. Details of the surveys undertaken, as well as their findings are provided in Environmental Statement, volume 6, Annex 3.1 - 3.14. Amongst others, the specific surveys included a: Badger Survey, Otter Sign Survey, Bat Survey (Dusk and Dawn/Emergence) and White Clawed Crayfish Survey. Where reasonably possible to do so, Hornsea Three has avoided sensitive areas through routing, or the use of trenchless technologies (e.g. HDD). Additional mitigation measures have also been identified to minimise indirect impacts on ecological receptors, see Environmental Statement Volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation, as well as the Outline Ecological Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.
R. Richards, (G E Carman, Timber Merchant)	<b>PEIR further comments</b> - I would hope the ecological surveys will highlight areas important for wildlife, especially breeding areas and avoidance of these areas made a priority	I	During the pre-application phase, extensive environmental surveys have been undertaken to identify sensitive habitats and species to inform the route refinement process. Details of the surveys undertaken, as well as their findings are provided in Environmental Statement, volume 6, Annex 3.1 - 3.14. Amongst others, the specific surveys included a: Badger Survey, Otter Sign Survey, Bat Survey (Dusk and Dawn/Emergence) and White Clawed Crayfish Survey. Where reasonably possible to do so, Hornsea Three has avoided sensitive areas through routing, or the use of trenchless technologies (e.g. HDD). Additional mitigation measures have also been identified to minimise indirect impacts on ecological receptors, see Environmental Statement Volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation, as well as the Outline Ecological Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.
<b>Section 48: Duty to publicise</b>			
Douglas Walters (Norfolk Geographical Association)	Cable corridor - It sounds a good idea to have the cabling underground. And should be built in a way that doesn't have too much impact on the coastal typography and local landmarks. Also be careful with cabling under streets and on possible flood plains	I	Through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive assets. Mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project are outlined in topic specific chapters, and include the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts on local road networks, ecological receptors (e.g. hedgerows) and hydrological features (e.g. main rivers).

Table 3.2: Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Further Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.B) relating to geology and ground conditions

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>38</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 42: Prescribed consultees (The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009: Schedule 1))</b>			
Environment Agency	<p>Geology and Ground Conditions</p> <p>Whilst the majority of land within the application corridor is agricultural, closer inspection of maps and a walk over survey (part of Preliminary Risk Assessment) may indicate areas which require further inspection / investigation. On initial review of the maps provided, the application corridor crosses two railway lines, runs adjacent to a former depot site and historic landfill (known as Central depot 1971-73) just south of the A11. The application corridor appears to skirt around the edge of the source protection zone (SPZ) 1 for the AW borehole at Easton College. Sufficient information should be provided with the application to provide assurance that the risks to the water environment are fully understood and can be addressed through appropriate measures including the need for site investigation, risk assessment and remediation.</p>	I	Potential sensitivities associated with geology and ground conditions has been considered during the refinement of the onshore cable corridor. The project has, for example avoided the Kelling Heath and Weybourne Cliffs SSSI, and committed to undertaking a preliminary risk assessments during the detailed design stage in order to identify any localised areas of contamination. Furthermore additional site specific surveys will be undertaken during detailed design to inform construction methodologies (see Environmental Statement, Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project Description, section 3.7.2) and an assessment of potential impacts on hydrology can be found in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 2: Hydrology and Flood Risk.
<b>Section 42: Local Authorities (prescribed under section 43 of the Act)</b>			
No comments were received from the local authorities relating to geology and ground conditions under Phase 2.B.			
<b>Section 42: Persons with an interest in the land (prescribed under section 44 of the Act)</b>			
CJC Lee (via agent, Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co)	<p>Part of the land owned and occupied by CJC Lee (Saxthorpe) Ltd at Bodham has been identified as being on a potential revised cable route by Orsted for the Hornsea 3 project.</p> <p>During previous consultations CJC Lee (Saxthorpe) Ltd, hereafter referred to as "the Company" did not raise specific objections to the inclusion of land at Bodham in the proposed cable route. These proposed interactions are shown on the left-hand image below, which is an extract from the Orsted consultation document. Areas where the company's land and the original corridor interact are shown with red edging. The area affected under the proposed alternate route are shown on the right-hand image as edged red with the blue route passing through.</p> <p>Original Route</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cut the corners off two fields and potentially interacted with a pit hole</li> <li>• Limited impact on farming business – inconvenient but deemed to be manageable as no one field would be overly impacted.</li> </ul>	N	<p>Hornsea Three responded as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It is acknowledged that the alternative route will impact different areas of land than previously. The opposition to this is noted and was fed into the route design consideration.</li> <li>2. If areas of land are segregated by the construction corridor and become unfarmable, then compensation will be payable for any reasonable losses on a proven loss basis. However, landowners are expected to mitigate their losses, where possible.</li> <li>3. The land will be fully reinstated following the work to a comparable condition of that recorded in the schedule of condition, with compensation being payable on a proven loss basis for any ongoing losses or where reinstatement is not possible. Drainage will also be reinstated, or installed as required, with compensation being payable on the same terms as above.</li> </ol>

<sup>38</sup> Y = Yes change made; N = No change made; I = Incorporated into or considered when producing the assessment or landowner voluntary agreement offer; N/A = Not applicable.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>38</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
<p>AV Youngs Ltd (via agent, Jonathan Rush, Brown &amp; Co)</p>	<p>Part of Pitt Farm has been identified as part of a potential cable route by Orsted for the Hornsea 3 project.</p> <p>The original proposal for the cable corridor cut through the middle of the farm and came close to the farmstead and campsite, thus potentially resulting in high levels of disturbance during the works.</p> <p>Following submission of responses to the PEIR an alternative route has been suggested by Orsted, which is shown below.</p> <p>AV Youngs Ltd thanks Orsted for considering the representations made to the PEIR, however the proposed route change does not go far enough to alleviate the concerns raised in the previous response, and it is believed that greater variation to the cable route is possible. Evidence of the ability to significantly alter the route is shown on Statutory Consultation Plan Map 2 of 9 and Map 5 of 9. These examples are shown below. AV Youngs Ltd wishes to make suggestions detailed below as to how the disruption from the works might be reduced.</p> <p>Reference is made to the plan titled AV Youngs Ltd – Alternative Route, which is taken from Google earth.</p> <p>Field A. Orsted Alteration: Top of field the route is moved west of the pit. AV Youngs Ltd comments: Supports the changes down to the point where the cable leaves the pit.</p> <p>Field A. Orsted Alteration: Cable has moved west but straightens back to a north south drop into field B. AV Youngs Ltd comments: The cable should move to the far south west corner of Field A and prepare to drop into Field C.</p> <p>Field B. Orsted Alteration: Cable has moved west but remains in Field B. AV Youngs Ltd comments: Field B is circa 4.19ha and the corridor at 1.65ha accounts for 40% of the field. Thus, the field will be totally compromised by the works and the proposed route cuts off the south-western corner of the field. This location is adjacent to the campsite</p> <p>Field C. Orsted Alteration: Orsted Cable Route avoids this field. AV Youngs Ltd comments: Field C is circa 24.10 ha and the corridor at 7.31 ha would account for 30% of the field. The AV Youngs proposed routing of the cable down the eastern side of the field leaves a regular, easier to work area of 16.79 ha. This is preferable as the corridor has a more proportionate impact on the field and simply acts to narrow it.</p> <p>There is a small copse at the top of Field C where the cable would cross from Field A. This copse is due to be felled within the next 24 months for firewood. The owner would agree to offer the same area of land to match woodland lost to the cable for replanting.</p> <p>Field D. Orsted Alteration: Cable has moved west in the top half of the field then re-joins the original corridor. AV Youngs Ltd comments: Field D is large enough to accommodate the cable route in the same way as Field C is, however the top part of the field is still close to the campsite and will cause disruption.</p>		<p>Hornsea Three responded to AV Youngs Ltd. concerns as follows:</p> <p>Concern regarding the route and the wish for it to be further amended is noted,</p> <p>Regarding point A, the revised route corridor is located to the west of the pit described.</p> <p>Regarding point B, the revised route corridor now follows this suggested route and crosses the road at the south-west corner of field A.</p> <p>Regarding points C and D, the revised route corridor now avoids field B &amp; D, and has moved west into field C. The offer of the area of land for potential replanting is appreciated and noted.</p> <p>Comments on field E are noted, therevised route now exits the field to the south with the proposed installation method under the road and woodland being via Horizontal Directional Drill.</p> <p>Hornsea Three has now altered the proposed route in response to the landowner feedback.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>38</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>Field E. Orsted Alteration: Cable has moved back onto original line to cross the public highway into Field E. It is assumed that the road will be closed and trenched the trees south of Field E will be felled to allow the cable through. AV Youngs Ltd comments: Moving the cable back into Field E will mean disruption to another field that could be avoided. Field E is only 7.63 ha and the corridor will account for 1.15 ha, which is 15%.</p> <p>If it is vital for engineering reasons to cross the woodland block F where shown, then the proposed route could follow the course in Field C and then cross into E at the lower end. This is shown as Exit B.</p> <p>A preference would be to exit Field C at Exit A. If the cable is to be installed by HDD under the road and woodland then launching at Exit A is preferred.</p> <p>The proposed changes do not go far enough to alleviate the concerns of the land owner. It is clear from other alterations shown on the route that the Owners proposed alterations should be feasible, especially as all the changes occur within the same title. A V Youngs Ltd seeks reasons for why their proposed alternative route cannot be adopted.</p> <p>Google Earth Image is next and final page of this document.</p>		
<b>Section 47: Duty to consult local community</b>			
<i>No comments were received from the local community relating to geology and ground conditions under Phase 2.B.</i>			
<b>Section 48: Duty to publicise</b>			
<i>No comments were received from in response to the Public Notice relating to geology and ground conditions under Phase 2.B.</i>			



## 3.2 Hydrology and Flood Risk

Table 3.3: Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.A) relating to hydrology and flood risk

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>39</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 42: Prescribed consultees (The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009: Schedule 1))</b>			
Norfolk Rivers Trust	Norfolk Rivers Trust would like to register their concern on the management of land and water.	I	Noted. Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including land and water either through design, or identification of built in mitigation measures. Potential impacts on geology, hydrology and land use are identified and assessed in Environmental Statement Volume 3, chapters 1: Geology and Ground Conditions, 2: Hydrology and Flood Risk and 6: Land Use and Recreation respectively.
Norfolk Rivers Trust	The Norfolk Rivers Trust would appreciate being fully consulted on any of the river crossing points on the Hornsea Three and other Dong projects.	N	It is noted that Hornsea Three has committed to use trenchless technology, (e.g. HDD) for the majority of watercourses along the onshore cable corridor route. Details of river crossing points are provided in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 2: Hydrology and Flood Risk (see Table 2.17) as well as the Outline Watercourse Crossing Method statement which is provided as Appendix B of the outline CoCP which forms part of the DCO application. Hornsea Three will consult with relevant parties during detailed design to develop detailed watercourse crossing method statement where required.
Norfolk Rivers Trust	1. Observations from previous cable input leads us to ask that clear mitigation measures are in place to ensure that run off from open sites does not enter the sensitive chalk rivers on the proposed path.	I	As set out in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 2: Hydrology and Flood Risk, appropriate mitigation measures would be implemented during construction to minimise flood risk, minimise the generation of silt and prevent runoff entering the watercourses. These measures are included in Table 2.17 of Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 2 and the Outline CoCP which forms part of the DCO application.
Norfolk Rivers Trust	2. The ground should not be allowed to be bare for any length of time in historical periods of high rainfall.	I	Prior to construction commencing a Schedule of Condition of the land will be taken and we have an obligation to return the land in the same state. Once the cables are installed, we will reinstate the land and to ensure it is in no worse a condition than prior to construction. We understand the importance of assessing soil structure before, during and after construction to ensure that the field drainage is maintained and will appoint a Drainage Consultant who will assess and design the mitigation scheme. Additional measures relating to construction methodology are set out in the outline CoCP which forms part of the DCO application.
Norfolk Rivers Trust	3. Downhill gradients should not allowed to become open silt carriageways.	I	Appropriate mitigation measures have been designed-in to Hornsea Three to minimise impacts on drainage, soil erosion and hydrology. These measures include construction drainage / silt traps to reduce soil erosion. Details are provided in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 2: Hydrology and Flood Risk (see Table 2.17) as well as the outline CoCP which forms part of the DCO application.
Norfolk Rivers Trust	4. Silt traps should be a statutory feature in vulnerable areas.	I	Where required, based on the findings of the assessment presented in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 2: Hydrology and Flood Risk, silt traps will be installed prior to construction works. This will be secured through the outline CoCP which forms part of the DCO application.
Norfolk Rivers Trust	5. A full photographic record must be a made available.	I	Prior to construction commencing a Schedule of Condition of the land will be taken and we have an obligation to return the land in the same state. The need for photographic records at crossing points will be agreed with the relevant asset owner or responsible party in parallel to the development of crossing method statements which will occur during detailed design.

<sup>39</sup> Y = Yes change made; N = No change made; I = Incorporated into or considered when producing the assessment or landowner voluntary agreement offer; N/A = Not applicable.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>39</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Norfolk Rivers Trust	6. Planting of areas affected should be carried out as soon as possible to alleviate flooding.	I	Appropriate mitigation measures have been design-in to Hornsea Three to minimise impacts on drainage and flooding. Details are provided in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 2: Hydrology and Flood Risk (see Table 2.17) as well as the Outline Watercourse Crossing Method statement which is provided as Appendix B of the outline CoCP which forms part of the DCO application. In relation to planting, the working area will be reinstated to a state commensurate with condition prior to the commencement of works following the completion of the onshore cable installation.
Norfolk Rivers Trust	The Norfolk Rivers Trust are working with Land agents and Landowners on the current Vattenfall project on proposed river crossing points.	N	Noted.
Swardeston Parish Council	6. The B1113 north of the A47 underpass has a recent history of flooding in heavy rain, with the majority of that flooding caused by water run-off from the field in which the proposed substation is to be sited. Is Dong energy aware of this historic issue and can users of the road be reassured that sufficient drainage will be put in place in order to avoid any increased likelihood of these flooding events?	I	A Flood Risk Assessment has been undertaken for the onshore HVDC converter/HVAC substation, provided as Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 2.1. This document acknowledges historic flooding events and sets out measures designed-in to the project in order to manage run-off and drainage. The FRA concludes that Hornsea Three meets the requirements of NPS EN-1 and the NPPF.
River Glaven Conservation Group	We have contributed comments to the earlier consultation on the potential cable route through the Upper Glaven Valley where as a Conservation Group, we have concerns about possible impacts on the river and adjacent habitats.	I	Potential impacts from Hornsea Three on hydrology receptors, including the River Glaven, have been assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 2: Hydrology and Flood Risk. Impacts to associated habitats are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation.  It is noted that the onshore cable route will cross the River Glaven (Gunthorpe Stream) using trenchless technology (e.g. HDD). An outline method statement for the proposed crossing methodologies is included in the outline CoCP which forms part of the DCO application. This method statement will be developed further (in discussion with the EA) during the detailed design stage.  The Environmental Statement concludes that impacts on surface watercourses would be, at most, minor adverse which is not significant in EIA terms.
Norfolk County Council	<b>Flood and Drainage Issues</b> 2.38 The County Council would wish to see further ground investigation work including infiltration testing together with an outline drainage design as part of the final application and request that DONG Energy continue to work closely with the County Council in its role as Lead Local Flood Authority.	I	Outline drainage strategies have been prepared and are provided in Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 2.1: Onshore Infrastructure FRAs. The proposed drainage strategies have been developed in accordance with the NPS, NPPF, PPG ID7 and the SuDS Manual, whereby sufficient attenuation storage is provided for 1 in 100 year plus climate change worst case storm event. Drainage provisions will be further developed during detailed design in agreement with the Norfolk County Council as LLFA.  During pre-application, it was not possible to undertake infiltration testing due to access permission restrictions. However this testing will be undertaken during detailed design to inform the detailed design of the Drainage Strategy.
Planning, South Norfolk Council	<b>Private Drinking Water Supplies</b> There are a number of private drinking supplies in the vicinity of the land in South Norfolk that will be impacted by this proposal. These represent the only source of drinking water for the premises they serve. The PEIR outlines measures that will be taken to address this issue which are considered acceptable but the detail will need to be agreed at the appropriate time.	I	A number of private water supplies have been identified in the Hornsea Three hydrology and flood risk study area. They are primarily from groundwater resources and are identified in Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 1.2: Abstraction Licences and Source Protection Zones.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>39</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Environment Agency	In particular, we are concerned about how WFD is to be assessed, the protection of groundwater resources, safeguarding white clawed crayfish (WCC) populations, beach processes where the cable makes landfall and, assessment of the potential for contaminated land. In addition, we have provided advisory notes in respect of flood risk assessments and flood risk activity permits.	I	<p>A WFD Groundwater Assessment has been carried out and is provided in Environmental Statement Volume 6, Annex 1.4. It contains WFD specific details, in particular it makes a clear link between the construction activities of Hornsea Three and the WFD receptors.</p> <p>According to the Groundsure records, there are no sites recorded as contaminated land under Part IIA of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 within the Hornsea Three geology and ground conditions study area.</p> <p>In respect to white-clawed crayfish populations, results of the Hornsea Three surveys are provided in Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 3.4: White Clawed Crayfish Survey. Potential impacts on white clawed crayfish are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation, which concludes no significant effects. In terms of the WFD, they are considered in volume 6, annex 2.5: Water Framework Directive Surface Water Assessment.</p> <p>Potential impacts from the construction of Hornsea Three on beach processes is assessed in Environmental Statement Volume 2, chapter 1: Marine Processes.</p> <p>Flood Risk Assessments have been carried out for the HVAC booster station, HVDC converter/HVAC substation, and where relevant, the onshore cable corridor. These are provided as Environmental Statement Volume 6, Annex 2.1, and conclude that Hornsea Three meets the requirements of NPS EN-1 and the NPPF.</p>
Environment Agency	Water Framework Directive: PEIR assessment of main and ordinary waterbodies will be based on precautionary 'Good' status in line with EA objectives (see para 2.7.8.3). This appears to assume that all the affected waterbodies will achieve 'Good' status because this is the aim and appears to conclude that the affected waterbodies do not require assessment. This is an unreasonable assumption and goes against the general ethos of the WFD, which is about constant improvement of waterbodies. We would also remind you that although the Environment Agency sets and monitors objectives, the obligations of WFD extend to all public bodies and decision makers. Whilst many of the waterbodies are considered high sensitivity, more WFD-specific detail will be required in the final WFD assessment. In particular the assessment needs to make a clear link between activities and WFD receptors, quantifying the likely impacts and assessing the risk of deterioration. Also, data used appears to be from 2012; we ask that more recent baseline is used.	I	<p>A WFD Groundwater Assessment has been carried out and is provided in Environmental Statement, Volume 6, Annex 1.4. It contains WFD specific details, in particular it makes a clear link between the construction activities of Hornsea Three and the WFD receptors. A Water Framework Directive Surfacewater Assessment has also been carried out and is provided in Environmental Statement Volume 6, Annex 2.5.</p> <p>At the time of writing, the most recent data from 2016 was used to assess as a baseline for ground water bodies and surface water bodies.</p>
Environment Agency	<b>Groundwater Resources:</b> (volume 1, chapter 3) It would be useful if the chapter contained information as to whether there are any designated geological sites or Regionally Important Geological and Geomorphological Sites in the search area.	I	Designated sites within the Hornsea Three Geology and Ground Conditions study area have been identified in Section 1.7 of Environmental Statement Volume 3, Chapter 1: Geology and Ground Conditions.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>39</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Environment Agency	<p>Source Protection Zones:As previously advised the location/boundaries for SPZs is under review and will be published shortly. The SPZs shown in Figure 1.4 Sheet 1 for Sheringham are out of date (there's now an additional borehole at Mace Hill and a new bore near Bodham), it may extend further to the west and may overlap with the proposed cable corridor – although probably not the SPZ1. We will be pleased to advise further once the new data is released. S1.7.5.23 notes that there are three chalk groundwater abstractions within or adjacent to the proposed cable corridor but there is no ongoing discussion as to how their supplies would be secured. Fig 1.4 Sheet 5 indicates that the cable corridor will run close to the groundwater levels borehole at Weston Longville. This is a key borehole in our groundwater levels network; data from this bore are used to assess whether or not cessation conditions should be imposed on numerous abstraction licences within the Wensum catchment. It is important that there is no significant disturbance to groundwater flow in this area and should be considered in any further reports.</p> <p>Table 1.3 – this should explicitly include potential changes to groundwater flow and impact on any local groundwater abstractors in terms of achieving yield/water quality (including suspended sediment).</p> <p>Table 1.13 – this should include consideration of the need to preclude any significant changes to groundwater flow and how these will be avoided together with the protection of any local groundwater abstractors in terms of groundwater flow as well as quality. We should be consulted on the methodologies for any site investigations at watercourse crossing points along with those for HDD work.</p> <p>Table 1.16. This should include consideration of changes in groundwater flow and potential impacts on any local abstractors.</p> <p>We cannot allow any deterioration in WFD status. So, for activities where a potential change in status is mooted, there needs to be in depth consideration of how this will be avoided. Consideration must be given and demonstrated how current groundwater flow directions and hydraulic connections (or lack thereof) between shallow and deep aquifers and aquifers and watercourses will be protected and preserved.</p>	I	<p>During the pre-application phase, the Environment Agency has provided details of the revised Source Protection Zone boundaries and these are shown in Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 1.2: Abstraction Licences. The potential impacts of Hornsea Three in terms of disruption of groundwater flow and the yields and quality of groundwater abstractions have been included in the assessment presented in Environmental Statement Volume 3, chapter 1: Geology and Ground Conditions. The Environment Agency will be consulted on the methodologies of the site investigations at watercourse crossing points (particularly where HDD is used) as secured through the Outline Code of Construction Practice. The purpose of these investigations will be to characterise the ground conditions and to provide information for the hydrogeological risk assessment.</p>



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>39</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Environment Agency	<p>Water Biodiversity: 3.11.1.126 states that records of WCC are known from the River Glaven, including the headwaters both upstream and downstream of the cable corridor and that it is possible that this species occurs within the onshore cable corridor search area and hence within watercourses or ditches that would be directly affected by cable installation. It is known that there are WCC present in the Hempstead watercourse, and so HDD should also be the method of crossing in this location.</p> <p>3.11.1.127 - We do not agree with the assumptions within this statement. WCC are present within the River Tud. It is likely signal crayfish are also present in the lower Tud due to the proximity of the Wensum confluence and no barriers to prevent their upstream movement into the Tud. However, it is not acceptable to assume the presence of WCC in the Tud is 'unlikely'. We know this to be incorrect. HDD is preferred where crossing the Tud and other sensitive land parcels but due consideration and mitigation should be given to groundwater effects. It is confirmed in section 3.11.1.201 that HDD is proposed for crossing the Tud and adjacent CWS.</p> <p>3.11.1.128 The report states that HDD will be employed to ensure that where WCC are present they will not be affected. The Weybourne/Spring Beck and the Hempstead Stream (Glaven headwater) contain WCC. Weybourne/Spring Beck contains WCC. They were introduced in 2016 as an 'Ark' relocation. The Hempstead Stream contains healthy populations of WCC. These waterbodies should be reconsidered for HDD due to their high sensitivity. A clear explanation as to why trenching is chosen over other crossing methods is required together with a method statement detailing the trenching methodology. It will be necessary to ensure minimal disturbance to the environment, including detailing pollution prevention measures, protected species surveys (as appropriate) and undertaking work at the correct time of year. Opportunities to enhance habitat around the trenching should be sought and detailed as part of the project. The mitigation hierarchy should be born in mind when considering movement of WCC, this should be planned to be avoided. given the sensitivity of these waterbodies, we request assurance that adequate biosecurity measures are in place when surveying for WCC to be addressed in EMP and CoCP.</p> <p>3.11.1.129 The maximum design scenario would have intermittent impacts of habitat loss and it may be necessary to relocate crayfish from watercourses up to three occasions. Exclusion of crayfish from the works area for the full duration of the maximum construction programme is not considered to be feasible or desirable as it would serve to isolate populations on either side of the cable corridor. 3.11.1.130 Translocation of crayfish, if required, would be carried out under licence from Natural England. Crayfish would need to be relocated into areas of suitable habitat up or downstream of the affected watercourses, enabling re-colonisation of the affected habitat post-restoration.</p>	Y	<p>Impacts on the water environment are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 2: Hydrology and Flood Risk.</p> <p>However, it is noted that through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including sensitive hydrological and ecological receptors. For example, all EA main rivers (including the River Tud) will be crossed using HDD to avoid direct impacts from Hornsea Three. Additional mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project to minimise indirect impacts on surface watercourses are outlined in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 2: Hydrology and Flood Risk.</p> <p>In respect to white-clawed crayfish populations, results of the Hornsea Three surveys are provided in Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 3.4: White Clawed Crayfish Survey. Potential impacts on white clawed crayfish are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation, which concludes no significant effects.</p> <p>Impacts relating to invasive species and impacts on ecological receptors is provided in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation. As noted, an outline EMP and CoCP has been produced, which contain measures which will be implemented during the construction phase to avoid or minimise the risk associated with invasive species and biosecurity.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>39</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Environment Agency	<p>Flood Risk: Flood Risk Permitting As detailed in Volume 3 Chapter 2 on hydrology and flood risk, the proposed crossings of the main rivers by both open cut and trenching methods will require a Flood Risk Activity Permit from the Environment Agency. The proposed crossings of main river by directional drilling may fall under an exemption FRA3 if they meet all of the conditions, which include being further than 200 from a SSSI, SAC and SPA, and the crossing is within 10 degrees of perpendicular to the direction of flow in the river. You can find all the requirements at: <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/environmentalpermitting-regulationsexempt-flood-risk-activities/exempt-flood-riskactivities-environmental-permits">https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/environmentalpermitting-regulationsexempt-flood-risk-activities/exempt-flood-riskactivities-environmental-permits</a></p> <p>You will need to register the exemption with the Environment Agency. If the proposed crossing does not meet all the conditions of the exemption then it will need to be applied for as a bespoke permit. The application forms can be found at: <a href="https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-riskactivities-environmental-permits#bespoke-permits">https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-riskactivities-environmental-permits#bespoke-permits</a></p> <p>We will consult Natural England if the works are near to a designated site, so the application will need to include details as to how the works will be prevented from having an adverse impact on the features of the designated sites. If the proposed crossings are using an open cut method then a bespoke permit will be required, as detailed above.</p> <p>The Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) in Appendix 2.1 states that the HVAC Booster Station and onshore HVDC converter/HVAC substation are both in Flood Zone 1, and the FRA refers solely to surface water drainage. We would not have any comments to make regarding this aspect as the Lead Local Flood Authority are responsible for assessing surface water drainage.</p>	I	<p>Environmental Statement, volume 6, annex 2.1: Onshore Infrastructure FRAs has been prepared in accordance with the NPS, NPPF, PPG ID7 and the SuDS Manual, including outline drainage strategies for the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation whereby sufficient attenuation storage is provided for 1 in 100 year plus climate change worst case storm event. The approach to the Hornsea Three FRA was discussed and agreed with Norfolk County Council (acting as LLFA for the Hornsea Three hydrology and flood risk study area) during a meeting in November 2017. As a result, the onshore cable corridor FRA focused on areas where the Hornsea Three onshore cable corridor crosses land assessed as Flood Zone 2 and 3, medium to high risk of flooding.</p> <p>Drainage provisions will be further developed during detailed design in agreement with the Norfolk County Council as LLFA. The Flood Risk Assessment which has been undertaken for the Project concludes that Hornsea Three meets the requirements of NPS EN-1 and the NPPF.</p>
River Glaven Conservation Group (RGCG) and CPRE Norfolk	<p>In our previous verbal and Phase 1B comments we stressed the importance of sediment not entering the river system. A HVAC booster station at Hempstead, thankfully now set aside, would it seems only been concerned about the sediment levels at Holt Lowes, an SAC site just downstream from an entry point. We hope that this was just as a monitoring point, as of course all sediment (and associated chemical contaminant) moves downstream over time and effects all the in-river habitat and ultimately the coastal lagoon which is also an SAC.</p> <p>Turning to protected species, the Glaven is vital for the native white-clawed crayfish, and we consider this requires a greater consideration when looking at the wider situation The battle for the long term future of its survival seems to have been lost in the Bure, Wensum and Tud. There still remains a 'clean' and healthy population from Letheringsett mill upstream to the Glaven headwaters. Translocations to other sites elsewhere, where neither the native or invasive Signal crayfish is present, have been made with 'balanced' population taken from the middle reaches of the Glaven.</p> <p>There is a considerable focus on the great crested newt, which is fortunately relatively common in North Norfolk, and can be quick to colonise a restored farmland pond. Such ponds are quick to come back to life with a wide range of species, including aquatic plants, invertebrates, dragonflies and insects, amphibians; and a local concentration of farmland birds, and other such as the swallow. There may a return of fish, most notably the native crucian carp. In addition there is the wider function of the benefit to the ecological network as discussed above, the stepping stones across a fragmented countryside.</p>	I	<p>Mitigation measures have been identified for the creation of preferential pathways to minimise the generation of silt and prevent runoff entering the watercourses. These measures are set out in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 1: Geology and Ground Conditions. volume 3, chapter 2: Hydrology and Flood Risk as well as in the Outline CoCP which forms part of the DCO application. Measures include a commitment to prepare Pollution Prevention and Emergency Response Plans.</p> <p>Impacts on protected species as well as associated habitats are included within Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>39</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
River Glaven Conservation Group (RGCG) and CPRE Norfolk	<p>SPECIFIC COMMENTS ON THE NON-TECHNICAL SUMMARY:</p> <p>The Non-Technical Summary makes a very useful overview, but also a 'way in' to reading the specialist chapters, which go in to considerable detail and length on a wide range of topics; and provide an overview of the specialist topics of particular interest. We make some comment on N-TS by referring to the numbered paragraph. We look to be brief and pick on points where we might either want to just note, support what we say above, and/or come back to later in the consultation process. We do this also with the ecology and nature conservation chapter, and the landscape chapter. We start with the NTS, and work down in order of paragraph number, and quote in full, abbreviate or paraphrase what Dong say to relate to the point we wish to make, or just note.</p> <p>3.5.1.1: The two primary transmission types are HVAC and HVDC for off-shore windfarms; the UK has traditionally used HVAC. With interconnectors between countries HVDC will become more technically and/or economically viable as such are used on a number of projects in Germany. We assume there are more problems in connecting the UK to a wider European system. We understand the need for Dong to take both systems through all planning stages, but hope by then they will be in a position to use HVDC. We also assume that as wind energy is more variable and less predictable than 'conventional' energy production, there is a greater need and opportunity for flexibility to 'chase' demand if inter-connection between countries is widespread.</p> <p>4.9.1.1: We note and welcome the statement: Hornsea Three will continue to develop and refine the project as it progresses towards a final application to Development Consent and beyond as it moves towards construction. The process will be informed by further stakeholder engagement and interpretation of the outputs from ongoing engineering, commercial and environmental investigations.</p> <p>5.1.1.1: In discussing the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Methodology dealing with the construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning of the project we have: Where significant effects are predicted, where possible it identifies mitigation to reduce the significance of these effects where that is practicable. The bold emphasis is ours, as this seems unduly negative in relation to what we say above. The technical term significant as associated with an EIA requires it must be determined in the Environmental Statement, but an issue deemed to be below this level gets less scrutiny. The word 'practicable' is capable of being interpreted in a range of ways, and can be taken as reluctance to deal with anything less than moderate/major adverse adverse significant.</p> <p>5.4.1.5: We welcome: Onshore surveys taken to date include ecological field surveys (bird, bat, badger, invertebrate and reptile), archaeological desktop and geophysical surveys, baseline noise surveys and landscape and visual assessments.</p> <p>5.4.1.6: We welcome: In addition to the surveys which have already been undertaken, a number of surveys are ongoing (such as aerial surveys of birds and marine animals, and onshore ecological surveys) or are proposed (e.g. geophysical survey of the nearshore extent of the Hornsea Three offshore cable corridor) and will inform the EIA presented in the Environmental Statement.</p> <p>5.5.1.1: We welcome: The Hornsea Three assessment uses an iterative approach. This has been employed in order to demonstrate mitigation of project-related impacts. The process of EIA has therefore been used as a means of informing the Hornsea Three design.</p>	I	<p>This response is noted.</p> <p>In respect to the comments made, through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive ecological receptors. Potential impacts which remain on ecological receptors are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation. This assessment considers the interactions between the project and ecological receptors, and is informed by the relationship between hydrogeology, hydrology and water-dependant habitats which are described in the Hydrological Characterisation Note which forms Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 2.4. This approach was discussed and agreed with the onshore ecology expert working group which comprised Natural England, the Wildlife Trust, Environment Agency and the RSPB amongst others.</p> <p>Mitigation measures have been identified to the creation of preferential pathways for groundwater flow, minimise flood risk, minimise the generation of silt and prevent runoff entering the watercourses. These measures are set out in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapters 1 and 2: Geology and Ground Condition and Hydrology and Flood Risk chapters respectively, as well as in the Outline Code of Construction Practice which forms part of the DCO application. Drainage provisions at the HVAC booster station and HVDC converter/HVAC substation will be further developed during detailed design in agreement with the Norfolk County Council as LLFA.</p> <p>The Glaven Valley Conservation Area is considered in Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 5.5: Screening Assessment - Onshore HVAC Booster Station, as well as annex 5.1: Desk Based Assessment.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>39</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>5.6.1.2: We note: The PEIR sets out all aspects on the environment likely to be significantly affected by the project (as required by the EIA Directive). Only effects in general judged to be of moderate to major significance are 'significant' in EIA terms (where this differs for specific assessments, this is explained within the appropriate PEIR chapters). Where effects are considered significant in EIA terms, this will normally trigger additional analysis, consultation and possibly further mitigation measures, where practicable. When the determining authority makes a decision for consent, it therefore does so in the knowledge of all likely significant effects on the environment. We comment: In this context we include on the latter that this should include an ecological network factor.</p> <p>7.2.1.1: We note: The geology and ground conditions study area comprises of a 1 km buffer around the onshore elements of Hornsea Three. There are three geological SSSI within the search area; Weybourne Cliffs, Weybourne Town Pit, Kelling Heath</p> <p>7.3.1.3: The hydrology and flood risk study area includes a number of catchments and associated surface watercourses. These include the rivers Yare, Tud, Wensum Bure River Glaven (Gunthorpe Stream). We comment: Gunthorpe Stream is not affected by the cabling route, but is one source of flooding and accompanied by arable run-off. Arable run-off is a major problem within the catchment, including the upper Glaven. We are concerned that this is not exacerbated by open trenching operations.</p> <p>7.3.1.6: The potential use of open cut trenching, Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD) and other site activities, may impact surface water quality due to increases in turbid (murky) run-off, spillages and leaks of fuel, oil etc and an alteration in surface in surface water pathways. With the inclusion of design measures such as the use of HDD at the Landfall the effects of these impacts have been assessed to be of minor adverse significance (not significant in EIA terms). We comment: this may be true for HDD at the Landfall, but in our view is NOT true for open cut trenching, particularly given the heterogeneity of the terrain throughout the Glaven catchment, and the long time that may elapse with excavated soil waiting to be back-filled. Turbid, mucky water contains sediment, as repeated many times a major problem in the Glaven catchment (and many others, not least the Wensum SAC).</p> <p>7.4.1.3: Twenty statutory designated sites, including SSSIs, SACs and Ramsar sites were identified within 2 km of the development, with 126 non-statutory designated sites also identified. The desk top study and site specific surveys indicated the presence of protected or otherwise notable species including bluebell, holly-leaved naiad, sandy stillball, white-clayed crayfish, whorl snail species, common lizard, great crested newt, grass snake, slow worm, breeding birds, wintering birds, migratory birds, badger, otter bats and water vole. We comment: near all are present in the upper Glaven, some in abundance, We will be adding more to this list, and also see the attached paper on the upper Glaven Ecological Network.</p> <p>7.4.1.4: There are a number of possible impacts on onshore habitats with the open cut trenching required to install the export cable. The impacts include potential habitat loss, for example in designated sites, hedgerows and sensitive water courses, as well as disturbance to notable species. The significance of the effects of these impacts is assessed to be in the range moderate to major adverse. With the actions quoted it is claimed they would mitigate the effects of impacts on potentially sensitive habitats and species. Therefore, with the proposed mitigation in place the significance of these effects would be reduced to negligible or minor adverse (not significant in EIA terms). We comment: This is a sweeping and ill-considered statement, which generalises a wide number of situations; it would if taken at face value surely see an unacceptable impact on some species, some habitats, and most certainly result in considerable damage to the ecological network that is provided by the Glaven catchment.</p>		



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>39</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>7.6.1.3: This paragraph relates to the Historic Environment and states that in the cable search area there are 13 scheduled monuments whose settings may be affected by the proposal there are 167 listed buildings, of which seven are listed at Grade I, 23 at Grade II* and 137 at Grade II. Many of these are in the North Norfolk district. There are 11 Conservation Areas, which in North Norfolk are Weybourne, Hempstead, Baconsthorpe Upper Sheringham and Glaven Valley. We comment: This is the only mention we can find of the Glaven Valley Conservation Area in the Dong documentation. It is a very large rural area, designated primarily on landscape grounds, but also the vernacular architecture and cultural associations such as the churches within it. The area is almost as large as the river catchment, and we will propose to the Council that the GVCA boundary of this could be overlain by the ecological network boundary, which essentially is the Glaven watershed boundary. This would recognise and bring together landscape and wildlife, to be incorporated in the Local Plan.</p> <p>7.11.1.2/3 and 4: This relates to the activities of the New Anglia Local Enterprise Partnership (NALEP) and other major developments that might interact with Hornsea Three. There is much activity in Greater Norwich as a Growth Area. As such the Northern Distributor Road (NDR) is to be completed next year. There is a proposal for a Norwich Western Link (NWL) road to take the NDR across the Wensum Valley to the A47 west, on which dualling will start in 2020, and a Food Hub site has been given consent for a site to the west of Easton Village, and the purpose of which is to bolster and justify the county council aspiration for a NWL road. The timescale for any NWL road would be beyond that for Hornsea Three, but the cabling route crosses the A47 and run through the middle of the Food Hub site, the Local Development Order being made within the context of the Greater Norwich Food Enterprise Zone (FEZ) in which the Hub is located.</p>		
Natural England	<p>Section 3.1 – Geology and Hydrology Without details of the pollution prevention measures in terms of run-off from the cable route activities it is not possible to comment on the assessment of the magnitude and significance of its effect.</p>	I	<p>An Outline CoCP forms part of the DCO application and contains management measures that the Undertaker and its construction contractors will be required to adopt and implement for all construction activities associated with Hornsea Three. This includes measures to minimise pollution, including a commitment to prepare Pollution Prevention and Emergency Response Plans.</p> <p>The CoCP is a 'living' document that will be updated as required post submission of the Development Consent Order (DCO) application, during the Examination Period following more detailed engagement with stakeholders and post examination by way of instruction of the Examining Authority and Secretary of State.</p>
Natural England	<p>Section 3.1 – Geology and Hydrology With regard to the impact of pollution and run off all wet receptors should be recognised as part of a wider catchment that ultimately leads to designated rivers, the sea and priority habitats. As such any pollutants, nutrients and sediment are likely to have greater spatial and temporal impacts than implied in the PEI. Their removal from catchment watercourses is also difficult so the reversibility appears to have been underestimated. Run off and any sediment it contains is likely to: - smother aquatic substrates, flora and fauna; - carry nutrients, particularly phosphates – a key water quality issue for the River Wensum; - carry pollutants such as agricultural pesticides. These issues need to be recognised and addressed, particularly when dealing with run off from exposed soils and subsoils. Water quality testing for key nutrients and pollutants should be undertaken before permitting run off to enter surface water receptors or ground supplies.</p>	I	<p>The Water Framework Directive Groundwater and Hydrology Assessments (Environmental Statement Volume 6, Annexes 1.4 and 2.5 respectively) consider the potential impacts of Hornsea Three to groundwater and watercourses on a catchment basis.</p> <p>Appropriate mitigation measures would be implemented during construction to minimise flood risk, minimise the generation of silt and prevent runoff entering the watercourses. These measures are included in the Outline Code of Construction Practice which forms part of the DCO application.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>39</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Natural England	Section 3.1 – Geology and Hydrology Natural England’s advice on hydrological assessment provided to the EIA Scoping consultation (25 November 2016) still applies. The hydrological characterisation will need to consider effects on groundwater supplies and flows in addition to all surface waters, and not just Environment Agency main rivers. All surface waters form part of interconnected wider catchments and many sites and habitats are dependent on groundwater, in particular the River Wensum and the ponds at Alderford Common.	I	Environmental Statement, volume 3, chapter 1: Geology and Ground Conditions assesses the impact of Hornsea Three on groundwater flows in terms of supporting abstractions and groundwater fed watercourses. The relationship between hydrogeology, hydrology and water-dependant habitats are described in the Hydrological Characterisation Note which forms Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 2.4.
Natural England	Section 3.1 – Geology and Hydrology The cable trenches and lines may act as preferential flow paths for ground water and effects of this needs consideration and mitigation.	I	Potential impacts of Hornsea Three in respect to creating preferential pathways have been included in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 1: Geology and Ground Conditions (paragraphs 1.11.3.1 to 1.11.3.10.) Mitigation measures have been identified to the creation of preferential pathways for groundwater flow, minimise flood risk, minimise the generation of silt and prevent runoff entering the watercourses. These measures are set out in Geology and Ground Condition chapter as well as in the Outline Code of Construction Practice which forms part of the DCO application.
Natural England	Section 3.2 Ecology and Nature Conservation Key Concerns The issues highlighted above in terms of hydrology are intrinsically linked to the impact on ecology and need to be clearly recognised as such.	I	Potential impacts from Hornsea Three on hydrology receptors have been assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 2: Hydrology and Flood Risk. Impacts to associated habitats are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation.  The relationship between hydrogeology, hydrology and water-dependant habitats are described in the Hydrological Characterisation Note which forms Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 2.4.
Swardeston Parish Council	Substation - 1 The siting of such a large structure so close to a residential area is undesirable. Is there any opportunity to challenge the decision of the National Grid to require Dong Energy to connect Hornsea Project Three to the Norwich Main substation? 2 Has Dong energy exhausted all alternatives before determining the precise site location for the substation? 3 Why is the onshore substation not being built adjacent to, and to the South of, the existing Norwich Main substation? This site has direct vehicular access off the A140 and is as removed, if not more removed, from existing residential developments as the proposed site. 4 The proposed substation is an immensely high structure. Has Dong Energy considered acquiring a portion of the Mangreen quarry site so as to be able to construct the substation at least partially below ground level? This site would have direct access off the A140 and A47 and the added benefit of almost totally screening the finished substation by a combination of building below ground and planting around the circumference. 5 Whatever the precise location of the substation site, we believe that access to the site should be directly from the A47 (or the A140-A47 slip road), at least for HGVs and “abnormal loads” and preferably for ALL traffic. The B1113 already fails to meet the needs of pedestrians and cyclists and will struggle to cope with the proposed increase in traffic. It is already gridlocked in places at certain times of day, especially at its junction with the A140. 6 The B1113 north of the A47 underpass has a recent history of flooding in heavy rain, with the majority of that flooding caused by water run-off from the field in which the proposed substation is to be sited. Is Dong energy aware of this historic issue and can users of the road be assured that sufficient drainage will be put in place in order to avoid any increased likelihood of these flooding events? 7 How does Dong Energy intend to alleviate any noise and light pollution consequent upon the construction and operation of the substation? 8 Dong Energy representatives have indicated that substantial tree planting will take place to reduce the visual impact of the substation.	I	Environmental Statement, volume 3, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives sets out the process of identifying a grid connection location.  The aim of the grid connection option appraisal was to identify the most economic and efficient design option for the connection of a project. Although both National Grid and Orsted input into the appraisal process (in respect to economic and strategic factors), the eventual grid connection offer is determined by National Grid. In May 2016, Hornsea Three was formally offered a grid connection at Norwich Main Substation as a result of this appraisal process.  Information pertaining to the site selection for the HVAC booster station and HVDC converter/HVAC substation is also provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives.  Through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive ecological receptors. For example, the orientation of the HVAC booster station has been optimised to minimise impacts on nearby field boundaries (hedgerows and trees) as well as maximise natural screening. Additional mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project are outlined in topic specific chapters, and include the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts on local road networks; the restoration of habitats (including hedgerows) which cannot be avoided; and landscape planting around the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>39</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>The proposed site already contains a number of ancient hedgerows and mature trees. Will Dong Energy be taking all necessary steps to ensure that these trees and hedges are protected, both for the sake of their existing ecology and for the immediate screening effect they will have on the finished substation? 9 Given the height of the proposed structure, we believe that 'bundling' the substation and planting along the crest will not of itself significantly reduce its visibility since most native tree varieties are relatively slow growing. Accordingly, we believe that, wherever possible, planting of semi-mature trees should commence immediately, not only around the boundaries of the site but also in other more distant areas where there is anticipated to be line of sight visibility of the substation. 10 Again, given the height of the structure, will Dong Energy be giving consideration to entering into agreements with mobile telephone network operators to enable mobile phone masts to be placed on the substation so as to improve reception in the area? 11 What assurances will Dong Energy give that Parishioners will not suffer financially from the decision to site the substation in the Parish? Clearly some Parishioners will have their homes permanently blighted such that they will become unsaleable. Many others however will find that their properties are reduced in value. For most people, their homes are an important part of their retirement planning. Any loss of value will have serious financial repercussions. How is Dong Energy planning to address this? 12 We understand that Dong Energy has previously established community funds to compensate the community as a whole for the inconvenience suffered during the construction process and whilst the substation is in operation. We have noted the sums being made available by Dong Energy through Grantscape in connection with the Race Bank and Hornsea Project One offshore windfarms. How have these sums been calculated? 13 The Race Bank and Hornsea Project One compensation schemes appear to have been established to compensate communities over a wide area on the basis, presumably, that they are all adversely affected over the long term through sight of the wind turbines. This will not be the case with the Hornsea Project Three. Since the turbines are well out of sight of land, communities along the cable laying route will only be affected during the relatively brief construction phase. Swardeston alone, with the possible inclusion of the area around the HVAC Booster Station if it is needed, will continue to be affected following the completion of the construction phase by the visual impact and polluting aspects of the continued operation of the substation. Will any community fund either be heavily weighted in favour of this locality, or a separate fund established to compensate Swardeston and its close neighbours. 14 Will Swardeston Parish Council have a leading role in determining how any community funds are distributed?</p>		<p>In respect to construction impacts, the Project will ensure that sensitive construction management measures, such as noise, dust and traffic control are implemented where required. These are documented in an outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) and outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP), which accompanies the DCO application.</p> <p>In respect to your final point, Hornsea Project Three will review the interactions of the project, as the proposal is refined and consider an appropriate way to feed benefits back into the local community. However, any decision to establish a community benefit fund for Hornsea Three would be made post financial investment decision (FID).</p>
<b>Section 42: Local Authorities (prescribed under section 43 of the Act)</b>			
Norfolk County Council	<p><b>Flood and Drainage Issues</b> 2.38 The County Council would wish to see further ground investigation work including infiltration testing together with an outline drainage design as part of the final application and request that DONG Energy continue to work closely with the County Council in its role as Lead Local Flood Authority.</p>	I	<p>Outline drainage strategies have been prepared and are provided in Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 2.1: Onshore Infrastructure FRAs. The proposed drainage strategies have been developed in accordance with the NPS, NPPF, PPG ID7 and the SuDS Manual, whereby sufficient attenuation storage is provided for 1 in 100 year plus climate change worst case storm event. Drainage provisions will be further developed during detailed design in agreement with the Norfolk County Council as LLFA.</p> <p>During pre-application, it was not possible to undertake infiltration testing due to access permission restrictions. However this testing will be undertaken during detailed design to inform the detailed design of the Drainage Strategy.</p>
Planning, South Norfolk Council	<p><b>Private Drinking Water Supplies</b> There are a number of private drinking supplies in the vicinity of the land in South Norfolk that will be impacted by this proposal. These represent the only source of drinking water for the premises they serve. The PEIR outlines measures that will be taken to address this issue which are considered acceptable but the detail will need to be agreed at the appropriate time.</p>	I	<p>A number of private water supplies have been identified in the Hornsea Three hydrology and flood risk study area. They are primarily from groundwater resources and are identified in Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 1.2: Abstraction Licences and Source Protection Zones.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>39</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 42: Persons with an interest in the land (prescribed under section 44 of the Act)</b>			
Christopher Bond, Bidwells, via Cozens-Hardy LLP (general comments)	Drainage & Irrigation Existing drainage and irrigation schemes must be taken into account at an early stage in the project	I	Noted - provision of land drainage plans is requested to feed into cable microrouting and for pre & post drainage considerations.
Jane Kenny, Savills (general comments)	Drainage – the PEIR report indicates the sensitivity of the receptor for field drains are considered to be medium whilst the magnitude of the impact minor. This is clearly incorrect and our clients would like to know what the pre and post drainage measures are together with the plans to ensure that irrigation is not affected.	I	Without the provision of drainage or irrigation plans, details of how the impact to these can be avoided or reduced cannot be provided. An independent drainage consultant will be appointed by the project in order to review and design pre & post drainage solutions in conjunction with existing drainage systems currently in place.
Simon Evans, Irelands Arnolds Keys on behalf of A & B Clarke	Land drainage The cable corridor will have a significant impact on and drainage over the entire length of the cable corridor which needs to be addressed and proposals put forward to address this. Currently there does not appear to be any consideration to the effect upon or remedies for land drainage within the PEIR. Many fields have significant land drains, some old clay land drains, others more modern systems but it is vital that drainage is given considerable thought especially with such a wide cable corridor. Drainage may also be required from the junction bays/link boxes. My client would require both pre and post construction drains to be installed. All proposals to be prepared by a local drainage consultant for the approval of my client. Specifically, at Crabgate Farm there are large 9" drainage pipes crossing the proposed route taking water from the farmyards and upland which needs to form part of any design proposals and drainage solutions.	I	An independent land drainage consultant will be appointed in order to consider and design pre and post drainage solutions, where required.



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>39</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co on behalf of Kelling Estate	<p>Terrain &amp; Soil</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The northern end of the route passes through the same field as where the DOW cables were installed. Putting another set of cables through the field will cause more disturbance to the soil structure and it will be on such a scale as to potentially render a highly productive field compromised for long term agricultural use.</li> <li>• The route from the coast road through to Holgate Hill sees a contour change from 15m ASL to 60m ASL – this is a 45m change in terrain over a 1,400m run.</li> <li>• The soils over this route are sandy with low bonding coefficient, thus creating a very high risk of soil runoff/wash.</li> <li>• Stripping a corridor of potentially more than 80m in width of its topsoil will create a large area of highly unstable and vulnerable surface that will be prone to surface runoff and wash.</li> <li>• In the event of soil runoff the likely course will be along the route and down the west face of the Cromer Ridge.</li> <li>• If water flows along the route it will erode at an accelerated rate due to the lack of any vegetative cover.</li> <li>• Incidences of runoff down the west face of the ridge will be far higher due to the lack of natural structure and vegetation to aid infiltration over the route.</li> <li>• Soil washing down to the west face will follow a course that leads directly into the domestic properties in the village that line The Street.</li> <li>• Soil wash may also drain to stream that runs parallel to The Street, which in turn will lead to diffuse soil pollution in the local surface water network.</li> <li>• Soil wash may also drain to the ponds to the west of the corridor and east of Kelling Hall. These ponds have high historic, amenity and ecological value and inundation with soil wash could have significant negative impacts on these factors.</li> </ul> <p>The following questions arise:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. How DONG will address/manage soil damage?</li> <li>2. How DONG will protect soils, waterways and property from erosion and runoff?</li> <li>3. Why this route is less damaging to the environment than the principle route?</li> </ol>	Y	<p>The existing Dudgeon (DOW) electricity cable route is proposed to be crossed via HDD, and therefore has no direct impact on the same land.</p> <p>Regarding the specific questions proposed by Kelling Estate:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 &amp; 2. Concern for disruption due to topography is noted. This will be managed by the construction contractor, once appointed, with appropriate mitigation measures being implemented as required. The cables are proposed to be installed under the woodland via HDD.</li> <li>3. This route was not proposed or adopted solely due to environmental constraints, but due to technical concerns and issues with the initially proposed route.</li> </ol>
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co (generic comments)	<p>Generic comments 4:</p> <p>The proposed working methodology is to strip a corridor and install circuits before reinstatement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o What methods will be used to ensure the subsoil is not damaged during installation?</li> <li>o Will also soils be tested prior to works starting?</li> <li>o What methods will be deployed in the event of inundation with rainwater?</li> <li>o Will there be appropriate means to deal with large volumes of surface water ponding?</li> <li>o Will there be appropriate means to manage large volumes of water borne soil runoff?</li> <li>o What provisions will be made to source additional topsoil that is a close match to the destination land?</li> </ul>	I	<p>Soil protection measures will be part of the project's Code of Construction Practice. Soils are not proposed to be tested prior to work commencing.</p> <p>An agricultural Liaison Officer will be appointed during construction to oversee the works and resolve any issues, regarding working on land following extreme weather conditions for example.</p> <p>The construction corridor will likely have to be de-watered in some locations, the terms of the agreement we will look to allow for this within the landowners estate, where appropriate, into adjacent drains and watercourses.</p> <p>Any additional top soil required for reinstatement will be sourced in liaison with the landowner.</p>
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co (generic comments)	<p>Generic comments 5:</p> <p>Biosecurity during works period is very important for farmers with clean farms and those who have high value crop contracts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o How will biosecurity be managed during the works process?</li> <li>o How will biosecurity be managed if the event of soil import</li> <li>o Will full pre-works surveys be carried out to establish disease status of land?</li> </ul>	I	<p>Construction on land subject to bio-security measures will follow procedures set out in the project's Code of Construction Practice, although once the construction corridor has been installed, this would be a separate work area and measures would be reduced, if appropriate.</p> <p>Any additional topsoil required to be imported following completion of construction will be done so in liaison with the landowner and be of the appropriate type and condition.</p> <p>Surveys to assess potential disease of land will not be undertaken prior to construction, this is the landowners obligation.</p>
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co (generic comments)	<p>Generic comments 7:</p> <p>Installation of cables will potentially disrupt in field drainage schemes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Please confirm that full pre-scheme drainage investigations will take place?</li> <li>o Landowners will in many cases wish to use their 'normal' drainage contractor to advise on and carry out remedial works. Please confirm that this will be acceptable?</li> </ul>	I	<p>An independent drainage consultant will be appointed to assess pre and post drainage solutions. It is possible then that local drainage contractors will be appointed in order to undertake the relevant works.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>39</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co on behalf of Kelling Estate	<p>Topography</p> <p>As can be seen from the topographic map shown (Left), the proposed pipeline is set to cut through terrain which steeply rises from 20m above sea level to 55m above sea level within 250m. Removing this amount of soil will not only totally change the landscape itself, but also significantly increase the potential for sediment mobilisation. This will impact the lower lying residents of Kelling as well as localised watercourses and features through increased risk of flooding and pollution.</p> <p>The image below gives an indication of the steep topography in parcel 5339. Taken 10th September 2017.</p> <p>SEE FIGURE IN KELLING ENVIRONMENTAL REPORT</p>	Y	The sections of woodland where there is a larger change in topography will be crossed via HDD.
Tom Corfield (on behalf of Lady M A Prince-Smith Morton Hall Estate)	<p>v) Land drainage</p> <p>The cable corridor will have a significant impact on and drainage over the entire length of the cable corridor which needs to be addressed and proposals put forward to address this. Currently there does not appear to be any consideration to the effect upon or remedies for land drainage within the PEIR. Many fields will have land drains, some old clay land drains, others more modern systems but it is vital that drainage is given considerable thought especially with such a wide cable corridor. Drainage may also be required from the junction bays/link boxes. My client would require both pre and post construction drains to be installed. All proposals to be prepared by a local drainage consultant for the approval of my client. Specifically, at Morton Hall Estate there is a large soakaway taking water from Marl Hill which needs to form part of any design proposals and drainage solutions.</p>	I	Any land drainage plans will be requested, in addition to details of the soakaway mentioned at Marl Hill. An independent land drainage consultant will be appointed in order to consider and design pre and post drainage solutions where required.
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co (generic comments)	<p>Generic comments 7:</p> <p>Installation of cables will potentially disrupt in field drainage schemes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Please confirm that full pre-scheme drainage investigations will take place?</li> <li>o Landowners will in many cases wish to use their 'normal' drainage contractor to advise on and carry out remedial works. Please confirm that this will be acceptable?</li> </ul>	I	An independent drainage consultant will be appointed to assess pre and post drainage solutions. It is possible then that local drainage contractors will be appointed in order to undertake the relevant works.
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co (generic comments)	<p>Generic comments 4:</p> <p>The proposed working methodology is to strip a corridor and install circuits before reinstatement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o What methods will be used to ensure the subsoil is not damaged during installation?</li> <li>o Will also soils be tested prior to works starting?</li> <li>o What methods will be deployed in the event of inundation with rainwater?</li> <li>o Will there be appropriate means to deal with large volumes of surface water ponding?</li> <li>o Will there be appropriate means to manage large volumes of water borne soil runoff?</li> <li>o What provisions will be made to source additional topsoil that is a close match to the destination land?</li> </ul>	I	<p>Soil protection measures will be part of the project's Code of Construction Practice. Soils will not be tested prior to work commencing.</p> <p>An agricultural Liaison Officer will be appointed during construction to oversee the works and resolve any issues, regarding working on land following extreme weather conditions, for example.</p> <p>The construction corridor will likely have to be de-watered in some locations and the terms of the option agreement will look to allow for this within the landowners estate, and, where appropriate, into adjacent drains and watercourses.</p> <p>Any additional top soil required for reinstatement will be sourced in liaison with the landowner.</p>
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co (generic comments)	<p>Generic comments 5:</p> <p>Biosecurity during works period is very important for farmers with clean farms and those who have high value crop contracts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o How will biosecurity be managed during the works process?</li> <li>o How will biosecurity be managed if the event of soil import</li> <li>o Will full pre-works surveys be carried out to establish disease status of land?</li> </ul>	I	<p>Construction on land subject to bio-security measures will follow procedures set out in the project's Code of Construction Practice, although once the construction corridor has been installed, this would be a separate work area and measures would be reduced, if appropriate.</p> <p>Any additional topsoil that needs to be imported following completion of construction will be done so in liaison with the landowner and be of the appropriate type and condition.</p> <p>Surveys to assess potential disease of land will not be undertaken prior to construction, this is the landowners obligation.</p>
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co (generic comments)	<p>Generic comments 7:</p> <p>Installation of cables will potentially disrupt in field drainage schemes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Please confirm that full pre-scheme drainage investigations will take place?</li> <li>o Landowners will in many cases wish to use their 'normal' drainage contractor to advise on and carry out remedial works. Please confirm that this will be acceptable?</li> </ul>	I	An independent drainage consultant will be appointed to assess pre and post drainage solutions. It is possible then that local drainage contractors will be appointed in order to undertake the relevant works.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>39</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co (generic comments)	<p>Generic comments 4:</p> <p>The proposed working methodology is to strip a corridor and install circuits before reinstatement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o What methods will be used to ensure the subsoil is not damaged during installation?</li> <li>o Will also soils be tested prior to works starting?</li> <li>o What methods will be deployed in the event of inundation with rainwater?</li> <li>o Will there be appropriate means to deal with large volumes of surface water ponding?</li> <li>o Will there be appropriate means to manage large volumes of water borne soil runoff?</li> <li>o What provisions will be made to source additional topsoil that is a close match to the destination land?</li> </ul>	I	<p>Soil protection measures will be part of the project's Code of Construction Practice. Soils will not be tested prior to work commencing.</p> <p>An agricultural Liaison Officer will be appointed during construction to oversee the works and resolve any issues, regarding working on land following extreme weather conditions for example.</p> <p>The construction corridor will likely have to be de-watered in some locations, the terms of the option agreement will seek to allow for this within the landowner's estate, and, where appropriate, into adjacent drains and watercourses.</p> <p>Any additional top soil required for reinstatement will be sourced in liaison with the landowner.</p>
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co (generic comments)	<p>Generic comments 5:</p> <p>Biosecurity during works period is very important for farmers with clean farms and those who have high value crop contracts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o How will biosecurity be managed during the works process?</li> <li>o How will biosecurity be managed if the event of soil import</li> <li>o Will full pre-works surveys be carried out to establish disease status of land?</li> </ul>	I	<p>Construction on land subject to bio-security measures will follow procedures set out in the project's Code of Construction Practice, although once the construction corridor has been installed, this would be a separate work area and measures would be reduced, if appropriate.</p> <p>Any additional topsoil that needs to be imported following completion of construction will be done so in liaison with the landowner and be of the appropriate type and condition.</p> <p>Surveys to assess potential disease of land will not be undertaken prior to construction, this is the landowners obligation.</p>
Jonathan Rush, Brown and Co, on behalf of Easton Estate/Honingham Aketieselskab	<p>Farming : The farm land is used to grow a full arable rotation including cereals, legumes, oilseeds and high value root crops, such as parsnips, potatoes and carrots. Disturbance to soil structure will compromise productive capacity and versatility of cropping.</p> <p>a. It is important that DONG carry out full soil surveys prior to entry to enable proper restoration to take place. Such tests should assess (as a minimum):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Mineral and Nutrient content</li> <li>ii. Soil composition</li> <li>iii. Pathogen content</li> </ol> <p>b. Construction works can result in topsoil 'loss' due to compaction and wash. DONG will need to identify potential donor sites for soils of matching quality in advance of carrying out works.</p> <p>c. Disruption to cropping will result in losses in the works year and subsequent years. DONG will be required to compensate for all losses, both direct and indirect, arising from the works.</p> <p>d. Arable land is drained in places with plastic pipe and shingle underdrains. DONG will need to carry out a full pre-works schedule of drainage installations and undertake to repair and alter the schemes as required.</p> <p>e. Irrigation is supplied to the farm via a mains system that is fed from a reservoir located to the West of the proposed corridor. DONG will be required to protect the main from damage and where require provide, or cover the cost of, diverting the main to ensure cropping is not interrupted. Any losses arising from inability to effectively utilise irrigation to be compensated for by DONG.</p>	I	<p>Hornsea Three responded the Easton Estate's comments as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Soil surveys will not be undertaken prior to construction.</li> <li>b. Any additional topsoil that must be imported following completion of construction will be done so in liaison with the landowner and be of the appropriate type and condition.</li> <li>c. Compensation will be payable for direct loss of crop or inability to crop and subsequent losses on a proven losses basis and on receipt of a claim.</li> <li>d. An independent land drainage consultant will be appointed in order to consider and design pre and post drainage solutions where required. Copies of any available land drainage plans were requested.</li> <li>e. Routes or plans of irrigation systems in place were requested in order for this to be considered accordingly. Compensation will be payable for any losses or disruption on proven loss basis and on receipt of a claim.</li> </ol>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>39</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Jonathan Rush, Brown and Co, on behalf of Easton Estate/Honingham Aketieselskab	<p>Ecology: The Estate has invested in conversation schemes, tree planting programs and carefully managed grazing of the lowland meadows to enhance the environmental value of the property.</p> <p>a. The proposed cable route will pass through a block of ancient semi natural woodland. This woodland should be avoided and measures taken to protect the habitat and wildlife living there</p> <p>b. The cable route passes through a block of plantation wood used to buffer the lowland river meadows and river from potential water born soil runoff. It is suggested that this woodland be drilled under to avoid habitat destruction and to reduce risk of runoff.</p> <p>c. The cable route runs north south with a terrain change from 50m ASL at Weston Road to 32m ASL at the A47. Within that run is a drop to the River Tud where the contour low is circa 15m ASL. This shows a drop of 35m over a 950m run. The greatest drop is from the 30m contour line to the River Tud at 15m over just 200m. This presents significant challenges in terms of managing topsoil bund stability, subsoil stability on the stripped corridor and water borne soil runoff. Due to the high risk of significant soil damage and diffuse pollution it is suggested that the section of cable from the 25m contour line to the south of the River Tud meadows should be drilled, not open cut.</p>	Y	<p>Hornsea Three confirmed that the proposed method of installation under the areas of woodland is via HDD.</p> <p>The landowner's concerns regarding topography are noted. This will be managed by the construction contractor, once appointed, with appropriate mitigation measures being implemented as required. As shown on the updated proposals, the cables are will be installed in the section, under both the woodland, river and adjacent fields, via HDD.</p>
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co (generic comments)	<p>Generic comments 4:</p> <p>The proposed working methodology is to strip a corridor and install circuits before reinstatement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o What methods will be used to ensure the subsoil is not damaged during installation?</li> <li>o Will also soils be tested prior to works starting?</li> <li>o What methods will be deployed in the event of inundation with rainwater?</li> <li>o Will there be appropriate means to deal with large volumes of surface water ponding?</li> <li>o Will there be appropriate means to manage large volumes of water borne soil runoff?</li> <li>o What provisions will be made to source additional topsoil that is a close match to the destination land?</li> </ul>	I	<p>Soil protection measures will be part of the project's Code of Construction Practice. Soils will not be tested prior to work commencing.</p> <p>An agricultural Liaison Officer will be appointed during construction to oversee the works and resolve any issues - such as working on land following extreme weather conditions, for example.</p> <p>The construction corridor will likely have to be de-watered in some locations, the terms of the option agreement will seek to allow for this within the landowners estate, and, where appropriate, into adjacent drains and watercourses.</p> <p>Any additional top soil required for reinstatement will be sourced in liaison with the landowner.</p>
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co (generic comments)	<p>Generic comments 5:</p> <p>Biosecurity during works period is very important for farmers with clean farms and those who have high value crop contracts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o How will biosecurity be managed during the works process?</li> <li>o How will biosecurity be managed if the event of soil import</li> <li>o Will full pre-works surveys be carried out to establish disease status of land?</li> </ul>	I	<p>Construction on land subject to bio-security measures will follow procedures set out in the project's Code of Construction Practice, although once the construction corridor has been installed, this would be a separate work area and measures would be reduced, if appropriate.</p> <p>Any additional topsoil that needs to be imported following completion of construction will be done so in liaison with the landowner and be of the appropriate type and condition.</p> <p>Surveys to assess potential disease of land will not be undertaken prior to construction, this is the landowners obligation.</p>
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co (generic comments)	<p>Generic comments 7:</p> <p>Installation of cables will potentially disrupt in field drainage schemes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Please confirm that full pre-scheme drainage investigations will take place?</li> <li>o Landowners will in many cases wish to use their 'normal' drainage contractor to advise on and carry out remedial works. Please confirm that this will be acceptable?</li> </ul>	I	<p>An independent drainage consultant will be appointed to assess pre and post drainage solutions. It is possible then that local drainage contractors will be appointed in order to undertake the relevant works.</p>
Sandra Gentle	<p><b>80m Refinement</b> - My water is currently extracted via a borehole near to the boundary of the proposed pipeline route. What assurance can you give me that this will not be affected and if it is what will you do to put it right?</p>	I	<p>BGS geological logs have been obtained for the Hornsea Three geology and ground conditions study area as defined in Environmental Statement Volume 3, chapter 1: Geology and Ground Conditions. The location of boreholes and a summary of the borehole logs and are included in Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 1.1: Borehole Logs. Across the Hornsea Three project, measures have been identified to prevent and control potential pollution incidents, see Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 1: Geology and Ground Conditions (Table 1.15). This includes, for example, the establishment of buffers around boreholes where potentially harmful chemicals cannot be stored.</p>



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>39</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
William Barr	<b>80m Refinement</b> - See picture 2* (attached with form) For location of our property - In particular we would like to highlight: 1. Borehole discharging treated sewage into field behind property. 2. Tree preservation order on oak tree by property	I	Information on boreholes are provided in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 1: Geology and Ground Conditions, as well as Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 1.1: Borehole Logs.  Tree protection orders are identified in the relevant plan which accompanies the DCO application. Impacts on trees from an ecological perspective are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation.
<b>Section 47: Duty to consult local community</b>			
Ann Abbott	13. I am in favour of the course running west of the village at Kelling Hard providing it skirts residents homes, the museum, and Kelling Hotel, as it will not impede the Beck stream in Weybourne village which is a rare chalk stream (b) the village should not be disrupted so much (c) it should not affect the tourists coming to the beach or walkers along the coastal path, visitors to the Museum, Hotels B and Bs - although I don't know about the fishermen.	Y	Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport confirms that traffic does not need to travel through Kelling. Construction traffic associated with the proposed works will travel along A149 through to Weybourne and utilise the haul road constructed as part of the cable installation works which will extend between A149 and Holgate Hill (and ensure that construction vehicle associated with the project can travel off the public highway network).  Impacts relating to hydrology, recreational users and tourism are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapters 2: Hydrology and Flood risk; chapter 6: Land Use and Recreation and chapter 10: socio-economics respectively.
Rt Hon Norman Lamb MP	Further, given that the area affected is prone to flooding, DONG must demonstrate that the plans they are developing will not only manage the risk of flooding during construction but that they will reduce the future risk of flooding once the wind farm is fully operation and for the expected duration of its life.	I	Outline drainage strategies have been prepared and are provided in Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 2.1: Onshore Infrastructure FRAs. The proposed drainage strategies have been developed in accordance with the NPS, NPPF, PPG ID7 and the SuDS Manual, whereby sufficient attenuation storage is provided for 1 in 100 year plus climate change worst case storm event. Drainage provisions will be further developed during detailed design in agreement with the Norfolk County Council as LLFA.  The Flood Risk Assessment which has been undertaken for the Project concludes that Hornsea Three meets the requirements of NPS EN-1 and the NPPF.
Martin Davies	<b>Mitigation Methods</b> - Drainage on the B1113 is very poor and is a safety risk. The new station should not worsen this risk, also access must be via A47 or A140 - Not the B1113.	I	Appropriate mitigation measures have been design-in to Hornsea Three to minimise impacts on drainage and flooding (particularly in relation to runoff). Details are provided in volume 3, chapter 2: Hydrology and Flood Risk (see Table 2.17) as well as the outline CoCP which forms part of the DCO application.  Furthermore, the design has sought to minimise run-off through maximising the area of permeable hardstanding and preparing an outline drainage strategy for the HVDC converter/HVAC substation. This outline strategy is provided in Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 2.1: Onshore Infrastructure FRAs and has been developed in accordance with the NPS, NPPF, PPG ID7 and the SuDS Manual, whereby sufficient attenuation storage is provided for 1 in 100 year plus climate change worst case storm event. Drainage provisions will be further developed during detailed design in agreement with the Norfolk County Council as LLFA. The Flood Risk Assessment which has been undertaken for the Project concludes that Hornsea Three meets the requirements of NPS EN-1 and the NPPF.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>39</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Z.P Kaznowski	<b>Cable Corridor</b> - I am on a borehole and this is my one supply. Contamination is a high concern. The road has limited access. I am concerned about blockage. I also have a small child and am very concerned for noise/safety during trench cutting and vicinity of the cable to the house. Access to my property is officially only one end of [REDACTED] Lane. Ordinance survey maps have the [REDACTED] Road end as not public access. I will need continued access to my property during construction	I	An assessment of potential ground contamination is provided in Environmental Statement, volume 3, chapter 1: Geology and Ground conditions, and a more detailed preliminary risk assessment would be undertaken at localised points during the detailed design stage. Measures to avoid contamination in the wider environment are set out in the Outline CoCP which forms part of the DCO application.  All private accesses will be maintained during the construction of Hornsea Three. Hornsea Three has identified a number of measures to minimise and manage the potential impacts from noise during construction these are set out in Environmental Statement volume 3, Chapter 8 Noise and Vibration and the outline CoCP which forms part of the DCO applications. Pedestrian safety has been assessed within Environmental Statement volume 3, Chapter 7 Traffic and Transport, with specific measures outlined in the outline CTMP to ensure safe co-existence of pedestrians and the working area.
Z.P Kaznowski	<b>80m Refinement</b> - Obviously due to my concerns above I would appreciate the cable route to be as close as can be to the field boundaries, especially in view of my water supply.	I	In refining the onshore cable corridor, Hornsea Three has sought to locate the corridor as close to field boundaries as possible. Other factors which have fed into the refinement of the onshore cable corridor are set out in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives.
Francis Farron	<b>Cable Corridor</b> - There are a number of ecologically sensitive areas near the corridor and although they are avoided many will be connected by water courses and could be impacted if these water courses are polluted or silt inundated. All water courses, however small, need great care	I	It is noted that the onshore cable route has sought to avoid direct impacts on ecologically sensitive locations through route refinement, or the use of trenchless technologies e.g. HDD. However, where this was not possible, or where indirect impact were predicted, potential impacts from Hornsea Three on ecological receptors have been assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation. In respect to impacts on hydrological sensitivities, Hornsea Three will cross a majority of surface watercourses HDD. An outline method statement for the proposed crossing methodologies is included in the outline CoCP which forms part of the DCO application. This method statement will be developed further (in discussion with the EA) during the detailed design stage. The Environmental Statement concludes that impacts on surface watercourses would be, at most, minor adverse which is not significant in EIA terms.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>39</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Mark Cook	<p><b>HVAC</b> - The booster station will have a huge impact in the villages of Edgefield and Little Barningham especially. We live in a very rural environment with little or narrow roads. It will be hit on the landscape and lead to an industrialisation of our countryside. What plans have been made to cope with run off of rain water? I assume alot of concrete will have to be built and also the surface area of the buildings will be large. Light pollution is another problem I foresee. And the screening of it - trees will take years to cover a building of this size.</p>	I	<p>Appropriate mitigation measures have been designed-in to Hornsea Three to minimise impacts on drainage and flooding (particularly in relation to runoff). Details are provided in volume 3, chapter 2: Hydrology and Flood Risk (see Table 2.17) as well as the outline CoCP which forms part of the DCO application.</p> <p>Furthermore, the design has sought to minimise run-off through maximising the area of permeable hardstanding and preparing an outline drainage strategy for the HVDC converter/HVAC substation. This outline strategy is provided in Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 2.1: Onshore Infrastructure FRAs and has been developed in accordance with the NPS, NPPF, PPG ID7 and the SuDS Manual, whereby sufficient attenuation storage is provided for 1 in 100 year plus climate change worst case storm event. Drainage provisions will be further developed during detailed design in agreement with the Norfolk County Council as LLFA. The Flood Risk Assessment which has been undertaken for the Project concludes that Hornsea Three meets the requirements of NPS EN-1 and the NPPF.</p> <p>In respect to lighting, site lighting at the HVDC converter/HVAC substation will only operate when required and will be directional to avoid unnecessary illumination.</p> <p>Landscape planting is proposed around the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation to minimise impacts, though it is noted there would be a period of time during which the planting would need to mature. This is reflected in the assessment presented in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources which assesses both a year 1 and year 15 scenario. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>39</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Sue Lowther	<p><b>Substation</b> - Does this affect our water supply? There are ancient hedges around here (at least 400 years old) that must be preserved, plus ancient trees. It will affect the view from this house. Can the substation be sunk into the ground? The consultation said there would be considerable noise levels from substation - this is not acceptable. The consultation also said the visual impact would be considerable. It should therefore be situated as far away from residents as is possible. Therefore locate next to the national grid station.</p>	I	<p>Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives sets out the process undertaken during the pre-application phase of Hornsea Three to identify the location of the HVDC converter/HVAC substation. The proposed site for the HVDC converter / HVAC substation, just south of the A47, has been identified following extensive environmental surveys, technical and feasibility studies and ongoing consultation. Due to the size of the land area required for the onshore substation, there are very limited options available and the location indicated in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Project Description was determined to be the most suitable following our site selection process.</p> <p>Impacts from Hornsea Three on ecological features, including hedgerows and trees has been avoided where possible through commitments to use trenchless technologies such as Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD). We recognise that protection and sensitive restoration of hedgerows is important to minimise any negative impact on biodiversity or landscape resulting from loss or reduction in hedgerows and in the few instances where sections of the hedgerow needs to be temporarily removed, it will of course be handled sensitively. The replacement of hedgerows at the end of the construction phase to be undertaken will ensure there is no net loss of hedgerow habitat as a result of Hornsea Project Three. Furthermore, restoration of hedgerows, currently in poor condition, provides an opportunity to achieve long term benefits for the biodiversity associated with this habitat type. The impacts of Hornsea Three on hedgerows and trees is presented in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation.</p> <p>Consideration was given to a wide range of potential mitigation in respect to landscape and visual effects of Hornsea Three. The lowering of the HVDC converter/HVAC substation below current ground level was one option which was considered; however, given that multiple underground cables need to connect into this infrastructure, this option would have had significant implications for the depth of cable trenches and thus earthworks needed along a length of the onshore cable corridor. Based on this, Hornsea Three has implemented a range of other mitigation measures which are set out in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Effects. For example, it is recognised that the onshore HVAC booster station and onshore HVDC converter/HVAC substation would not be screened entirely by existing landform or vegetation in some views. As such, an indicative landscape strategy has been developed to assist in mitigating visual and landscape impacts. This is presented in the outline Landscape Management Plan which accompanies the DCO application.</p> <p>In respect to noise, the noise generated by the HVDC converter/HVAC substation is considered within Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 8: Noise and Vibration. Furthermore, an operational noise management plan will be prepared and agreed with the local environmental health officer.</p>



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>39</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Sue Lowther	<p><b>PEIR</b> - Water access to our homes is restricted. Considerable noise effect. Safety of underground cables. Possible effect on surrounding properties of 'dirty electricity'. Wildlife has already been affected by the A47 - you will find no birds the closer you get to the A47. The substation will further affect wildlife. I regularly walk my dog around fields between the properties and the A47, and regularly see deer around. Their habitat will be further reduced.</p>	I	<p>Through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive ecological receptors. For example, Weybourne Cliffs and Kelling Heath SSSI have been avoided and no direct impacts are predicted on these designated sites from Hornsea Three; furthermore landscape planting is proposed at the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation to provide additional screening. Additional mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project are outlined in topic specific chapters, and include the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts on local road networks, ecological receptors (e.g. hedgerows) and hydrological features (e.g. main rivers).</p> <p>Where impacts remain, these are assessed in the relevant topic chapter of the Environmental Statement, volume 3.</p>
Julia Peters	<p><b>Proposal</b> - Very concerned over the potential time span of the project once work commences. Altering the ECR to avoid the very fragile environments of Weybourne Beach wetland and Kelling Heath would be ideal, mostly for the wildlife and also tourism. Destruction of local hedges and ponds should be avoided by shifting the line of the ECR by 100m as required. The ECR at Pine Farm and setting is contrary to your own policy documents. Construction needs to be mindful of silt and unintentional pollution of the River Glaven headwaters. Mitigation should consider both repairing the damage and also improving the landscape features on the proposed route.</p>	Y	<p>Through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive ecological receptors. For example, Weybourne Cliffs and Kelling Heath SSSI have been avoided and no direct impacts are predicted on these designated sites from Hornsea Three. Additional mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project are outlined in topic specific chapters, and include the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts on local road networks, ecological receptors (e.g. hedgerows) and hydrological features (e.g. main rivers).</p> <p>Measures to minimise the generation of silt and prevent runoff entering the watercourses are set out in the Outline Code of Construction Practice which forms part of the DCO application, and includes a commitment to prepare Pollution Prevention and Emergency Response Plans.</p> <p>Prior to construction commencing a Schedule of Condition of the land will be taken and we have an obligation to return the land in the same state. In this regard, any hedgerows which cannot be avoided will be replaced at the end of the construction phase. Furthermore, restoration of hedgerows, currently in poor condition, provides an opportunity to achieve long term benefits for the biodiversity associated with this habitat type as well as gap up hedgerows providing landscape and visual mitigation. Further details on hedgerow removal, retention and replacement can be found in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation, the Outline Ecological Management Plan and the Outline Landscape Management Plan.</p>
Graham & Susan Mette	<p><b>Temporary Construction Compounds</b> - Very concerned about Beach Lane car park being used as a compound. Both the visual impact to us at The Rocket House for the period of up to 11 years! And the potential for the shingle bank being affected by the works and increasing the flood risk to our home.</p>	Y	<p>Following design refinement, the area identified for landfall works has reduced and the beach lane car park is not under consideration as a construction compound.</p> <p>Furthermore it is noted that Hornsea Three has sought to minimise the duration of any disruption close to the landfall, reducing the total duration of the construction phase onshore to eight years. Within this, the maximum duration for construction of the onshore cable corridor is approximately 2.5 years, this therefore means that the maximum duration over which construction of the onshore cable corridor could occur would be 5.5 years incorporating two phases (assuming a three-year gap between the two phases).</p> <p>In respect to flood risk, Hornsea Three has assessed potential impacts on flood risk within a flood risk assessment provided in Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 2.1: Onshore Infrastructure FRAs. Taking into consideration the measures designed into Hornsea Three to minimise impacts on drainage and flood risk, the FRA concludes that Hornsea Three meets the requirements of NPS EN-1 and the NPPF. Details of these measures are provided in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 2: Hydrology and Flood Risk (see Table 2.17) as well as the outline CoCP which forms part of the DCO application.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>39</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Graham & Susan Mette	<p><b>Support</b> - However Weybourne village will be seriously affected. Walkers, holiday makers, retired residents will all have to live with the long period of works, noise, traffic, etc etc. The village needs to be compensated, and residents immediately affected need to be compensated, and businesses need to be compensated. In particular the important crab/lobster industry. Personally, I need some assurances about protection from flood and maybe a combination of installing flood protection would be helpful.</p>	I	<p>Potential impacts from Hornsea Three on socio-economic and recreational receptors are identified and assessed in Environmental Statement Volume 3, Chapter 10: Socio-Economics and chapter 6: Land Use and Recreation respectively. Hornsea Project Three will review the interactions of the project, as the proposal is refined and consider an appropriate way to feed benefits back into the local community. However, any decision to establish a community benefit fund for Hornsea Three would be made post financial investment decision (FID).</p> <p>In respect to flooding, appropriate mitigation measures have been designed-in to Hornsea Three to minimise impacts on drainage and flooding. Details are provided in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 2: Hydrology and Flood Risk (see Table 2.17). The Flood Risk Assessment which has been undertaken for the Project concludes that Hornsea Three meets the requirements of NPS EN-1 and the NPPF.</p>
Graham & Susan Mette	<p><b>PEIR - Not Comprehensive</b> - Does not acknowledge the flood risk at Beach Lane</p>	I	<p>Appropriate mitigation measures have been design-in to Hornsea Three to minimise impacts on drainage and flooding. Details are provided in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 2: Hydrology and Flood Risk (see Table 2.17) as well as the outline CoCP which forms part of the DCO application.</p> <p>A flood risk assessment is provided in Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 2.1: Onshore Infrastructure FRAs and identified historic flooding events relevant to Hornsea Three. This has been developed in accordance with the NPS, NPPF, PPG ID7 and the SuDS Manual. The Flood Risk Assessment which has been undertaken for the Project concludes that Hornsea Three meets the requirements of NPS EN-1 and the NPPF.</p>
Graham & Susan Mette	<p>I am not averse to windfarms or renewable sources of energy. In fact, I believe out at sea is possibly a good location. However, the likelihood of up to 11 years disruption, visual impact and possible disturbance to the shingle bank which could further affect my property from flood damage is a major personal concern</p>	Y	<p>During the design refinement Hornsea Three has sought to minimise the duration of any disruption, and has reduced the total duration of the construction phase onshore to eight years. Within this, the maximum duration for construction of the onshore cable corridor is approximately 2.5 years, this therefore means that the maximum duration over which construction could occur would be 5.5 years incorporating two phases (assuming a three-year gap between the two phases). The work associated with each phase is expected to progress along the Hornsea Three onshore cable corridor with a typical active construction works duration of three months at any particular location.</p> <p>Appropriate mitigation measures for visual disturbance are outlined in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources. This includes, for example, the restoration of habitats (including hedgerows) which cannot be avoided at the end of the construction phase.</p> <p>Hornsea Three has assessed potential impacts on flood risk within a flood risk assessment provided in Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 2.1: Onshore Infrastructure FRAs. Taking into consideration the measures designed into Hornsea Three to minimise impacts on drainage and flood risk, the FRA concludes that Hornsea Three meets the requirements of NPS EN-1 and the NPPF. Details of these measures are provided in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 2: Hydrology and Flood Risk (see Table 2.17) as well as the outline CoCP which forms part of the DCO application.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>39</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 48: Duty to publicise</b>			
Douglas Walters (Norfolk Geographical Association)	<b>Local Matters Landfall zone</b> - Just that it doesn't interfere with recreational use - like the Norfolk Coastal path and is built to be flood resistant	Y	Potential impacts from Hornsea Three on recreational receptors, including coastal paths and PRoW are identified and assessed in Environmental Statement chapter 6: Land Use and Recreation. Where the onshore cable corridor crosses public rights of way, Hornsea Three has sought to avoid impacts through the use of HDD technology. However, where open cut, or HDD with a haul road over, is proposed, the routes will be temporarily diverted along existing tracks, for a maximum of one month per cable. In particular, at the landfall, a diversion has been allowed for within the Order Limits.  In respect to flooding, appropriate mitigation measures have been design-in to Hornsea Three to minimise impacts on drainage and flooding. Details are provided in volume 3, chapter 2: Hydrology and Flood Risk (see Table 2.17). The Flood Risk Assessment which has been undertaken for the Project concludes that Hornsea Three meets the requirements of NPS EN-1 and the NPPF.
Douglas Walters (Norfolk Geographical Association)	<b>Cable corridor</b> - It sounds a good idea to have the cabling underground. And should be built in a way that doesn't have too much impact on the coastal typography and local landmarks. Also be careful with cabling under streets and on possible flood plains	I	Through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive assets. Mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project are outlined in topic specific chapters, and include the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts on local road networks, ecological receptors (e.g. hedgerows) and hydrological features (e.g. main rivers).

Table 3.4: Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Further Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.B) relating to hydrology and flood risk

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>40</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 42: Prescribed consultees (The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009: Schedule 1))</b>			
Estelle Hook, Norfolk Coast Partnership	We have identified a number of sensitive landscapes and habitats and request that the impact on these is minimised through careful planning and delivery. These sites include (working south from the landfall site): Weybourne Cliffs SSSI The shingle beach and shingle ridge, where its natural movement and profile should not be disrupted The reedbed and pond to the west of the beach car park – which the Norfolk Coast Partnership is seeking funding for a community project to restore Weybourne Beck (aka Spring Beck) – which has a published Catchment Management Plan (available from Norfolk Coast Partnership or Norfolk Rivers Trust) Kelling Heath SSSI – a valuable heathland landscape The Glaven River, running to its source near Selbrigg Pond – a rare chalk river with its northern stretch running through the AONB to the sea, of high ecological value and sensitive to pollution (e.g. run off during construction).	Y	Through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive ecological receptors (including designated sites). For example, Weybourne Cliffs and Kelling Heath SSSI have been avoided and no direct impacts are predicted on these designated sites from Hornsea Three. Additional mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project are outlined in topic specific chapters (Environmental Statement volume 3), and include the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts on ecological receptors (e.g. hedgerows) and hydrological features (e.g. main rivers).
Environment Agency	Our ref: AE/2017/122280/01-L01. We have reviewed the document and have some comments which should be considered in conjunction with our earlier S42 response dated 19 September 2017. We have additional comments in respect of groundwater and ground conditions.	N	Noted, responses provided to individual comments.

<sup>40</sup> Y = Yes change made; N = No change made; I = Incorporated into or considered when producing the assessment or landowner voluntary agreement offer; N/A = Not applicable.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>40</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Environment Agency	<p>Geology and Ground Conditions</p> <p>Whilst the majority of land within the application corridor is agricultural, closer inspection of maps and a walk over survey (part of Preliminary Risk Assessment) may indicate areas which require further inspection / investigation. On initial review of the maps provided, the application corridor crosses two railway lines, runs adjacent to a former depot site and historic landfill (known as Central depot 1971-73) just south of the A11. The application corridor appears to skirt around the edge of the source protection zone (SPZ) 1 for the AW borehole at Easton College. Sufficient information should be provided with the application to provide assurance that the risks to the water environment are fully understood and can be addressed through appropriate measures including the need for site investigation, risk assessment and remediation.</p>	I	<p>Potential sensitivities associated with geology and ground conditions has been considered during the refinement of the onshore cable corridor. The project has, for example avoided the Kelling Heath and Weybourne Cliffs SSSI, and committed to undertaking a preliminary risk assessments during the detailed design stage in order to identify any localised areas of contamination. Furthermore additional site specific surveys will be undertaken during detailed design to inform construction methodologies (see Environmental Statement, Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project Description, section 3.7.2) and an assessment of potential impacts on hydrology can be found in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 2: Hydrology and Flood Risk.</p>
Environment Agency	<p>Water Resources</p> <p>Review of Maps.</p> <p>Map 4. Inset 2. Abstractions to be aware of:</p> <p>(i) Pig Farm – TG 142 272</p> <p>This is a domestic abstraction approximately 20 m north of the corridor boundary. This could be abstracted from a shallow aquifer which should be investigated. If it is a shallow aquifer care will be required to ensure that supply is not disrupted.</p> <p>(ii) Licensed abstraction 7/34/06/*G/0217 – TG 1438 2709</p> <p>This is located approximately 100 m south but of the corridor boundary. However, this is from chalk so significant issues are less likely. You should however, ensure that sufficient measures are in place to protect the supply.</p>	I	<p>During the pre-application phase, the Environment Agency has provided details of the revised Source Protection Zone boundaries and these are shown in Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 1.2: Abstraction Licences. The potential impacts of Hornsea Three in terms of disruption of groundwater flow and the yields and quality of groundwater abstractions have been included in the assessment presented in Environmental Statement Volume 3, chapter 1: Geology and Ground Conditions. The Environment Agency will be consulted on the methodologies of the site investigations at watercourse crossing points (particularly where HDD is used) and secured through the Outline Code of Construction Practice. The purpose of these investigations will be to characterise the ground conditions and to provide information for the hydrogeological risk assessment.</p>
Environment Agency	<p>Map 5. Potential re-route.</p> <p>Abstraction to be aware of:</p> <p>Deregulated abstraction 7/34/11/*G/0332 – TG 1212 1990. This is located 15 m east of the corridor boundary and could be from shallow aquifer. If it is a shallow aquifer care will be required to ensure that supply is not disrupted.</p>	I	<p>During the pre-application phase, the Environment Agency has provided details of the revised Source Protection Zone boundaries and these are shown in Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 1.2: Abstraction Licences. The potential impacts of Hornsea Three in terms of disruption of groundwater flow and the yields and quality of groundwater abstractions have been included in the assessment presented in Environmental Statement Volume 3, chapter 1: Geology and Ground Conditions. The Environment Agency will be consulted on the methodologies of the site investigations at watercourse crossing points (particularly where HDD is used) and secured through the Outline Code of Construction Practice. The purpose of these investigations will be to characterise the ground conditions and to provide information for the hydrogeological risk assessment.</p>
Environment Agency	<p>Flood Risk</p> <p>We have noted some additional areas of activity in flood zones:</p> <p>Map 5</p> <p>There are the following additional proposals: 3 new proposed access routes &amp; a potential onshore cable corridor re-route. The proposed access route in Alderford opposite Bell Farm goes along next to Flood Zone 3 on an ordinary watercourse. The river at this location is not Main River so Environment Agency permission is not required. However you should consult with the Lead Local Flood Authority Norfolk County Council and the Internal Drainage District Norfolk Rivers IDD to see whether an ordinary watercourse consent is needed from them.</p>	I	<p>Appropriate mitigation measures have been design-in to Hornsea Three to minimise impacts on drainage and flooding (particularly in relation to runoff). Details are provided in volume 3, chapter 2: Hydrology and Flood Risk (see Table 2.17) as well as the outline CoCP which forms part of the DCO application.</p> <p>A flood risk assessment is provided in Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 2.1: Onshore Infrastructure FRAs and identified historic flooding events relevant to Hornsea Three. This has been developed in accordance with the NPS, NPPF, PPG ID7 and the SuDS Manual. The Flood Risk Assessment which has been undertaken for the Project concludes that Hornsea Three meets the requirements of NPS EN-1 and the NPPF.</p>



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>40</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Environment Agency	Map 7 There are the following additional proposals: 4 new proposed access routes & a potential onshore cable corridor re-route. The proposed access route near Marlingford opposite Cobb's Grove Plantation goes into Flood Zone 3 as it nears the main River Yare. These works may need an environmental permit for a flood risk activity. The potential onshore cable corridor re-route crosses Flood Zones 3. The river at this location is not Main River so Environment Agency permission is not required. However you should consult with the Lead Local Flood Authority Norfolk County Council and the Internal Drainage District Norfolk Rivers to see whether an ordinary watercourse consent is needed from them.	I	Appropriate mitigation measures have been design-in to Hornsea Three to minimise impacts on drainage and flooding (particularly in relation to runoff). Details are provided in volume 3, chapter 2: Hydrology and Flood Risk (see Table 2.17) as well as the outline CoCP which forms part of the DCO application.  A flood risk assessment is provided in Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 2.1: Onshore Infrastructure FRAs and identified historic flooding events relevant to Hornsea Three. This has been developed in accordance with the NPS, NPPF, PPG ID7 and the SuDS Manual. The Flood Risk Assessment which has been undertaken for the Project concludes that Hornsea Three meets the requirements of NPS EN-1 and the NPPF.
Environment Agency	Map 9 There are the following additional proposals: 9 new proposed access routes, a new potential storage area & a potential onshore cable corridor re-route. The new proposed access route, potential storage area & potential onshore cable corridor re-route at Hethersett, off of station lane by the Glade is in Flood Zone 3. The river at this location is not Main River so Environment Agency permission is not required. However, you should consult with the Lead Local Flood Authority Norfolk County Council and the Internal Drainage District Norfolk Rivers to see whether an ordinary watercourse consent is needed from them. Environmental Permit for Flood Risk Activities.	I	Appropriate mitigation measures have been design-in to Hornsea Three to minimise impacts on drainage and flooding (particularly in relation to runoff). Details are provided in volume 3, chapter 2: Hydrology and Flood Risk (see Table 2.17) as well as the outline CoCP which forms part of the DCO application.  A flood risk assessment is provided in Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 2.1: Onshore Infrastructure FRAs and identified historic flooding events relevant to Hornsea Three. This has been developed in accordance with the NPS, NPPF, PPG ID7 and the SuDS Manual. The Flood Risk Assessment which has been undertaken for the Project concludes that Hornsea Three meets the requirements of NPS EN-1 and the NPPF.
<b>Section 42: Local Authorities (prescribed under section 43 of the Act)</b>			
No comments were received from the local authorities relating to hydrology and flood risk under Phase 2.B.			
<b>Section 42: Persons with an interest in the land (prescribed under section 44 of the Act)</b>			
Jane Kenny, Savills, on behalf of Easton & Otley College, Easton	POTENTIAL ONSHORE CABLE CORRIDOR RE-ROUTES There are a number of requested route changes which have not been considered. In particular: • Easton & Otley College, Easton – the current proposed route has been raised at informal consultations and within the PEIR response, however it appears in the second consultation not to have been re-routed and as it currently stands will interfere with the College's future expansion plans.	Y	A refined route located to west of cable corridor has been adopted, following a request from the College in order to reduce potential impact to area at Broom Farm.  Further detail was requested on the proposed expansion plans in order for these to be taken into consideration if the proposed route does not meet the requirements.
Christopher Bond, Bidwells on behalf of Benjamin Robert Goodfellow & Phillip George Day	Benjamin Robert Goodfellow, c/o Birketts, [REDACTED] (map 8 of 9) Potential onshore cable corridor re-routes We note the potential corridor cable re-route to the west of the preferred route which is unacceptable to our clients as this will be more intrusive into their fields and further affect agricultural operations. Proposed access routes We note 2 proposed access routes and comment as follows: - (Northern) across the River meadows — this is impractical being low lying land prone to flooding (very wet in winter) and follows the line of an Anglian Water sewer. - (Southern) known as Racecourse track — This is an existing track which we believe would need to be upgraded before use by heavy vehicles — can we have details of what is proposed.	Y	Hornsea Three addressed the landowner's response as follows:  1. Concern regarding the alternative route option is noted. This has since been discounted following accurate identification of the route of the discussed MOD pipeline on this land.  2.a. Information regarding the land on this proposed access route is noted and appreciated, an alternative route has now also been incorporated following receipt of this feedback.  b. Where required, existing tracks would be upgraded prior to be used for access by the project, and also reinstated following completion of the work as required and in accordance with the schedule of condition. Detail on the specific construction of access tracks will be available in due course and once a construction contractor has been appointed.



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>40</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 47: Duty to consult local community</b>			
The River Glaven Conservation Group - Henry Crawley	The cutting of a corner in the route to avoid Pine Farm, Bodham will cross the river Glaven headwaters at a lower contoured field, and so this is to be welcomed as there may be less risk of soil run-off during works. Our main concern is silt pollution to the river and wildlife, and we would naturally expect Direct Drilling at the river crossings in the upper Glaven in any case. The duration of open trenching is a serious risk to silt pollution events with heavy rainfall. It would be good to be informed of the reasoning for the re-route suggested.	I	<p>Mitigation measures have been identified to the creation of preferential pathways for groundwater flow, minimise flood risk, minimise the generation of silt and prevent runoff entering the watercourses. These measures are set out in Geology and Ground Condition chapter as well as in the Outline Code of Construction Practice which forms part of the DCO application. Measures to minimise the generation of silt and prevent runoff entering the watercourses are set out in the Outline Code of Construction Practice which forms part of the DCO application, and includes a commitment to prepare Pollution Prevention and Emergency Response Plans.</p> <p>In respect to the route refinement process, additional information is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives.</p>
The River Glaven Conservation Group - Henry Crawley	The addition of screening to the HVAC booster site at Barningham again is welcome. I assume this implies a tree belt. We would of course prefer that HVDC is used, not only precluding need for a Booster site, but also needing a much narrower cabling excavation corridor and less damage to the vulnerable countryside and river valley.	I	<p>Due to current uncertainty (see Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives), a decision on which transmission system (HVDC or HVAC) to adopt will not be made until post consent after extensive engagement with potential systems suppliers has taken place. As a result of this, we have conducted our assessments based on a realistic worst-case scenario, which could be either HVDC or HVDC technology depending on the receptor.</p> <p>Appropriate mitigation measures for visual disturbance are outlined in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources. This includes, for example, the restoration of habitats (including hedgerows) which cannot be avoided and landscape planting around the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.</p>
<b>Section 48: Duty to publicise</b>			
No comments were received in response to the Public Notice relating to hydrology and flood risk under Phase 2.B.			

Table 3.5: Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Focused Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.C) relating to hydrology and flood risk

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>41</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 42: Prescribed consultees (The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009: Schedule 1))</b>			
Environment Agency	We have reviewed the document and have made some comments which should be considered in conjunction with our earlier S42 responses dated 10th September 2017 and 21 December 2017 as well as having reference to our ongoing contributions to the Hornsea Three Evidence Plan expert working groups. Our review of the new locations does not indicate any major new constraints that fall within our remit but rather continuing issues that require consideration. These are recorded below. In general, we would also remind you of a broader concern regarding diffuse pollution within the river basins requiring appropriate management in relation to surface water run-off, and soil and sediment mobilization which remains relevant to the new areas.	I	Response made in previous consultation periods have been taken into consideration, with responses provided in the relevant section of this Consultation Report.
Environment Agency	Map 5 - The new area of activity crosses the Intwood stream - ref GB105034051240 eastward of the original search area. Sufficient information should be provided with the application to provide assurance that the risks to the water environment are fully understood and can be addressed through appropriate measures.	I	Appropriate mitigation measures have been designed-in to Hornsea Three to minimise impacts on surface watercourses and the water environment (particularly in relation to runoff). Details are provided in volume 3, chapter 2: Hydrology and Flood Risk (see Table 2.17) as well as the outline CoCP which forms part of the DCO application.  Impacts and mitigation specific to the crossing of the Intwood Stream are outlined in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 2: Hydrology and Flood Risk.
<b>Section 42: Local Authorities (prescribed under section 43 of the Act)</b>			
No comments were received from the local authorities relating to hydrology and flood risk under Phase 2.C.			
<b>Section 42: Persons with an interest in the land (prescribed under section 44 of the Act)</b>			
No comments were received from persons with an interest in the land relating to hydrology and flood risk under Phase 2.C.			
<b>Section 47: Duty to consult local community</b>			
Tom Corfield (Ireland Arnold Keys) On behalf of Lady Prince Smith	2) The junction with the A1067 regularly floods and this winter this particular junction was under two feet of water for approximately four weeks during the months of December and January.	N	Lady Prince Smith's comments were noted regarding the water and will be taken into account in the design process. Should the ground conditions here not be suitable for use as a compound at the time, then additional materials could be used to create a more robust surface which should in turn assist with reinstatement of the land back to agricultural use.
Tom Corfield (Ireland Arnold Keys) On behalf of Lady Prince Smith	3) There is an Anglian Water mains water pipe, constructed of the old weaker material, just under the entrance to your suggested Compound. This water main has a history of bursting up Marl Hill and I doubt that it will take the pressure of continual lorry movements out of and into the site.	N	Hornsea Three is aware of the location of the Anglian Water pipeline as it runs along Marl Hill and the edge of the landowner's field from records they have provided. This has been considered in relation to Hornsea Three's proposals.
Tom Corfield (Ireland Arnold Keys) On behalf of Lady Prince Smith	4) It will be much more difficult to reinstate this particular area owing to the amount of water that regularly flows down Marl Hill whenever it rains. The overflow pipe from the road drain also passes under the proposed entrance.	N	The proposed storage compound consists of a small area of agricultural land (approx. 1.2 acres) which would likely be sterilised and unfarmable during the construction period. The proposal to utilise this area for storage, if required, should therefore alleviate the requirement for any additional agricultural land to be taken out of production. The choice of materials for the storage compound will reflect the specific requirements of the site at the time of construction. The positioning of any overflow pipes will also be taken into consideration.
<b>Section 48: Duty to publicise</b>			

<sup>41</sup> Y = Yes change made; N = No change made; I = Incorporated into or considered when producing the assessment or landowner voluntary agreement offer; N/A = Not applicable.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>41</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
No comments were received in response to the Public Notice relating to hydrology and flood risk under Phase 2.C.			

### 3.3 Ecology and Nature Conservation

Table 3.6: Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.A) relating to ecology and nature conservation

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>42</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 42: Prescribed consultees (The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009: Schedule 1))</b>			
Amphibian and Reptile Conservation	We have received a letter asking to take part in the statutory consultation for the Hornsea Project Three Offshore Wind Farm. As a conservation NGO looking after amphibians, reptiles, and their habitats, we'd like to take a look at our records for the area around the PEIR boundary to see whether this proposed development might affect any known populations. I have received two maps, one showing the proposed onshore cable line and the other showing the subsea electricity cable line. Do you have any GIS shapefiles available for these boundaries that can help me limit my data search? Alternatively, do you have a detailed PDF or JPG file that I can georeference?	N	Ørsted shared a shapefile with Amphibian and Reptile Conservation group to help inform their response to the consultation.
Norfolk and Norwich Naturalists' Society	Herewith the response of the Norfolk and Norwich Naturalists' Society to your consultation about this project. With thanks, Nick Owens (Hon. Secretary, Norfolk and Norwich Naturalists' Society). Thank you for sending consultation documents to the Norfolk and Norwich Naturalists' Society referring to the Hornsea Project Three Offshore Windfarm, ref. HOW03- s42 25072017. The Norfolk and Norwich Naturalists' Society is one of the country's oldest natural history societies and has published wildlife records and scientific articles since its inception in 1869: see <a href="http://www.nnns.org.uk">http://www.nnns.org.uk</a> Its current constitutional brief concerning environmental development impact is limited to endangered species, although, as individuals, our concerns regarding the development may go further. Whilst recognising the importance of renewable energy, we would like to raise several concerns about the effects of the development on endangered wildlife, both offshore and on land.	N	Thank you for your feedback. See further responses below.
Norfolk and Norwich Naturalists' Society	Onshore: Disturbance of Kelling Heath SSSI. This site is very rich in vulnerable wildlife, is one of only a handful of coastal heathland sites in the county and should not be disturbed in any way. An alternative route should be found which avoids the heath altogether. Important bird species include breeding dartford warbler, woodlark, nightjar and turtle dove. Other vulnerable wildlife includes adder, 32 butterfly species including silver-studded blue, the rare heathland weevil <i>Coniocleonus nebulosus</i> , over 150 species of aculeate hymenoptera and over 200 species of flowering plants including 10 out of the 12 indicators of the H8 plant community ( <i>Calluna/Ulex gallii</i> heath). Many species present here are endangered and otherwise have ecological requirements which are too specialised or inadequately understood to allow suitable mitigation or compensation for the inevitable damage resulting from installations.	Y	Through the design development process, the onshore cable corridor now avoids Kelling Heath Site of Special Scientific Interest and Kelling Heath Park. Therefore there is no potential for significant impacts on this particular designated site, and no further action is required.  Notwithstanding the above, the Environmental Statement considers potential impacts on ecological receptors as a result of Hornsea Three in volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation. Where possible, mitigation measures have been built into the design to minimise any potential impacts.

<sup>42</sup> Y = Yes change made; N = No change made; I = Incorporated into or considered when producing the assessment or landowner voluntary agreement offer; N/A = Not applicable.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>42</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Norfolk Rivers Trust	6. Planting of areas affected should be carried out as soon as possible to alleviate flooding.	I	Appropriate mitigation measures have been design-in to Hornsea Three to minimise impacts on drainage and flooding. Details are provided in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 2: Hydrology and Flood Risk (see Table 2.17) as well as the Outline Watercourse Crossing Method statement which is provided as Appendix B of the outline CoCP which forms part of the DCO application. In relation to planting, the working area will be reinstated to a state commensurate with condition prior to the commencement of works following the completion of the onshore cable installation.
Norfolk Rivers Trust	7. On non agricultural land native UK seed mixes must be the standard application.	I	New planting will be carried out in accordance with the Landscape Management Plan and associated biosecurity risk assessments. The Outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application includes planting methodologies and plant species lists. These comprise native UK seed mixes.
River Glaven Conservation Group	Response to Dong3 latest consultation and PIER from River Glaven Conservation Group and contribution of an ecological assessment of Upper Glaven River Catchment.	N	Noted
River Glaven Conservation Group	We have contributed comments to the earlier consultation on the potential cable route through the Upper Glaven Valley where as a Conservation Group, we have concerns about possible impacts on the river and adjacent habitats.	I	Potential impacts from Hornsea Three on hydrology receptors, including the River Glaven, have been assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 2: Hydrology and Flood Risk. Impacts to associated habitats are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation.  It is noted that the onshore cable route will cross the River Glaven (Gunthorpe Stream) using trenchless technology (e.g. HDD). An outline method statement for the proposed crossing methodologies is included in the outline CoCP which forms part of the DCO application. This method statement will be developed further (in discussion with the EA) during the detailed design stage.  The Environmental Statement concludes that impacts on surface watercourses would be, at most, minor adverse which is not significant in EIA terms.
River Glaven Conservation Group	Our main concern however is the possibly deleterious effects on the upper Glaven River environment when cable burial is carried out. To this end I attach a document the RGCG has produced which sets out the ecological importance of the area and the threats cable burial could pose if not carefully managed. I hope this detailed local knowledge will add to the PIER and can be taken into account with mitigation measures to reduce risk.	I	Impacts on the River Glaven are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 2: Hydrology and Flood Risk.
East Carleton & Ketteringham Parish Council	East Carleton & Ketteringham Parish Council considered the initial suveys and PEIR at its meeting on 17th August 2017. There are many trees within the pathway of the proposed cable corridor and a particular concern was raised about oak trees in Cantley Lane. The parish council would like to see the impact on trees minimised and any tree protection orders respected when the exact details of the cable corridor are finalised.	Y	Impacts from Hornsea Three on ecological features, including hedgerows and trees (including woodlands) has been avoided where possible through commitments to use trenchless technologies such as Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD). HDD is proposed for Cantley Lane (South).  Where removal of hedgerows and trees is unavoidable, the replacement of hedgerows at the end of the construction phase to be undertaken will ensure there is no net loss of hedgerow habitat as a result of Hornsea Project Three. Furthermore, restoration of hedgerows, currently in poor condition, provides an opportunity to achieve long term benefits for the biodiversity associated with this habitat type. Further details on hedgerow removal, retention and replacement can be found in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation as well as the Outline Ecological Management Plan and the Outline Landscape Management Plan which form part of the DCO application.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>42</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
East & East Midlands Forestry Commission	<p>The Forestry Commission is a non-statutory consultee on developments in or within 500m of ancient woodland. As a Government department we do not object or support applications, but seek to provide relevant information to assist decision making. From our examination of the maps we are pleased to see that it would appear that the chosen route has been designed to miss most of the Ancient Semi Natural Woodland (ASNW) which as we have mentioned in previous correspondence is an irreplaceable habitat, the one place we can see from the corridor route that may impact on Ancient Woodland is Harman's grove .</p> <p>The Chapter 3 of the PIER July 2017 states that; 3.11.1.22 Harman's Grove CWS: 1.5 ha of replanted ancient semi-natural broad-leaved woodland managed as coppice with standards, 32% of the total site area, falls within the onshore cable corridor search area. This comprises a significant proportion of the site, and given that deep-rooting trees cannot be planted over the cables, habitat restoration is not considered to be a realistic possibility. Cable installation would also result in the loss of soil biota associated with ancient woodland, affecting the integrity of the site. The impact is predicted to be of local spatial extent, long term duration, and irreversible. It is predicted that the impact will affect the receptor directly. The magnitude is therefore, considered to be major.</p>	Y	<p>We recognise that protection and sensitive restoration of hedgerows and trees is important to minimise any negative impact on biodiversity or landscape. Impacts from Hornsea Three on ecological features, including hedgerows and trees (including woodlands) has been avoided where possible through commitments to use trenchless technologies such as Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD). As a result of this, Hornsea Three has no direct impacts on ancient woodland.</p> <p>The replacement of hedgerows at the end of the construction phase to be undertaken will ensure there is no net loss of hedgerow habitat as a result of Hornsea Project Three. Furthermore, restoration of hedgerows, currently in poor condition, provides an opportunity to achieve long term benefits for the biodiversity associated with this habitat type. Further details on hedgerow removal, retention and replacement can be found in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation as well as the Outline Ecological Management Plan and the Outline Landscape Management Plan which form part of the DCO application.</p>
East & East Midlands Forestry Commission	<p>We would prefer that you avoided this Ancient woodland it is already fairly small and any further fragmentation may make it none viable. It is our understanding that where you have to pass through any woodland this effectively sterilises the area above for trees. We therefore suggest avoid if possible, and that if it cannot be avoided, that the top soil be removed and stored so that this could be used in the necessary compensatory woodland planting adjacent to the existing woodland, this would at least go some way to mitigating the loss. A major problem with many of these woods is fragmentation and small size so any compensatory extension/or linking of existing woods should be considered.</p>	Y	<p>We recognise that protection and sensitive restoration of hedgerows and trees is important to minimise any negative impact on biodiversity or landscape. Impacts from Hornsea Three on ecological features, including hedgerows and trees (including woodlands) has been avoided where possible through commitments to use trenchless technologies such as Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD). As a result of this, Hornsea Three has no direct impacts on ancient woodland.</p> <p>The replacement of hedgerows at the end of the construction phase to be undertaken will ensure there is no net loss of hedgerow habitat as a result of Hornsea Project Three. Furthermore, restoration of hedgerows, currently in poor condition, provides an opportunity to achieve long term benefits for the biodiversity associated with this habitat type. Further details on hedgerow removal, retention and replacement can be found in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation as well as the Outline Ecological Management Plan and the Outline Landscape Management Plan which form part of the DCO application.</p>
East & East Midlands Forestry Commission	<p>Whilst it is not clear from the maps the amount of other woodland that might be impacted we thought we should point out that lowland mixed deciduous woodland is a Habitat of Principal Importance (s41 NERC Act 2006) and identified as a conservation priority. It therefore should be compensated for if lost at least on a 'no net loss' basis. Any new compensatory woodland that can be created which could connect other woodland would help maintain the integrity of remaining areas of woodland, the larger the woodland the more resilient it is to pests/disease and climate change. Any temporary adverse effect could therefor result in a permanent beneficial effect this can be significant at district and borough level.</p>	I	<p>We recognise that protection and sensitive restoration of hedgerows and trees is important to minimise any negative impact on biodiversity or landscape. Impacts from Hornsea Three on ecological features, including hedgerows and trees (including woodlands) has been avoided where possible through commitments to use trenchless technologies such as Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD).</p> <p>Further details on hedgerow removal, retention and replacement can be found in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation as well as the Outline Ecological Management Plan and the Outline Landscape Management Plan which form part of the DCO application. Indirect impacts on trees and areas of woodland are also assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation.</p>



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>42</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Norfolk County Council	<p>APPENDIX A: Detailed Comments Ecology and Nature Conservation 5.8 (a) The County Council wish to highlight the need for maintaining ecological connectivity throughout the construction phases between the designated sites of Alderford Common SSSI, the River Wensum SAC and the area to the south. This connectivity is particularly important for bats, as there are known bat roosts in the area, including those of Barbastelle bats in the woodland in Morton-on-the-Hill. The County Council would expect that minimal disruption of features used by bats for feeding and commuting would be designed into the construction process. 5.8 (b) The County Council welcomes the detailed consideration of Local Wildlife Sites of county importance (CWS) in the PEIR. The County Council would wish to see Horizontal Directional Drilling used where the cable route crosses three CWS: Low Common CWS, Foxburrow Meadow CWS and Old Hall Meadows CWS, and also where the significance of impacts on habitats have been identified as major or moderate. This is important as maximum design scenario of 11 years means reinstatement might not happen until after that period, and that potentially an area could be impacted three separate times. 5.10 (c) Where the PIER refers to White-clawed Crayfish, it should be noted that Weybourne Beck in the area of the landfall has been used as a relocation site for this species. Surveys will be required and mitigation may be necessary.</p>	Y	<p>Through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including sensitive ecological receptors. For example, Weybourne Cliffs and Kelling Heath SSSI have been avoided and no direct impacts are predicted on these designated sites from Hornsea Three. Additional mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project are outlined in topic specific chapters, and include the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts on local road networks, ecological receptors (e.g. hedgerows) and hydrological features (e.g. main rivers).</p> <p>A full list of crossings, including their methodologies, are provided in Environmental Statement volume 4, annex 3.5: Onshore Crossing Schedule. This identified, so example that all CWSs which are crossed by Hornsea Three are done so using HDD, thus avoiding any direct impacts. Highly sensitive receptors such as the River Wensum SAC are also crossed using HDD.</p> <p>Where it has not been possible to maintain hedgerows, they will be replaced at the end of the construction phase to provide continued connectivity. Furthermore, restoration of hedgerows, currently in poor condition, provides an opportunity to achieve long term benefits for the biodiversity associated with this habitat type. Further details on hedgerow removal, retention and replacement can be found in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation as well as the Outline Ecological Management Plan and the Outline Landscape Management Plan which form part of the DCO application.</p>
Great Yarmouth Borough Council	<p>Policy CS11 of the Great Yarmouth Local Plan Core Strategy confirms that designated nature conservation sites will be conserved and enhanced, and protected species such as the Little Terns should be adequately protected from adverse effects of new development, and where negative effects are unavoidable, suitable measures will be required to mitigate such impact(s). Therefore any potential indirect impacts should be considered and where mitigation measures are necessary, should complement the measures set out in the Council's Natura 2000 Sites Monitoring and Mitigation Strategy.</p>	I	<p>Environmental Statement, Volume 2, Chapter 5 – Offshore Ornithology assesses the potential impact of the project on different bird species, including little tern. This chapter also highlights any necessary monitoring and/or mitigation measures which could prevent, minimise, reduce or offset the possible environmental effects identified in the EIA process. Any mitigation or monitoring proposed will consider relevant policy guidelines and stakeholder advice.</p>
The Wildlife Trust (joint response from Norfolk WT and TWT)	<p>4. Onshore ecology (volume 3) 4.1. General comments We are pleased to see that the cable routes have been refined so that there are now fewer areas remaining with a choice of routes. Our comments on the onshore ecology section of the PEIR are made in general terms rather than for every individual receptor and impact, owing to the fact that much work still needs to be done to further refine routes and assess the best mitigation measures for each area of ecological value. We will continue to engage via the Onshore Ecology Working Group between the submission of the PEIR and the final application, by which time we expect routes and mitigation measures to be well defined. We hope that this engagement by ourselves and others will enable DONG to put forward measures that will minimise impacts on habitats and species both on and off designated sites by the time of the final submission.</p>	I	<p>Through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive ecological receptors. For example, Weybourne Cliffs and Kelling Heath SSSI have been avoided and no direct impacts are predicted on these designated sites from Hornsea Three. Additional mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project are outlined in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation, as well as the Outline Ecological Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application. These measures include the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts on ecological receptors (e.g. hedgerows) and associated hydrological features (e.g. main rivers).</p>
The Wildlife Trust (joint response from Norfolk WT and TWT)	<p>4.2.1. Table 3.14 General comments on mitigation measures proposed: We are pleased to see trenchless techniques being considered at major watercourses and at designated sites such as Kelling Heath and River Wensum and that this will also be considered for other watercourses, such as Glaven and Tud and at Local Wildlife Sites. Although this has been considered for non-designated watercourses in relation to impacts on otter and water vole, it is also important with regard to prevention of silt run-off into watercourses. For this reason, the use of trenchless crossings should be used wherever possible and feasible for all watercourses that may connect with sensitive wildlife sites (with regard to the geomorphology and hydrology of the underlying substrate).</p>	Y	<p>Impacts from Hornsea Three on hydrological features, designated sites and ecological features has been avoided where possible through commitments to use trenchless technologies such as Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD). HDD is proposed under all 'main' watercourses and numerous 'ordinary' minor watercourses in order to reduce potential impacts. A full list of crossings, along with the methodology proposed, is provided in Environmental Statement volume 4, annex 3.6: Onshore Crossing Schedule.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>42</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
The Wildlife Trust (joint response from Norfolk WT and TWT)	4.3. Assessment of significance: We do not disagree with the assessment of magnitude of impacts in this section and understand that this is in relation to worst case scenarios with regard to any part of a receptor being within 200m corridor and use of open cut techniques. There are potential impacts on a number of CWS. NWT advises owners on management of CWS and we respond to planning applications with regard to these sites. As result we are keen to engage with DONG to help minimise impacts on these sites.	I	Through engagement with the onshore Ecology EWG and design refinement, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on designated sites, include CWSs. In addition to the use of HDD for a number of ecologically sensitive receptors, other mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project are outlined in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation, as well as the Outline Ecological Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application. A full list of crossings, along with the methodology proposed, is provided in Environmental Statement volume 4, annex 3.6: Onshore Crossing Schedule.
The Wildlife Trust (joint response from Norfolk WT and TWT)	With regard to 3.11.1.18 Kelling Park CWS it is important to note that some areas within the holiday park but outside the CWS boundary are also made up of heathland habitat.	Y	Since the PEIR, a refined landfall location has been identified (western re-route around Kelling) and the area identified for landfall works has reduced. This was informed by a number of factors including community feedback in the area of Kelling and Weybourne, avoidance of the Kelling Heath SSSI/CWS and Holiday Park as well as engineering/technical considerations. As such, the final onshore cable corridor now avoids all areas of heathland within or adjacent to Kelling Heath SSSI and Kelling Park CWS.
The Wildlife Trust (joint response from Norfolk WT and TWT)	NWT also manages Booton Common SSSI and we are keen to engage with regard to mitigation of any impacts on this site. Final choice of route and cable laying techniques needs to ensure that there will be no adverse impact.	Y	HDD is proposed for approximately 340 m under Blackwater Drain and associated meadow and woodland habitat, therefore avoiding direct impacts on sensitive habitats from trenching. The Outline CoCP includes measures to minimise risks associated with HDD including a protocol for dealing with bentonite breakout, which will reduce risks to acceptable levels.
The Wildlife Trust (joint response from Norfolk WT and TWT)	With regard to mitigation for impacts on protected species, we would like to see the option explored of working with Natural England to establish whether there is potential for using the development as a pilot for the roll out the new great-crested newt licencing proposals and for this to include working with the Norfolk Pond Partnership.	I	This option will be explored prior to commencement. For the purposes of the Environmental Statement and Outline EMP it has been assumed that standard GCN mitigation measures would be adopted, via an EPS licence application.
The Wildlife Trust (joint response from Norfolk WT and TWT)	We understand that cabling works may include 3 installations extended over an 11 year period. The impact of delaying restoration over this long time period is flagged up in table 3.10 and in the accompanying text. Whilst we recognise that design is expected to avoid areas of sensitive habitat and designated sites and that HDD will be employed where feasible for sensitive ecological receptors, we do have concerns about the impacts on locally important habitat features, as a result of the long cable installation period. This issue is discussed in paragraph 3.11.1.63 and following paragraphs, where the impact is considered moderate adverse on a county level. In our view, greater clarification should be provided over frequency and extent of disturbance at the time of the final submission. In addition, mitigation should include initiatives to enhance connectivity in areas adjacent to the cable routes and these measures should be put in place at an early stage. These measures are required, in order to compensate for the extended period during which restoration will not be possible. There is an opportunity to combine this approach with measures to minimise impacts on ponds and great-crested newt that have been proposed by Norfolk Pond Partnership and Natural England and also to link to the emerging ecological connectivity and green corridor mapping being undertaken by Norfolk Biodiversity Information Service on behalf of Norfolk local authorities. NWT is keen to engage further in relation to this issue.	Y	During the design refinement Hornsea Three has sought to minimise the duration of any disruption, and has reduced the total duration of the construction phase onshore to eight years.  Through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive ecological receptors. For example, Weybourne Cliffs and Kelling Heath SSSI have been avoided and no direct impacts are predicted on these designated sites from Hornsea Three. Additional mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project are outlined in topic specific chapters, and include the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts on local road networks, ecological receptors (e.g. hedgerows) and hydrological features (e.g. main rivers).  Prior to construction commencing a Schedule of Condition of the land will be taken and we have an obligation to return the land in the same state. In this regard, any hedgerows which cannot be avoided will be replaced at the end of the construction phase. Furthermore, restoration of hedgerows, currently in poor condition, provides an opportunity to achieve long term benefits for the biodiversity associated with this habitat type as well as gap up hedgerows providing landscape and visual mitigation. Further details on hedgerow removal, retention and replacement can be found in volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation, the Outline Ecological Management Plan and the Outline Landscape Management Plan.  In respect to great-crested newt mitigation, this is outlined in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation, as well as the outline EMP which forms part of the DCO Application.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>42</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Holt County Division	<b>SSSI AONB and MCZ</b> Significant concerns have been raised about the SSSI along sections of the proposed cable corridor.	Y	Through the design development process, the route of the onshore cable corridor has been refined to avoid direct impacts on all Sites of Special Scientific Interest. Therefore there is no potential for significant impacts on SSSIs as a result of the construction, operation and maintenance or decommissioning of Hornsea Three (see Environmental Statement Volume 3, Chapter 1: Geology and Ground Conditions).
Holt County Division	Kelling Heath is an almost unique SSSI, in that it is not only designated for its biological interest but also its geomorphology. In its reasons for notification Natural England states that - 'Kelling Heath provides perhaps the best example of a glacial outwash plain in England..... and are geomorphological sites of national importance.'	Y	The importance and sensitivity of Kelling Heath SSSI is noted. Through the design development process, the route of the onshore cable corridor has been refined to avoid direct impacts on all Sites of Special Scientific Interest, including Kelling Heath SSSI. Therefore there is no potential for significant impacts on Kelling Heath SSSI as a result of the construction, operation and maintenance or decommissioning of Hornsea Three (see Environmental Statement Volume 3, Chapter 1: Geology and Ground Conditions).
Holt County Division	The sites are home to a vast array of species many of which are under threat. Whilst appreciating much has been done to record numbers over recent months, this does not take into consideration the serious decline in certain populations overall. Neither does it note the necessity to protect their favoured environments particularly for breeding, in particular Lapwing and Skylark populations which have red endangered status with the RSPB and Nightjars are amber.	I	Environmental Statement volume 6, annexes 3.1 - 3.14 report on the full suite of ecological baseline surveys undertaken to inform the assessment of impacts on ecology and nature conservation as reported in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation. Environmental Statement volume 6, annexes 3.9 and 3.10 provide a description of the currently baseline in respect to ornithology (wintering, migratory and breeding birds).
Holt County Division	We cannot rebuild these natural landscapes once they have been damaged or destroyed the impact on our environment will be permanent.	I	Through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including landscapes. Mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project are outlined in topic specific chapters, of particular relevance would be Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 1: Geology and Ground Conditions, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation and chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Effects.
Environment Agency	In particular, we are concerned about how WFD is to be assessed, the protection of groundwater resources, safeguarding white clawed crayfish (WCC) populations, beach processes where the cable makes landfall and, assessment of the potential for contaminated land. In addition, we have provided advisory notes in respect of flood risk assessments and flood risk activity permits.	I	A WFD Groundwater Assessment has been carried out and is provided in Environmental Statement Volume 6, Annex 1.4. It contains WFD specific details, in particular it makes a clear link between the construction activities of Hornsea Three and the WFD receptors.  According to the Groundsure records, there are no sites recorded as contaminated land under Part IIA of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 within the Hornsea Three geology and ground conditions study area.  In respect to white-clawed crayfish populations, results of the Hornsea Three surveys are provided in Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 3.4: White Clawed Crayfish Survey. Potential impacts on white clawed crayfish are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation, which concludes no significant effects. In terms of the WFD, they are considered in volume 6, annex 2.5: Water Framework Directive Surface Water Assessment.  Potential impacts from the construction of Hornsea Three on beach processes is assessed in Environmental Statement Volume 2, chapter 1: Marine Processes.  Flood Risk Assessments have been carried out for the HVAC booster station, HVDC converter/HVAC substation, and where relevant, the onshore cable corridor. These are provided as Environmental Statement Volume 6, Annex 2.1, and conclude that Hornsea Three meets the requirements of NPS EN-1 and the NPPF.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>42</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Environment Agency	<p>Water Biodiversity: 3.11.1.126 states that records of WCC are known from the River Glaven, including the headwaters both upstream and downstream of the cable corridor and that it is possible that this species occurs within the onshore cable corridor search area and hence within watercourses or ditches that would be directly affected by cable installation. It is known that there are WCC present in the Hempstead watercourse, and so HDD should also be the method of crossing in this location.</p> <p>3.11.1.127 - We do not agree with the assumptions within this statement. WCC are present within the River Tud. It is likely signal crayfish are also present in the lower Tud due to the proximity of the Wensum confluence and no barriers to prevent their upstream movement into the Tud. However, it is not acceptable to assume the presence of WCC in the Tud is 'unlikely'. We know this to be incorrect. HDD is preferred where crossing the Tud and other sensitive land parcels but due consideration and mitigation should be given to groundwater effects. It is confirmed in section 3.11.1.201 that HDD is proposed for crossing the Tud and adjacent CWS.</p> <p>3.11.1.128 The report states that HDD will be employed to ensure that where WCC are present they will not be affected. The Weybourne/Spring Beck and the Hempstead Stream (Glaven headwater) contain WCC. Weybourne/Spring Beck contains WCC. They were introduced in 2016 as an 'Ark' relocation. The Hempstead Stream contains healthy populations of WCC. These waterbodies should be reconsidered for HDD due to their high sensitivity. A clear explanation as to why trenching is chosen over other crossing methods is required together with a method statement detailing the trenching methodology. It will be necessary to ensure minimal disturbance to the environment, including detailing pollution prevention measures, protected species surveys (as appropriate) and undertaking work at the correct time of year. Opportunities to enhance habitat around the trenching should be sought and detailed as part of the project. The mitigation hierarchy should be born in mind when considering movement of WCC, this should be planned to be avoided. given the sensitivity of these waterbodies, we request assurance that adequate biosecurity measures are in place when surveying for WCC to be addressed in EMP and CoCP.</p> <p>3.11.1.129 The maximum design scenario would have intermittent impacts of habitat loss and it may be necessary to relocate crayfish from watercourses up to three occasions. Exclusion of crayfish from the works area for the full duration of the maximum construction programme is not considered to be feasible or desirable as it would serve to isolate populations on either side of the cable corridor. 3.11.1.130 Translocation of crayfish, if required, would be carried out under licence from Natural England. Crayfish would need to be relocated into areas of suitable habitat up or downstream of the affected watercourses, enabling re-colonisation of the affected habitat post-restoration.</p>	Y	<p>Impacts on the water environment are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 2: Hydrology and Flood Risk.</p> <p>However, it is noted that through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including sensitive hydrological and ecological receptors. For example, all EA main rivers (including the River Tud) will be crossed using HDD to avoid direct impacts from Hornsea Three. Additional mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project to minimise indirect impacts on surface watercourses are outlined in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 2: Hydrology and Flood Risk.</p> <p>In respect to white-clawed crayfish populations, results of the Hornsea Three surveys are provided in Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 3.4: White Clawed Crayfish Survey. Potential impacts on white clawed crayfish are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation, which concludes no significant effects.</p> <p>Impacts relating to invasive species and impacts on ecological receptors is provided in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation. As noted, an outline EMP and CoCP has been produced, which contain measures which will be implemented during the construction phase to avoid or minimise the risk associated with invasive species and biosecurity.</p>
RSPB	<p>Preliminary Environmental Information Report: Volume 1: Chapter 3: Project Description Para 3.6.11.5 – the use of HDD for landfall cable laying would be preferable. Para 3.7.1.6 – The RSPB note the maximum installation duration of 30 months and hope that this will allow for suitable scheduling of works to avoid the most sensitive areas at the points of the year when the relevant receptors are present. Para 3.7.1.8 – Please ensure that measures are put in place to manage any reptiles that may enter the trench whilst it is open. This may be a particular issue around Kelling Heath.</p>	I	<p>At the landfall area, Hornsea Three may use HDD or open trenching from Mean Low Water to the Norfolk Coast Path. A decision on which technique to use will be made during detailed design based on further technical information. The assessments presented in this chapter, and in related chapters assess the maximum design scenario for each particular receptor.</p> <p>Although the installation of the onshore cable is expected to take up to 30 months in total, work is expected to progress along the route with a typical works duration of three months at any particular location (see Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description). As such the duration of activities at the most sensitive areas would be significantly less than the maximum installation duration of 30 months, although the exact timing of impacts would be determined during detailed design. Notwithstanding this, mitigation measures for works in sensitive areas will be employed as appropriate (see Table 3.19)</p> <p>The Outline EMP that accompanies the DCO application contains measures to mitigate impacts on reptiles, including ensuring they are protected from risk of injury or death during cabling works that affect areas of reptile habitat.</p>



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>42</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
RSPB	Para 5.1.6.1.4 - The RSPB does not consider that the comments on predicted mortality and the comparative roles of adults, juveniles and non-breeding birds are correct.	I	The contribution of adult, juvenile and non-breeding birds to the population of birds found at Hornsea Three is considered throughout the assessments presented in Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore Ornithology



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>42</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
RSPB	<p>Volume 3: Chapter 3 – Ecology and Nature Conservation Para 3.7.33 – 3.7.35 – The RSPB notes that pink-footed geese foraging near the landfall area will be the main concern. Para 3.7.4.27 – The survey work has identified a significant proportion of the North Norfolk Coast SPA population of pink-footed geese. It will be important to consider appropriate mitigation to maintain the levels of food available to foraging geese. The RSPB is keen that the bird scarers proposed to deter ground nesting birds are not used in areas that could support pink-footed geese in the early part of the potential breeding season (i.e. February as defined in the PEIR) as they could have a wide impact that displaces birds over a large area. Para 3.9.2.6 – There is the potential that SPA and SAC features do not align with the SSSI features. Consequently we consider it is important to ensure that the SPA/SAC features are not taken as representative of the SSSIs. The RSPB recommends a review that demonstrates that the features are aligned, and which highlights where there are differences. In some areas some SSSI features may now be of international importance and we are keen to see this reflected. Table 3.14, page 36, penultimate row (beginning “Where trees, hedgerow or scrub”) – As highlighted in our comments on para 3.7.4.27 above the RSPB does not support the use of bird scarers due to their potential impacts on pink-footed geese. Table 3.15, page 45 – the RSPB are not convinced that the River Wensum SAC and SSSI designations should be treated differently. If the SAC is deemed to be adversely affected then it indicates that significant impacts could also occur to the SSSI. We consider that both could be similarly affected. Section 3.11, Assessment of significance – As more detail is released on the corridor route and final survey reports are released the RSPB will be better placed to comment. The RSPB notes that the measures proposed generally appear to be appropriate, but we consider that there needs to be a focus on net gains to biodiversity as the project continues to be refined as these have had less attention at these earlier stages. Para 3.11.1.174 – Whilst pink-footed geese have been observed in fields with a tractor the situation would be different if people were walking about outside the vehicle. During cable laying it must be assumed that there will be people walking around outside vehicles, and therefore we do not consider that this observation can currently be relied upon in this context. It is possible that further detail on how cables will be laid may help to alleviate our concerns, but we do not consider it appropriate to assess the impact on the basis that all staff will be within vehicles. It is also important to note that if more than one vehicle is present that the displacement effect from vehicles is consequently likely to be greater. Para 3.11.1.175 – It is important to consider what the effect of displacing pink-footed geese from sugar beet fields is likely to be. As discussed at the Onshore Ecology Expert Working Group, we recommend that the planting of alternative sugar beet fields to give displaced pink-footed geese an alternative food source during the winter months. Paras 3.11.1.334 – 341 – The RSPB agrees that the numbers of birds are not high, so we accept that the impacts are likely to be limited. However, we consider that it would be extremely helpful to identify what measures can be put in place after the construction to ensure that the area remains important for birds and can deliver more for the identified species of conservation concern. Para 3.11.1.357 – This paragraph should make it clear that the material to be used for surfacing tracks will be inert. In addition, any run-off from the tracks must be managed to ensure that it does not introduce contamination into water courses – something which will be particularly important around protected sites.</p>	I	<p>Bird scarers will not be employed north of High Kelling in February, and this has been written in to the Outline EMP.</p> <p>The assessment of potential impacts set out in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation, section 3.11 takes into account all activities which would take place, including vehicle movements and pedestrian movements within the working area. Effects on pink-footed goose are set out in section 3.11. Offshore effects on wintering and migratory birds are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 5: Offshore Ornithology: and the Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment (RIAA) which accompanies the DCO application. Opportunities for enhancement as also outlined in volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation.</p> <p>The mitigation measures proposed as part of the onshore elements of Hornsea Three and the assessment of effects for pink-footed geese are provided in Environmental Statement, volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation, sections 3.10 and 3.11, as well as the Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment (A6.5.5.1). Drainage would be installed either side of the Hornsea Three onshore cable corridor to ensure that existing land drainage flow is maintained, altered and channelled by the corridor. Effects on drainage and flood risk were assessed as being of no higher than minor adverse significance. For further details of proposed runoff control measures and the assessment of effects on hydrology refer to Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 2: Hydrology and Flood Risk. Groundwater flows are considered in Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 1: Geology and Ground Conditions, and no effects from cabling or HDD on groundwaters above minor negative adverse significance were identified.</p> <p>Measures to control impacts from construction, including access tracks, are detailed in the Outline CoCP. The Outline EMP and CoCP are provided as part of the DCO application. Final, more detailed, documents will be developed prior to construction.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>42</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>Para 3.11.1.389 – 3.11.1.402 – The RSPB considers that, subject to confirming the specific details in relation to pink-footed geese mitigation, that this approach appears to be appropriate.</p> <p>Para 3.16.1.1 – 3.16.1.5 – The RSPB notes that there will be habitat loss. Although this may only be small areas in any one location, collectively the loss could be significant. The RSPB considers that ways to recreate habitat to provide a net gain for wildlife from the project should be explored.</p> <p>Para 3.16.1.14 – The RSPB considers that further consideration of mitigation for pink-footed geese is required. It is also important that hydrological impacts arising from the scheme are properly considered: currently the hydrological assessment is looking at surface flows, but the big issue could actually be below ground where the cable and trench cut through the soil and potentially also below ground flows, which can be highly important for wetland sites. We consider that the focus on surface flows does not adequately deal with sites such as Booton Common that will be adjacent to the cable route.</p> <p>Para 3.17.1.4 – The RSPB notes that the ecological mitigation measures will form part of the Code of Construction Practice and the Outline Ecological Management Plan that will accompany the final Environmental Statement. The RSPB looks forward to the opportunity to work with DONG on the preparation of these documents to ensure that our concerns about pink-footed geese, and impacts on hydrology and Kelling Heath are addressed.</p>		
RSPB	<p>Volume 5: Annex 5.3 – Collision Risk Modelling The RSPB has set out concerns about the approach to Collision Risk Modelling in our response to Chapter 5 above.</p> <p>Para 1.3.2.2 – The RSPB awaits the outputs of the Offshore Renewables Joint Industry Programme with interest and has been involved with the project from the start, currently sitting on the expert panel that advises it.</p> <p>It is not always clear whether the version of the model used is Band (2012) or Masden (2015). In terms of avoidance rates we welcome the presentation of a range, but as highlighted above in our response to Chapter 5, we would prefer partitioning of different avoidance rates for gannet in breeding season and non-breeding season. We note that the predicted mortalities for gannet and kittiwake match those in table 5.24, but not for gannet in table 5.25.</p> <p>B3.4.4 – The RSPB consider that an acknowledgement that migrating birds are likely to fly higher than those that make up the generic data set would be welcome here. We consider that the avoidance rates presented are appropriate.</p>	I	<p>The Band (2012) collision risk model has been used. This approach was agreed through the Evidence Plan process in which RSPB participate.</p> <p>A range of avoidance rates is presented within Environmental Statement volume 5, annex 5.3: Collision Risk Modelling. The use of avoidance rates in collision risk modelling follows the recommendations of Cook et al. (2014) and JNCC et al. (2014).</p>
RSPB	<p><b>Volume 6:</b> <b>Annex 3.1 – Onshore Ornithology – Wintering Bird Survey Report</b> Subject to the concerns that we have highlighted in relation to pink-footed geese, the RSPB has no further comments on this document.</p>	N	Acknowledged. Environmental Statement, volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation considers potential impacts on ecological receptors as a result of Hornsea Three. This includes potential impacts on species such as Pink-footed Geese.
RSPB	Para 8.7.2.12 – There is a need for PVA for kittiwake.	I	PVA modelling has been considered in the final RIAA
RSPB	<p>Annex 1: HRA Screening Report Para 4.4.1 – for reasons set out above, the RSPB does not agree with the assertion “This overview of the bird data indicates that Hornsea Three does not represent an area of significant importance for breeding, passage or wintering birds.” However, once the RSPB has had the opportunity to consider the full data and our concerns set out elsewhere in this document have been addressed we may be able to agree with this assertion.</p>	I	Noted. A full dataset is included in the final RIAA/ES and associated Annexes

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>42</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
National Grid	<p>Electricity and Gas Transmission infrastructure within / in close proximity to the order boundary</p> <p>Electricity Transmission</p> <p>National Grid Electricity Transmission has high voltage electricity overhead transmission lines, a high voltage substation and high voltage underground cables within the onshore scoping area. The overhead line, substation cables form an essential part of the electricity transmission network in England and Wales.</p> <p>Substation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Norwich 400kV</li> </ul> <p>Overhead Lines</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· 4VV (400kV) overhead line route - Norwich Main to Walpole 1 - Norwich Main to Walpole 2</li> <li>· 4YM (400kV) overhead line route - Bramford to Norwich Main 1- Bramford to Norwich Main 2</li> <li>· PHC (132kV) overhead line - Norwich Main to Trowse 1</li> <li>· PGG (132kV) overhead line - Norwich Main to Trowse 3</li> </ul> <p>Underground Cable</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Norwich Main – PHC001</li> </ul>	N/A	Ørsted acknowledged the relevant locations of the electrical infrastructure and entered into discussions with NGET regarding asset interactions.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>42</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
<p>Edgefield, Bodham, Corpusty &amp; Saxthorpe, Hempstead and Plumstead Parish Councils (and others)</p>	<p>1. Unacceptability of 'phasing' that requires the same sections of cable corridor to be dug up more than once We understand that the current commissioning process for projects of this nature could involve consent being granted to the developers in up to three phases. This would involve the digging up of, what is effectively, the same ground along the entire cable corridor up to three times during the length of the project, adversely affect its economic viability, and unnecessarily delay the upgrading and expansion of the nation's electricity supply. This is clearly a ridiculous waste of money. But more importantly, it means all of the negative consequences of the cable corridor will be multiplied and the long-term damage to the area made significantly worse. The effects relate to traffic, tourism and road safety – and above all, the permanent damage to the natural environment.</p> <p>Whatever route it takes, the cable corridor will inevitably involve disrupting areas of unspoiled natural beauty, habitat loss (hedgerows, hedge margins, meadow, wet and ancient woodland), associated habitat fragmentation and the high potential for water pollution (due to soil and nutrient loss to watercourses). We recommend referring to the report produced by the River Glaven Conservation Group for a detailed and thorough explanation of the many significant environmental issues along the route.</p> <p>Several areas of the proposed cable route are areas of High Landscape Value, as well as being subject to deliberate and managed conservation. There is a wide variety of flora and fauna, even in the most apparently straightforward North Norfolk field, the quality of which can only really be appreciated through year-round observation. North Norfolk hosts a significant amount of wildlife, from barn owls to deer, hares and birds of prey including kestrels, buzzards and kites, as well as rare flora and fauna. The natural conditions which make this area of the UK so suitable for wildlife have been preserved for generations, and are unique in the extent to which they have resisted urbanisation, industrialisation and the ensuing noise, light and atmospheric pollution.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Corpusty &amp; Saxthorpe Parish representatives and landowners adjacent to the proposed site of the crossing of the River Bure and its adjacent water meadows are concerned that these environs receive special attention. To mitigate any environmental impact on these, surrounding ancient hedgerows and a domestic water well it is respectfully requested that HDD under-drilling be utilised for approximately 600m length at an appropriate depth below the base of the water well.</p> <p>The above concerns are all grounds on which to object most strongly to the idea of any such development whatsoever carving a decade-long scar through the landscape. Indeed it is extremely rare for a community as wide and representative as the one made up in the signatories of this letter, to come out cautiously in support of something so catastrophic for the local environment. We are, however, understanding of the need the country has as a whole to develop sustainable sources of alternative energy. But we are also mindful of the need to protect and preserve this beautiful and unique asset for generations to come for the benefit of residents, workers and visitors alike.</p> <p>We are reassured to read that the consultation process will give due consideration to the negative impacts of the development on the natural environment. There must, as part of the granting of consent for this development, be a guarantee that the best modern engineering practices (not just the statutory minima) are adopted to repair the effects of the development on the environment and reinstatement of soil, water, flora, fauna and habitats.</p> <p>Nothing will ever be able to be restored completely: no amount of soil stratification will be able to reinstate the balance of soil that has been known and worked by the people here for generations. Visual reinstatement – itself something that takes years – is only one part of the picture.</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>During the design refinement Hornsea Three has sought to minimise the duration of any disruption, and has reduced the total duration of the construction phase onshore to eight years. Within this, the maximum duration for construction of the onshore cable corridor is approximately 2.5 years, this therefore means that the maximum duration over which construction could occur would be 5.5 years incorporating two phases (assuming a three-year gap between the two phases). The work associated with each phase is expected to progress along the Hornsea Three onshore cable corridor with a typical active construction works duration of three months at any particular location.</p> <p>Through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive ecological receptors. For example, Weybourne Cliffs and Kelling Heath SSSI have been avoided and no direct impacts are predicted on these designated sites from Hornsea Three. Additional mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project are outlined in topic specific chapters, and include the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts on local road networks, ecological receptors (e.g. hedgerows) and hydrological features (e.g. main rivers).</p> <p>Where impacts have not been avoided, these are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement volume 3.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>42</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>To support this development happening at all has taken patience, understanding and significant compromise, but to allow it to happen three times is patently unacceptable. Minimising the number of times the same areas need digging up had the strongest consensus of all issues connected to the cable route: 95% of respondents rated it as 4 or 5 (out of 5) in importance, with standard deviation of just 0.61 across all responses.</p> <p>Everything that stands to be lost by the construction of the onshore component of this project will be significantly worsened if the work along each point of the cable corridor is not carried out once and once only, quickly and efficiently, and the land reinstated thoroughly and permanently. Whether it is within the control of the developers, or something that only Government can change, we will object vociferously and unendingly to any development consent order that is granted without absolute assurance that individual sections of the cable route will not be 'dug up' on more than one occasion. At the very least, alternative ideas should be explored such as laying all ducting in the first phase so that the land does not need to be dug up more than once.</p> <p>We are utterly dedicated and passionate about this aspect of the proposed development, and will defend our land at all costs – as we have done in the past</p>		



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>42</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
<p>Edgefield, Bodham, Corpusty &amp; Saxthorpe, Hempstead and Plumstead Parish Councils (and others)</p>	<p>3. Mitigations of impact of HVAC booster station At present, based on the drawings, descriptions and 3D models we have seen, there are no mitigating measures planned around the construction of the HVAC booster station at Little Barningham and this is simply unacceptable. The potential height on its own would create an eyesore that could significantly undermine the quality of life of people living in, and passing through, the area. Not to mention the noise. There are very few rural services in North Norfolk and precious little economic activity beyond tourism. The quality of life and the beautiful natural environment we enjoy are what people get instead and this could be significantly eroded by the developers' plans if mitigation steps are not put in place. 97% of residents said that improving the natural habitat after construction was finished was "important" or "very important" - the strongest response of all the issues covered and the answer that had the greatest consensus (standard deviation: 0.56). 95% furthermore said that the natural environment has a lot to do with their quality of life.</p> <p>Visual</p> <p>The proposed 12.5m structure will be visible over hundreds of hectares, including from all neighbouring villages, and a significant length of the Holt road. We do not recognize the visualisations we have been shown by the developer based on our local knowledge, and we will undertake experiments ourselves to see the true distance over which the structure as currently planned would be seen. Significant height mitigations should be volunteered by the developer or required as a condition of the order, to reduce substantially the relative height to the extent that it would be similar in size to other aesthetically limited constructions in the local area: only churches remotely approach the height currently proposed. We urge the developers to consider ideas for this – a very small selection of which include: digging out the foundations so the building starts at a lower level; using the soil to create a bank around the construction and planting the scheme with trees.</p> <p>We note the lengthy disclaimers attached to the developer's visualisations and feel they are therefore an ineffective tool to understand the visual impact of the booster station from different viewpoints. Physical demonstrations would be required in order to understand the true visibility of the proposed construction.</p> <p>77% of residents said that ensuring the height of the booster station was kept to a minimum was "very important" and this is an area we hope the developers will consider seriously before making their application - at present no mitigations whatsoever are proposed and this is clearly unacceptable.</p> <p>We have been informed that flood lighting will be needed on site to provide safe working conditions at night in the event of emergency. We accept this, but do not understand why this lighting needs to be motion-sensitive. For the purposes of security we understand remote monitored, motion-sensitive, infrared cameras would be equally effective and request that any flood lighting be manually triggered either remotely or from on-site so as to prevent any eventuality where the night sky in this remote and rural area is illuminated unnecessarily.</p> <p>Noise and vibration</p> <p>Currently the developer proposes noise and vibration mitigation that reduces the noise impact of the booster station to "acceptable levels". We have seen no evidence that these levels are respectful of the fact that, at night in North Norfolk, the environment is virtually absent of any background noise or vibration interference whatsoever. Nor are we confident that background studies have been carried out at sites close to the proposed construction..</p>	<p>I</p>	<p>Information pertaining to the site selection for the HVAC booster station is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives, whilst maximum dimensions are provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description.</p> <p>Through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive ecological receptors. For example, the orientation of the HVAC booster station has been optimised to minimise impacts on nearby field boundaries (hedgerows and trees) as well as maximise natural screening. Additional mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project are outlined in topic specific chapters, and include the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts on local road networks, ecological receptors (e.g. hedgerows) and hydrological features (e.g. main rivers); and landscape planting around the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>42</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>We insist that the required noise and vibration levels within 500m of the proposed booster station are set at the current background levels at those locations on a clear night.</p> <p>We strongly urge the developers to provide detailed noise and vibration mitigation steps as part of their application, rather than leave any doubt whatsoever that the targets will be adequate. If local people are being dragged into a national infrastructure project with no way of knowing what the impact will be, and with no formal powers of recourse, then the enforcement of rights will only be able to be fought for post hoc by residents through protest and inconvenience once the DCO has been granted. It benefits everyone for the precise specification of "acceptable levels" to be disclosed upfront – and at a level that is agreeable.</p> <p>We believe that the available mitigation options should be able to reduce noise and vibration well below statutory levels – and that the extraordinary nature of this development means it is quite appropriate for entirely subjective levels to be set. 96% of residents said that ensuring the booster station couldn't be heard nearby was "important" or "very important", making it the highest rated issue relating to the booster station, and the booster-station related issue whose response had the greatest consensus (standard deviation: 0.67). As it stands, it is still unclear whether the current background noise levels were sampled in appropriate places, or by suitably independent third parties.</p> <p>Decommissioning</p> <p>We seek reassurance from the developers that any potential booster station will be adequately demolished and removed at the end of its working life and the land restored.</p> <p>The HVAC booster station will be of significant and long-term detriment to our area, and our area alone – and the best in class mitigation practices should be deployed, however costly. For the avoidance of doubt, our proposal in point two above should require the cost comparison to be inclusive of the cost of mitigations to the booster station in the case of HVAC</p>		
River Glaven Conservation Group (RGCG) and CPRE Norfolk	<p>OVERVIEW ON KEY ISSUES</p> <p>The RGCG and CPRE Norfolk made separate submissions to the Phase 1B consultation, and also verbal input prior to that at the 'roadshow' events. The RGCG did so from the remit of enhancing and protecting the Glaven and its catchment, and CPRE from a wider remit with landscape being the main issue. However we have felt for some time that wildlife and landscape go hand-in-hand. This is particularly so in the context of a river valley and the catchment area, which have the key role in a wider ecological network, and so now make a joint submission. The reason is well expressed by Brendan Joyce, Chief Executive of the Norfolk Wildlife Trust when he said in the preface to the CPRE Norfolk policy document A Vision for Norfolk (July 2017):</p> <p>The county is famous for its wildlife and habitats and extremely rich in its biodiversity, but so much of it is rare and endangered and confined to isolated, fragmented nature reserves. It is not enough to protect what is there from growing threats. Its future survival depends on us taking a more landscape approach to its conservation and this means creating more space for wildlife and repairing broken ecological networks.</p> <p>It is only in recent years that we have realised the potential of the restoration of farmland ponds in repairing a key part of this network, particularly those on a watershed between the two river systems and this work was initiated on the Glaven-Bure catchment 'boundary'. Such an area, particularly if sited on a watershed, can be the weakest link in ecological network. Our experience shows us that rivers and aquatic habitats can, with the appropriate restoration techniques, regain their wildlife in a relatively short space of time. We attach as evidence on this point the RGCG Strategy 2016-20 to illustrate this; also what we now see as the greatest threats, arable run-off and invasive species. A recent RGCG Newsletter Autumn 2016 contains an article on the ponds work, and Spring 2017 on the Dong project at it was at that time.</p> <p>However our most important evidence is a paper written by RGCG members on the Upper Glaven Ecological Network (August 2017) (ATTACHED IN EMAIL) and is the result of many years of experience. However this remains an ongoing exercise, and we expect to contribute further on this and other topics throughout the whole Project Three timescale.</p>	I	<p>Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive ecological receptors.</p> <p>Potential impacts which remain on ecological receptors are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation. This assessment considers the interactions between the project and ecological receptors, and is informed by the relationship between hydrogeology, hydrology and water-dependant habitats which are described in the Hydrological Characterisation Note which forms Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 2.4. This approach was discussed and agreed with the onshore ecology expert working group which comprised Natural England, the Wildlife Trust, Environment Agency and the RSPB amongst others.</p> <p>Potential impacts on landscape and visual resources are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources.</p> <p>The interaction between landscape and ecological receptors is acknowledged and addressed through cross-referencing between the outline landscape management plan and the outline ecological management plan (both of which form part of the DCO application). For example, restoration of hedgerows, currently in poor condition, provides an opportunity to achieve long term benefits for the biodiversity associated with this habitat type as well as gap up hedgerows providing landscape and visual mitigation.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>42</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
River Glaven Conservation Group (RGCG) and CPRE Norfolk	<p>The 2008 Core Strategy of North Norfolk District Council refers to the importance of the North Norfolk Chalk rivers at Policy EN 9 on Biodiversity, and has a six page appendix B devoted to the ecological network, thanks to the good acceptance of the input of the Norfolk Wildlife Trust. In our view however the importance of this is still underplayed in the national planning system, in which there is a lack of connectivity. The planning system compartmentalises landscape and wildlife; and in wildlife there is a separation between habitats and species. There is a lack in consideration of the overall importance of the ecological network and how it embraces the component parts. Clearly Dong Energy has to evaluate impacts and mitigation options arising from their development within the existing planning framework. However we would hope that Dong might be 'ahead of the game', and provide an overlay on the importance of the ecological network, and this might influence how they assess the effects and impacts' significance in the range from negligible to minor, and moderate adverse to major adverse. If that is a step too far in the present Environment Impact Assessment framework, then still apply in practice to what is considered to be appropriate mitigation measures to be taken, and do all possible to apply the best possible.</p> <p>We could add further in support of this that the compartmentalisation extends to considering each impact event and fails to assess the cumulative impact across the whole length of the project. To put it crudely but illustrate the point, there is a need to completely avoid the potential territory of death by a thousand cuts and backfill. So we urge a 'generous' approach to mitigation measures all along the cabling route, especially where it is within an important ecological corridor. The most important mitigation technique is the use of horizontal direct drilling, but at present the Glaven headwaters are only in the 'second league' of sites. We fully realise that Hornsea Project Three is a complex, massive and expensive project; and that open trench will be the norm, and that there is no transmission loss by cabling up a hill rather than going through by direct drill. We are of course aware also that the cabling route is designed to avoid sites of the highest nature conservation (and identified farmland ponds). We ask however that the use of HDD is given careful consideration in aquatic based an ecological network; and where there are important features such as hedgerows, woodland strips and meadows of wildlife value. In the context we add that it may be up to a decade between start and finish of the whole project and all cut and backfill work is completed.</p>	I	<p>Potential impacts which remain on ecological receptors are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation. This assessment considers the interactions between the project and ecological receptors, and is informed by the relationship between hydrogeology, hydrology and water-dependant habitats which are described in the Hydrological Characterisation Note which forms Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 2.4. This approach was discussed and agreed with the onshore ecology expert working group which comprised Natural England, the Wildlife Trust, Environment Agency and the RSPB amongst others.</p> <p>Impacts from Hornsea Three on ecological and hydrological features, including hedgerows, trees (including woodlands) and sensitive watercourses has been avoided where possible through commitments to use trenchless technologies such as Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD). Further details are provided in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation as well as the Outline Ecological Management Plan which form part of the DCO application.</p>
River Glaven Conservation Group (RGCG) and CPRE Norfolk	<p>In our previous verbal and Phase 1B comments we stressed the importance of sediment not entering the river system. A HVAC booster station at Hempstead, thankfully now set aside, would it seems only been concerned about the sediment levels at Holt Lowes, an SAC site just downstream from an entry point. We hope that this was just as a monitoring point, as of course all sediment (and associated chemical contaminant) moves downstream over time and effects all the in-river habitat and ultimately the coastal lagoon which is also an SAC.</p> <p>Turning to protected species, the Glaven is vital for the native white-clawed crayfish, and we consider this requires a greater consideration when looking at the wider situation. The battle for the long term future of its survival seems to have been lost in the Bure, Wensum and Tud. There still remains a 'clean' and healthy population from Letheringsett mill upstream to the Glaven headwaters. Translocations to other sites elsewhere, where neither the native or invasive Signal crayfish is present, have been made with 'balanced' population taken from the middle reaches of the Glaven.</p> <p>There is a considerable focus on the great crested newt, which is fortunately relatively common in North Norfolk, and can be quick to colonise a restored farmland pond. Such ponds are quick to come back to life with a wide range of species, including aquatic plants, invertebrates, dragonflies and insects, amphibians; and a local concentration of farmland birds, and other such as the swallow. There may a return of fish, most notably the native crucian carp. In addition there is the wider function of the benefit to the ecological network as discussed above, the stepping stones across a fragmented countryside.</p>	I	<p>Mitigation measures have been identified for the creation of preferential pathways to minimise the generation of silt and prevent runoff entering the watercourses. These measures are set out in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 1: Geology and Ground Conditions. volume 3, chapter 2: Hydrology and Flood Risk as well as in the Outline CoCP which forms part of the DCO application. Measures include a commitment to prepare Pollution Prevention and Emergency Response Plans.</p> <p>Impacts on protected species as well as associated habitats are included within Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>42</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
River Glaven Conservation Group (RGCG) and CPRE Norfolk	<p>Finally on this overview we wish to place to record that we welcome the decision following the Phase 1B consultation to set aside the Hempstead and Pond Hills site for the location of a HVAC booster station. This was a great relief to us, particularly for the Hempstead site which had a high potential for damage to the Glaven, during construction and in operation, and have a severe impact in the landscape. We do understand why many people have a great concern on a booster station, and these are foremost in terms of profile; and understandably due to the complexity and much less obvious the types of damage that can be done but unseen.</p> <p>We add that, as said in the previous response, the selected Little Barningham site is also in attractive and unspoilt countryside, but the contours and woodland on two sides offer more opportunity for screening and other mitigation techniques. The most desirable approach would be of course the use of HVDC and avoid the need for a booster station. We return to this issue later in this document.</p>	I	Noted. Further information pertaining to the alternative locations considered for the HVAC booster station is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Alternatives.
River Glaven Conservation Group (RGCG) and CPRE Norfolk	<p>SPECIFIC COMMENTS ON THE NON-TECHNICAL SUMMARY:</p> <p>The Non-Technical Summary makes a very useful overview, but also a 'way in' to reading the specialist chapters, which go in to considerable detail and length on a wide range of topics; and provide an overview of the specialist topics of particular interest. We make some comment on N-TS by referring to the numbered paragraph. We look to be brief and pick on points where we might either want to just note, support what we say above, and/or come back to later in the consultation process. We do this also with the ecology and nature conservation chapter, and the landscape chapter. We start with the NTS, and work down in order of paragraph number, and quote in full, abbreviate or paraphrase what Dong say to relate to the point we wish to make, or just note.</p> <p>3.5.1.1: The two primary transmission types are HVAC and HVDC for off-shore windfarms; the UK has traditionally used HVAC. With interconnectors between countries HVDC will become more technically and/or economically viable as such are used on a number of projects in Germany. We assume there are more problems in connecting the UK to a wider European system. We understand the need for Dong to take both systems through all planning stages, but hope by then they will be in a position to use HVDC. We also assume that as wind energy is more variable and less predictable than 'conventional' energy production, there is a greater need and opportunity for flexibility to 'chase' demand if inter-connection between countries is widespread.</p> <p>4.9.1.1: We note and welcome the statement: Hornsea Three will continue to develop and refine the project as it progresses towards a final application to Development Consent and beyond as it moves towards construction. The process will be informed by further stakeholder engagement and interpretation of the outputs from ongoing engineering, commercial and environmental investigations.</p> <p>5.1.1.1: In discussing the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Methodology dealing with the construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning of the project we have: Where significant effects are predicted, where possible it identifies mitigation to reduce the significance of these effects where that is practicable. The bold emphasis is ours, as this seems unduly negative in relation to what we say above. The technical term significant as associated with an EIA requires it must be determined in the Environmental Statement, but an issue deemed to be below this level gets less scrutiny. The word 'practicable' is capable of being interpreted in a range of ways, and can be taken as reluctance to deal with anything less than moderate/major adverse adverse significant.</p>	I	<p>This response is noted.</p> <p>In respect to the comments made, through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive ecological receptors. Potential impacts which remain on ecological receptors are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation. This assessment considers the interactions between the project and ecological receptors, and is informed by the relationship between hydrogeology, hydrology and water-dependant habitats which are described in the Hydrological Characterisation Note which forms Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 2.4. This approach was discussed and agreed with the onshore ecology expert working group which comprised Natural England, the Wildlife Trust, Environment Agency and the RSPB amongst others.</p> <p>Mitigation measures have been identified to the creation of preferential pathways for groundwater flow, minimise flood risk, minimise the generation of silt and prevent runoff entering the watercourses. These measures are set out in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapters 1 and 2: Geology and Ground Condition and Hydrology and Flood Risk chapters respectively, as well as in the Outline Code of Construction Practice which forms part of the DCO application. Drainage provisions at the HVAC booster station and HVDC converter/HVAC substation will be further developed during detailed design in agreement with the Norfolk County Council as LLFA.</p> <p>The Glaven Valley Conservation Area is considered in Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 5.5: Screening Assessment - Onshore HVAC Booster Station, as well as annex 5.1: Desk Based Assessment.</p>



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>42</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>5.4.1.5: We welcome: Onshore surveys taken to date include ecological field surveys (bird, bat, badger, invertebrate and reptile), archaeological desktop and geophysical surveys, baseline noise surveys and landscape and visual assessments.</p> <p>5.4.1.6: We welcome: In addition to the surveys which have already been undertaken, a number of surveys are ongoing (such as aerial surveys of birds and marine animals, and onshore ecological surveys) or are proposed (e.g. geophysical survey of the nearshore extent of the Hornsea Three offshore cable corridor) and will inform the EIA presented in the Environmental Statement.</p> <p>5.5.1.1: We welcome: The Hornsea Three assessment uses an iterative approach. This has been employed in order to demonstrate mitigation of project-related impacts. The process of EIA has therefore been used as a means of informing the Hornsea Three design.</p> <p>5.6.1.2: We note: The PEIR sets out all aspects on the environment likely to be significantly affected by the project (as required by the EIA Directive). Only effects in general judged to be of moderate to major significance are 'significant' in EIA terms (where this differs for specific assessments, this is explained within the appropriate PEIR chapters). Where effects are considered significant in EIA terms, this will normally trigger additional analysis, consultation and possibly further mitigation measures, where practicable. When the determining authority makes a decision for consent, it therefore does so in the knowledge of all likely significant effects on the environment. We comment: In this context we include on the latter that this should include an ecological network factor.</p> <p>7.2.1.1: We note: The geology and ground conditions study area comprises of a 1 km buffer around the onshore elements of Hornsea Three. There are three geological SSSI within the search area; Weybourne Cliffs, Weybourne Town Pit, Kelling Heath.</p> <p>7.3.1.3: The hydrology and flood risk study area includes a number of catchments and associated surface watercourses. These include the rivers Yare, Tud, Wensum Bure River Glaven (Gunthorpe Stream). We comment: Gunthorpe Stream is not affected by the cabling route, but is one source of flooding and accompanied by arable run-off. Arable run-off is a major problem within the catchment, including the upper Glaven. We are concerned that this is not exacerbated by open trenching operations.</p> <p>7.3.1.6: The potential use of open cut trenching, Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD) and other site activities, may impact surface water quality due to increases in turbid (murky) run-off, spillages and leaks of fuel, oil etc and an alteration in surface in surface water pathways. With the inclusion of design measures such as the use of HDD at the Landfall the effects of these impacts have been assessed to be of minor adverse significance (not significant in EIA terms). We comment: this may be true for HDD at the Landfall, but in our view is NOT true for open cut trenching, particularly given the heterogeneity of the terrain throughout the Glaven catchment, and the long time that may elapse with excavated soil waiting to be back-filled. Turbid, mucky water contains sediment, as repeated many times a major problem in the Glaven catchment (and many others, not least the Wensum SAC).</p> <p>7.4.1.3: Twenty statutory designated sites, including SSSIs, SACs and Ramsar sites were identified within 2 km of the development, with 126 non-statutory designated sites also identified. The desk top study and site specific surveys indicated the presence of protected or otherwise notable species including bluebell, holly-leaved naiad, sandy stillball, white-clayed crayfish, whorl snail species, common lizard, great crested newt, grass snake, slow worm, breeding birds, wintering birds, migratory birds, badger, otter bats and water vole. We comment: near all are present in the upper Glaven, some in abundance, We will be adding more to this list, and also see the attached paper on the upper Glaven Ecological Network.</p>		



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>42</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>7.4.1.4: There are a number of possible impacts on onshore habitats with the open cut trenching required to install the export cable. The impacts include potential habitat loss, for example in designated sites, hedgerows and sensitive water courses, as well as disturbance to notable species. The significance of the effects of these impacts is assessed to be in the range moderate to major adverse. With the actions quoted it is claimed they would mitigate the effects of impacts on potentially sensitive habitats and species. Therefore, with the proposed mitigation in place the significance of these effects would be reduced to negligible or minor adverse (not significant in EIA terms). We comment: This is a sweeping and ill-considered statement, which generalises a wide number of situations; it would if taken at face value surely see an unacceptable impact on some species, some habitats, and most certainly result in considerable damage to the ecological network that is provided by the Glaven catchment.</p> <p>7.6.1.3: This paragraph relates to the Historic Environment and states that in the cable search area there are 13 scheduled monuments whose settings may be affected by the proposal there are 167 listed buildings, of which seven are listed at Grade I, 23 at Grade II* and 137 at Grade II. Many of these are in the North Norfolk district. There are 11 Conservation Areas, which in North Norfolk are Weybourne, Hempstead, Baconsthorpe Upper Sheringham and Glaven Valley. We comment: This is the only mention we can find of the Glaven Valley Conservation Area in the Dong documentation. It is a very large rural area, designated primarily on landscape grounds, but also the vernacular architecture and cultural associations such as the churches within it. The area is almost as large as the river catchment, and we will propose to the Council that the GVCA boundary of this could be overlain by the ecological network boundary, which essentially is the Glaven watershed boundary. This would recognise and bring together landscape and wildlife, to be incorporated in the Local Plan.</p> <p>7.11.1.2/3 and 4: This relates to the activities of the New Anglia Local Enterprise Partnership (NALEP) and other major developments that might interact with Hornsea Three. There is much activity in Greater Norwich as a Growth Area. As such the Northern Distributor Road (NDR) is to be completed next year. There is a proposal for a Norwich Western Link (NWL) road to take the NDR across the Wensum Valley to the A47 west, on which dualling will start in 2020, and a Food Hub site has been given consent for a site to the west of Easton Village, and the purpose of which is to bolster and justify the county council aspiration for a NWL road. The timescale for any NWL road would be beyond that for Hornsea Three, but the cabling route crosses the A47 and run through the middle of the Food Hub site, the Local Development Order being made within the context of the Greater Norwich Food Enterprise Zone (FEZ) in which the Hub is located.</p>		

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>42</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
River Glaven Conservation Group (RGCG) and CPRE Norfolk	<p>COMMENTS ON ECOLOGY AND NATURE CONSERVATION:</p> <p>3.2.15: We note that the PEIR assessment is based on the wider 200 m wide onshore cable corridor search area which includes the proposed locations for the onshore HVAV booster station and onshore HVDC converter/HVAC substation. The final 80 m wide cable corridor construction area (60 m wide permanent cable corridor) will continue to be refined before being confirmed in the final DCO. It is anticipated that a number of potential impacts identified through this assignment will be mitigated or removed, through the refinement of the onshore cable corridor, particularly where the onshore cable corridor search area currently crosses designated sites. We comment: This 'wriggle room' might be particularly useful for avoiding impact on the restored (and those yet to be restored) farmland ponds in the upper Glaven, proving to be important as a key link in the ecological network.</p> <p>3.3.1.4, Table 3.1, Field surveys undertaken and associated survey area: We note in this list in particular the comments on hedgerows, white-clawed crayfish, great crested newt, bats, otters and water voles. All present in the upper Glaven, see attached Ecological Network document.</p> <p>3.9.1.3 and Table 3.11; and 3.9.2.2 and Table 3.12: We note the impact assessment criteria and definition of terms relating to the sensitivity of the receptor, and the magnitude of the impact. We comment: we agree with the hierarchy order of importance and sensitivity of an international designation (very high), national designation (high), county or regional level (medium), district level (low) and local level (negligible). We comment: BUT this is part of the compartmentalisation issue as all on a wider basis might be part of an ecological corridor, have in that sense a greater importance than when done in isolation. In the refinement and mitigation stage of the cabling route this needs to be taken into account.</p> <p>3.10.1.3 and Table 3.14: We welcome the design measures adopted in selecting a cabling route. In particular as a Valued Ecological Receptor (VER) features such as ponds and Local Wildlife Sites (LWSs); these have been avoided where possible; likewise standard trees. Also as a pre-construction measure the surveys of ponds; where a trenchless installation across a water course will be undertaken where water voles, Desmoulin's whorl snail, white-clawed crayfish and/or otters have been recorded. On construction methods that the landfall cable installation may be by trenchless method beneath Weybourne Cliffs SSSI, we assume by HDD.</p> <p>Table 3.14 continued to page 38: There are two lists where measures to minimise the potential for pollution incidents, and options for trenchless installation. The first lists places where they are identified, seven in all and include the rivers Wensum, Tud and Bure, and associated water bodies. The second list of four locations are being considered and may be identified following the completion of species survey, and include Kelling Heath SSSI and River Glaven head waters and tributaries. We urge that these should be 'promoted'. The first because heather is difficult if not impossible to regenerate following an open cut and backfill; it forms part of an area where much effort has been taken to restore heathland also at nearby at Salthouse, Wiveton Downs and Holt Lowes. There is an impact on Landscape as well as species, and in addition to being much walked they are part of the North Norfolk tourism 'offer'. On the Glaven headwaters, and at the risk of repeating a mantra, we would argue for the central role in the ecological corridor, and that the numbers of protected species would out-compete the other three rivers, albeit not well recognised.</p> <p>3.11.1.3/3.11.1.4: Weybourne Cliffs are mentioned again, and notes that they are designated SSSI for its geological features, and about 1.8 ha of the land falls within the Ecology and nature conservation area. We comment: this is helpful reminder of in depth on one topic but segregation of others, including landscape and tourism interests. On a specific point, the sand martin colony does need checking ahead of construction. After many years of being located under the Coastguard Cottage, some 3-4 years ago they moved to about 1 km to the east.</p>	Y	<p>Impacts on protected species as well as associated habitats are included within Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation. This assessment considers the interactions between the project and ecological receptors, and is informed by the relationship between hydrogeology, hydrology and water-dependant habitats which are described in the Hydrological Characterisation Note which forms Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 2.4. This approach was discussed and agreed with the onshore ecology expert working group which comprised Natural England, the Wildlife Trust, Environment Agency and the RSPB amongst others.</p> <p>Hornsea Three has committed to use HDD at all EA main rivers and a majority of tributaries. A full list of crossing, and the methodologies proposed are provided in Environmental Statement volume 4, annex 3.5: Crossing Schedule (onshore).</p> <p>It is noted that since the PEIR, refined route at landfall has been identified (western re-route around Kelling) and the area identified for landfall works has reduced. This was informed by a number of factors including community feedback in the area of Kelling and Weybourne, avoidance of the Kelling Heath SSSI/CWS and Holiday Park as well as engineering/technical considerations.</p> <p>Appropriate mitigation measures for visual disturbance are outlined in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources. This includes, for example, the restoration of habitats (including hedgerows) which cannot be avoided and landscape planting around the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>42</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>3.11.1.5: Kelling Heath returns with a statement that 5.2 ha of heathland habitat falls inside the onshore cable corridor, which is 5.2% of the SSSI. Then we have: Although restoration would be put in place, restoration of heathland is not guaranteed and can take many years to succeed. In addition the maximum design scenario would involve three separate trenching operations over an 11 year period, and it is considered that heathland restoration would not succeed except potentially in the very long term given the repeat disturbance that would result in this scenario. We comment, and make some general points here: Much effort has been put in to extend precious habitat, such as heathland, and we should not be reversing this by knocking lumps off in some places. Further the EIA 'system' rightly takes a view as a safety net that the impact of a maximum dimension should be considered as a scenario. However an 11 year vacuum in many situations would be ruinous, not least by some pernicious weeds (as defined by Defra) such as thistles; but also invasive plant species such as Himalayan Balsam, which on the Glaven the RGCG spend much time seeking to eradicate. There is also a major issue on many and various individual sites of sediment run-off. Should you wish to visit an area already badly affected by Himalayan Balsam, then visit the Wensum or Bure; the same applies there for arable run-off, and near extinction of the white-clawed crayfish. The EU Habitat Regulations state that a development for a river such as the SAC Wensum should not make matters worse than the already are. The same principle should apply to our other Chalk Rivers. The Water Directive Framework seeks to improve the ecology status of all our rivers, those affected by the development are described as moderate condition, except the Bure classified as poor.</p> <p>There are other paragraphs that we have 'marked up', but to comment would become repetitive and unnecessary as regards ecology and nature conservation; and some have appeared in the N-TS section. For this and the Landscape Chapter we will respond again at the next consultation step, and in addition likely to submit further information on the Glaven for species and habitats in the context of the ecological network.</p>		
Swannington with Alderford and Little Witchingham Parish Council	<p>Alderford Common SSSI This is a nationally-important site and at present the wider planned route area impinges on a corner of the Common. As the owners of the Common we want the route to avoid this area: please confirm that this is possible. You have confirmed to me that you are in communication with local landowners directly affected.</p>	Y	Through the route refinement process, the Hornsea Three now avoids direct impacts on the Alderford Common SSSI.
Natural England	<p>Section 3.2 Ecology and Nature Conservation Key Concerns The issues highlighted above in terms of hydrology are intrinsically linked to the impact on ecology and need to be clearly recognised as such.</p>	I	<p>Potential impacts from Hornsea Three on hydrology receptors have been assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 2: Hydrology and Flood Risk. Impacts to associated habitats are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation.</p> <p>The relationship between hydrogeology, hydrology and water-dependant habitats are described in the Hydrological Characterisation Note which forms Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 2.4.</p>
Natural England	<p>Section 3.2 Ecology and Nature Conservation Key Concerns The integrity of internationally designated sites and European protected species extends beyond site boundary to habitats and features which support the site function and species population. Impacts on catchments, functionally linked habitats and corridors are therefore relevant and should be considered more explicitly.</p>	I	Impacts on ecology and nature conservation, including designated sites and protected species, are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>42</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Natural England	Section 3.2 Ecology and Nature Conservation Key Concerns The PEI recognises that 'at this stage of the assessment process, it is not possible to assess effects as the extent, location and ecological value of species are not known and therefore determining magnitude of impact, sensitivity of receptor and hence significance of impact cannot be carried out.' Natural England agrees that without these data sets it is not possible to carry out an impact assessment. Sufficient evidence to support the EIA process will have to be presented in full in the Environmental Statement.	I	Environmental Statement volume 6, annexes 3.1 - 3.14 report on the full suite of ecological baseline surveys undertaken to inform the assessment of impacts on ecology and nature conservation as reported in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation.
Natural England	Section 3.2 Ecology and Nature Conservation Key Concerns We note that it is planned to include biosecurity measures in the EMP and Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) at the Environmental Statement stage. However, Natural England is concerned that no consideration is given in the present Ecology and Nature Conservation chapter to impacts of invasive non-native species and disease on ecology and protected species. The movement of people and equipment between sites could spread disease and invasive species. Appropriate biosecurity and work phase planning will be needed to avoid the risk of spreading disease and invasive species into areas currently free or at low risk from these. This is particularly important with white clawed crayfish and crayfish plague where the works cover refuge populations of white clawed crayfish as well as areas where signal crayfish and crayfish plague are present. More widely all plant and animal diseases and invasive species should be surveyed for and measures put in place to prevent their spread and where possible eradication from work areas. There is likely to be a similar issue around agricultural pests and diseases. Therefore it is very important that an invasive species protocol is included in the Environmental Statement.	I	Impacts relating to invasive species and impacts on ecological receptors is provided in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation. As noted, an outline EMP and CoCP has been produced, which contain measures which will be implemented during the construction phase to avoid or minimise the risk associated with invasive species and biosecurity.
Natural England	Section 3.2 Ecology and Nature Conservation Key Concerns The impact extent, duration and reversibility of the works on protected sites and species is not certain and should not be assumed without appropriate survey results and site and activity specific monitoring and mitigation details.	I	Impacts on designated ecological/nature conservation sites are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation.
Natural England	3.2.1 Vol. 3 Chapter 3 – Ecology and Nature Conservation 3.7.4.35 Please be aware that intentional displacement and deterrence of water voles by habitat management, even temporarily, is a licensable activity.	I	Impacts on water voles are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation. It is noted that intentional displacement and deterrence of water voles is a licensable activity, the need for a licence in respect to Hornsea Three will be determined during the detailed design phase.
Natural England	3.2.2 Vol. 3 Chapter 3 – Ecology and Nature Conservation 3.11.1.232 White clawed crayfish and other aquatic species: 'HDD is unlikely to significantly affect white-clawed crayfish from either direct habitat loss or disturbance during HDD operations.' We accept this in a strictly limited context but the impacts of sediment generated from any aspect of the works, including launch and exit pits and vehicle routes, entering watercourses is likely to negatively impact on White Clawed Crayfish habitat and that of other aquatic invertebrates that support much of the fish and other wildlife populations.	I	Impacts on white clawed-crayfish and other aquatic species are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation. As noted, an outline EMP and CoCP has been produced, which contain measures which will be implemented during the construction phase to avoid or minimise the impacts on watercourses along the onshore cable corridor route.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>42</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Natural England	<p>3.2.3 Vol. 3 Chapter 3 – Ecology and Nature Conservation Table 3.14, top row p.36 Specific reference to: 'Where considered necessary by the ECoW...' Temporary Amphibian Fencing (TAF) is used to act as a barrier to movements of great crested newts in their terrestrial phase. This includes preventing newts from reaching an area subject to potentially harmful construction activities. Its use normally requires a licence for the following reasons: - Deliberately interfering with newt movements in this way may constitute disturbance and could therefore be an offence. - The installation of TAF could cause disturbance or result in other offences. - If the TAF obstructs access to places used for shelter or protection, this could also be an offence. Given that TAF would normally only be erected where there is a reasonable likelihood of encountering great crested newts, fence installation would be deemed a deliberate intervention and as would be considered a licensable activity.</p>	I	Impacts on great crested newts are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation. The need for a licence in respect to Hornsea Three will be determined during the detailed design phase.
Natural England	<p>3.2.4 Vol. 3 Chapter 3 – Ecology and Nature Conservation Table 3.14, p. 37 'Further details of measures relating to pollution prevention will be described in the outline CoCP Measures will include the provision of a pollution incident response plan and a drainage management plan to minimise potential pollution effects.' These details will be required to comment further on this aspect of the works.</p>	I	Further details on pollution prevention measures are set out in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 2: Hydrology and Flood Risk, as well as the outline CoCP which forms part of the DCO application.
Natural England	<p>3.2.5 Vol. 3 Chapter 3 – Ecology and Nature Conservation Table 3.14, p. 38 Although it is appreciated that it is stated that the 'NE method statement will be adhered to', it is not made clear in these sections (as it is with other species) whether a licence is intended to be applied for. Please see below the activities which would be licensable: - Intentionally capture, kill or injure water voles; - damage, destroy or block access to their places of shelter or protection (on purpose or by not taking enough care); - disturb them in a place of shelter or protection (on purpose or by not taking enough care); - possess, sell, control or transport live or dead water voles or parts of them (not water voles bred in captivity) Please note that there is a class licence that enables spring displacement (15 Feb-15 Apr) but an individual licence (or project licence) would be required for autumn displacement (15 Sept-31 Oct).</p>	I	Impacts on ecological receptors are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation. The need for licences in respect to Hornsea Three will be determined during the detailed design phase, in consultation with Natural England.
Natural England	<p>3.2.6 Vol. 3 Chapter 3 – Ecology and Nature Conservation 3.11.1.192 Natural England believes that badgers are relatively tolerant of moderate levels of noise and activity around their setts and that low or moderate levels of apparent disturbance at or near to badger setts do not necessarily disturb the badgers occupying those setts. As such, we do not believe that such levels of apparent disturbance around setts require a licence under section 10 of the Act. The requirement for a licence should therefore be assessed on the predicted level of disturbance which development works would cause, rather than the distance it occurs from an active sett.</p>	I	Impacts on ecological receptors, including badgers, is assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation. This chapter also sets out specific mitigation identified to avoid or minimise impacts on badgers.



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>42</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Natural England	<p>3.2.7 Vol. 3 Chapter 9 – Air Quality 9.12.1.15 Without sight of the controls referred to in 9.12.1.15 it is not possible to comment other than to say dust is not only a potential issue in itself but also may carry nutrients and pollutants, similarly to runoff as described above. This could have greater impact on ecological receptors than the dust per se and this should be recognised. Where dust settles it will have the potential to run off into watercourses with impacts as for run off, but potentially away from any mitigation or monitoring and so onsite control, including all exposed soils, will be vital.</p>	Y	<p>As part of the project design process, several designed-in measures have been proposed to reduce the potential for air quality impacts, including dust. These are outlined in Environmental Statement, volume 3, chapter 9: Air Quality and include the development of a Dust Management and Monitoring Plan, a process for communicating with the local community, regular site visits and inspections to monitor dust and standard site maintenance.</p> <p>Potential impacts associated with dust are assessed in Environmental Statement, volume 3, chapter 9: Air Quality. This concludes that there would be no significant effects in relation to air quality as a result of Hornsea Three.</p> <p>Measures to minimise the settling of dust and to prevent runoff entering watercourses are set out in the Outline Code of Construction Practice which forms part of the DCO application, and includes a commitment to prepare Pollution Prevention and Emergency Response Plans.</p>
Natural England	<p>3.2.8 Vol 6 Annex 3.1 – Wintering Birds General comment Natural England agrees that overwintering pink footed goose should be considered further in the EIA and HRA and advises that possible mitigation measures such as working window and crop rotation could be potential mitigation measures.</p>	I	<p>Environmental Statement, volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation and the Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment consider potential impacts on ecological receptors as a result of Hornsea Three. This includes potential impacts on species such as Pink-footed Geese.</p>
East Carleton & Ketteringham Parish Council	<p>The parish council has concerns about trees that may be in the cable corridor and particularly old established oaks. Avoid the destruction of trees and respect any tree protection orders in place</p>	I	<p>Impacts from Hornsea Three on ecological features, including hedgerows and trees (including woodlands) has been avoided where possible through commitments to use trenchless technologies such as Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD). We recognise that protection and sensitive restoration of hedgerows and trees is important to minimise any negative impact on biodiversity or landscape.</p> <p>The replacement of hedgerows at the end of the construction phase to be undertaken will ensure there is no net loss of hedgerow habitat as a result of Hornsea Project Three. Furthermore, restoration of hedgerows, currently in poor condition, provides an opportunity to achieve long term benefits for the biodiversity associated with this habitat type. Further details on hedgerow removal, retention and replacement can be found in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation as well as the Outline Ecological Management Plan and the Outline Landscape Management Plan which form part of the DCO application.</p>
East Carleton & Ketteringham Parish Council	<p>The visual impact should be mitigated as far as possible and screening considered to soften the effect on the rural landscape in which it will be constructed. Also consider the impact on the vista from the A47. consider the impact on neighbouring properties and respect the rural environment and impact on wildlife</p>	I	<p>Appropriate mitigation measures for visual disturbance are outlined in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources. This includes, for example, the restoration of habitats (including hedgerows) which cannot be avoided and landscape planting around the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.</p> <p>Impacts on sensitive residential and ecological receptors are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3).</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>42</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Swardeston Parish Council	<p>Substation - 1 The siting of such a large structure so close to a residential area is undesirable. Is there any opportunity to challenge the decision of the National Grid to require Dong Energy to connect Hornsea Project Three to the Norwich Main substation? 2 Has Dong energy exhausted all alternatives before determining the precise site location for the substation? 3 Why is the onshore substation not being built adjacent to, and to the South of, the existing Norwich Main substation? This site has direct vehicular access off the A140 and is as removed, if not more removed, from existing residential developments as the proposed site. 4 The proposed substation is an immensely high structure. Has Dong Energy considered acquiring a portion of the Mangreen quarry site so as to be able to construct the substation at least partially below ground level? This site would have direct access off the A140 and A47 and the added benefit of almost totally screening the finished substation by a combination of building below ground and planting around the circumference. 5 Whatever the precise location of the substation site, we believe that access to the site should be directly from the A47 (or the A140-A47 slip road), at least for HGVs and "abnormal loads" and preferably for ALL traffic. The B1113 already fails to meet the needs of pedestrians and cyclists and will struggle to cope with the proposed increase in traffic. It is already gridlocked in places at certain times of day, especially at its junction with the A140. 6 The B1113 north of the A47 underpass has a recent history of flooding in heavy rain, with the majority of that flooding caused by water run-off from the field in which the proposed substation is to be sited. Is Dong energy aware of this historic issue and can users of the road be assured that sufficient drainage will be put in place in order to avoid any increased likelihood of these flooding events? 7 How does Dong Energy intend to alleviate any noise and light pollution consequent upon the construction and operation of the substation? 8 Dong Energy representatives have indicated that substantial tree planting will take place to reduce the visual impact of the substation. The proposed site already contains a number of ancient hedgerows and mature trees. Will Dong Energy be taking all necessary steps to ensure that these trees and hedges are protected, both for the sake of their existing ecology and for the immediate screening effect they will have on the finished substation? 9 Given the height of the proposed structure, we believe that 'bundling' the substation and planting along the crest will not of itself significantly reduce its visibility since most native tree varieties are relatively slow growing. Accordingly, we believe that, wherever possible, planting of semi-mature trees should commence immediately, not only around the boundaries of the site but also in other more distant areas where there is anticipated to be line of sight visibility of the substation. 10 Again, given the height of the structure, will Dong Energy be giving consideration to entering into agreements with mobile telephone network operators to enable mobile phone masts to be placed on the substation so as to improve reception in the area? 11 What assurances will Dong Energy give that Parishioners will not suffer financially from the decision to site the substation in the Parish? Clearly some Parishioners will have their homes permanently blighted such that they will become unsaleable. Many others however will find that their properties are reduced in value. For most people, their homes are an important part of their retirement planning. Any loss of value will have serious financial repercussions. How is Dong Energy planning to address this? 12 We understand that Dong Energy has previously established community funds to compensate the community as a whole for the inconvenience suffered during the construction process and whilst the substation is in operation. We have noted the sums being made available by Dong Energy through Grantscape in connection with the Race Bank and Hornsea Project One offshore windfarms. How have these sums been calculated? 13 The Race Bank and Hornsea Project One compensation schemes appear to have been established to compensate communities over a wide area on the basis, presumably, that they are all adversely affected over the long term through sight of the wind turbines. This will not be the case with the Hornsea Project Three.</p>	I	<p>Environmental Statement, volume 3, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives sets out the process of identifying a grid connection location.</p> <p>The aim of the grid connection option appraisal was to identify the most economic and efficient design option for the connection of a project. Although both National Grid and Orsted input into the appraisal process (in respect to economic and strategic factors), the eventual grid connection offer is determined by National Grid. In May 2016, Hornsea Three was formally offered a grid connection at Norwich Main Substation as a result of this appraisal process.</p> <p>Information pertaining to the site selection for the HVAC booster station and HVDC converter/HVAC substation is also provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives.</p> <p>Through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive ecological receptors. For example, the orientation of the HVAC booster station has been optimised to minimise impacts on nearby field boundaries (hedgerows and trees) as well as maximise natural screening. Additional mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project are outlined in topic specific chapters, and include the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts on local road networks; the restoration of habitats (including hedgerows) which cannot be avoided; and landscape planting around the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.</p> <p>In respect to construction impacts, the Project will ensure that sensitive construction management measures, such as noise, dust and traffic control are implemented where required. These are documented in an outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) and outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP), which accompanies the DCO application.</p> <p>In respect to your final point, Hornsea Project Three will review the interactions of the project, as the proposal is refined and consider an appropriate way to feed benefits back into the local community. However, any decision to establish a community benefit fund for Hornsea Three would be made post financial investment decision (FID).</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>42</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>Since the turbines are well out of sight of land, communities along the cable laying route will only be affected during the relatively brief construction phase. Swardeston alone, with the possible inclusion of the area around the HVAC Booster Station if it is needed, will continue to be affected following the completion of the construction phase by the visual impact and polluting aspects of the continued operation of the substation. Will any community fund either be heavily weighted in favour of this locality, or a separate fund established to compensate Swardeston and its close neighbours. 14 Will Swardeston Parish Council have a leading role in determining how any community funds are distributed?</p>		
<b>Section 42: Local Authorities (prescribed under section 43 of the Act)</b>			
Norfolk County Council	<p>APPENDIX A: Detailed Comments Ecology and Nature Conservation 5.8 (a) The County Council wish to highlight the need for maintaining ecological connectivity throughout the construction phases between the designated sites of Alderford Common SSSI, the River Wensum SAC and the area to the south. This connectivity is particularly important for bats, as there are known bat roosts in the area, including those of Barbastelle bats in the woodland in Morton-on-the-Hill. The County Council would expect that minimal disruption of features used by bats for feeding and commuting would be designed into the construction process. 5.8 (b) The County Council welcomes the detailed consideration of Local Wildlife Sites of county importance (CWS) in the PEIR. The County Council would wish to see Horizontal Directional Drilling used where the cable route crosses three CWS: Low Common CWS, Foxburrow Meadow CWS and Old Hall Meadows CWS, and also where the significance of impacts on habitats have been identified as major or moderate. This is important as maximum design scenario of 11 years means reinstatement might not happen until after that period, and that potentially an area could be impacted three separate times. 5.10 (c) Where the PIER refers to White-clawed Crayfish, it should be noted that Weybourne Beck in the area of the landfall has been used as a relocation site for this species. Surveys will be required and mitigation may be necessary.</p>	Y	<p>Through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including sensitive ecological receptors. For example, Weybourne Cliffs and Kelling Heath SSSI have been avoided and no direct impacts are predicted on these designated sites from Hornsea Three. Additional mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project are outlined in topic specific chapters, and include the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts on local road networks, ecological receptors (e.g. hedgerows) and hydrological features (e.g. main rivers).</p> <p>A full list of crossings, including their methodologies, are provided in Environmental Statement volume 4, annex 3.5: Onshore Crossing Schedule. This identified, so example that all CWSs which are crossed by Hornsea Three are done so using HDD, thus avoiding any direct impacts. Highly sensitive receptors such as the River Wensum SAC are also crossed using HDD.</p> <p>Where it has not been possible to maintain hedgerows, they will be replaced at the end of the construction phase to provide continued connectivity. Furthermore, restoration of hedgerows, currently in poor condition, provides an opportunity to achieve long term benefits for the biodiversity associated with this habitat type. Further details on hedgerow removal, retention and replacement can be found in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation as well as the Outline Ecological Management Plan and the Outline Landscape Management Plan which form part of the DCO application.</p>
Great Yarmouth Borough Council	<p>Policy CS11 of the Great Yarmouth Local Plan Core Strategy confirms that designated nature conservation sites will be conserved and enhanced, and protected species such as the Little Terns should be adequately protected from adverse effects of new development, and where negative effects are unavoidable, suitable measures will be required to mitigate such impact(s). Therefore any potential indirect impacts should be considered and where mitigation measures are necessary, should complement the measures set out in the Council's Natura 2000 Sites Monitoring and Mitigation Strategy.</p>	I	<p>Environmental Statement, Volume 2, Chapter 5 – Offshore Ornithology assesses the potential impact of the project on different bird species, including little tern. This chapter also highlights any necessary monitoring and/or mitigation measures which could prevent, minimise, reduce or offset the possible environmental effects identified in the EIA process. Any mitigation or monitoring proposed will consider relevant policy guidelines and stakeholder advice.</p>
<b>Section 42: Persons with an interest in the land (prescribed under section 44 of the Act)</b>			

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>42</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Sherrill and Gerald Bullimore	<p><b>Mole Orchard Kelling</b> We own a piece of land known as 'Mole Orchard' Kelling Paddocks, [REDACTED]. This land is just 1 1/4 acres plot and is AMENITY AND UTILITY LAND (NOT agricultural). We paid [REDACTED] for it in 2008. In this small plot we have a Log Cabin Summer house. We inhabit this as is necessary. When we have sick animals and wildlife and we have many, and also occupy in the Summer months. We also have an apple and pear orchard of 60 plus trees, a Butterfly garden, a pony paddock and two stables, also chickens and a hen house, a haystore barn and two feed and tack sheds and most importantly a copse of 50 assorted larges trees 30 plus years old and 10 small oaks - 2 small ponds. We have mains water and a water motor (Anglian Water). For the past 9 1/2 years we have tended this small plot which is home too. One rescue pony, Chickens, Birds, Swallows, Yellow Hammers, Blue Tit, Great Tit, finches, thrush (all nesting), Jays, Hawks, Barn Owl, Bats, Butterfly, Painted Lady Red Admiral Brown Peacock, Blue Emperor, Lavender Emperor, Small brown orange moth, Purple dragonfly, crickets. Bees, Bumble Bees (3 species), Black Beetle, Frogs 3 varieties, toads and orange slug, hedgehog various species of mole, fox, deer (that we rehabilitated) and many more species. On the land we also have bluebells, primroses, Bea Orchid, Clover and many wild pasture flower, as we leave the grass long to promote activity. These creatures all come from Kelling Heath which a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) just 50 years from our plot 'Mole Orchard'.</p>	Y	Details of the land parcel and environmental status were noted, including wildlife and proximity to the SSSI. Hornsea Three has now committed to a Horizontal Directional Drill (HDD) to minimise impact to the landowner.
Dr George Carman	<p>Considerations for refining the Corridor down to 80 metres No Hedgerow crossings to be greater than 60 degrees (i.e. to be between 90 degrees to 60 degrees) to minimise impact and preserve ancient hedgerow bio-corridors and scenic amenity of North Norfolk. Offering to replant hedgerows simply does not replace their antiquity.</p>	I	<p>Where possible, Hornsea Three has sought to avoid landscape features (including trees and hedgerows) through cable routing or the use of trenchless technologies.</p> <p>Given the nature of Hornsea Three, there are some hedgerows which cannot be avoided and will be removed to enable construction. Any hedgerows which cannot be avoided will be replaced at the end of the construction phase. Furthermore, restoration of hedgerows, currently in poor condition, provides an opportunity to achieve long term benefits for the biodiversity associated with this habitat type as well as gap up hedgerows providing landscape and visual mitigation. Further details on hedgerow removal, retention and replacement can be found in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation as well as the Outline Ecological Management Plan and the Outline Landscape Management Plan which form part of the DCO application.</p>
Dr George Carman	<p>Comments on areas identified for temporary construction compounds and potential access routes. We are very concerned that the proposed Oulton Construction Compound is some 5 km from the cable corridor invoking much traffic disruption through Itteringham village for access to corridor north of the River Bure and through Corpusty/Heydon village environs for access to the corridor south of the River Bure. We are also concerned on the Environmental impact on ALL North Norfolk access country routes which are predominantly single-lane, high-earth-banked, and hedge-rowed lanes with fragile flora and fauna and have high scenic and antiquity values. We are exceptionally concerned that access to the south of the River Bure crossing at Corpusty will be heaviest at a node immediately south of the river which is on, and in the vicinity of, stakeholder property.</p>	I	<p>Access routes will be required from the nearby road network at various places along the onshore export cable route to access the construction works as well as the various compounds along the route that may be set-up in advance of the cable laying. Vehicle movements will vary depending on their purpose but will include heavy goods vehicles as well as abnormal indivisible loads.</p> <p>However, during construction, temporary haul roads will be installed within the cable corridor to facilitate the movement of construction vehicles to the site and to allow trench excavation to take place. These haul roads will also help minimise interactions with the local road networks.</p> <p>Measures will be implemented to minimise dust, mud and debris associated with the movement of construction vehicles between the compounds and the route, the details of which will be provided in an outline Code of Construction Practice which forms part of the DCO application. Furthermore, prior to the commencement of traffic generating works, a Construction Traffic Management Plan(s) will be agreed with the relevant Local Highway Authority in consultation with the Highways Agency.</p> <p>Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport provides detailed assessment of potential traffic impacts on the local road network.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>42</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Dr George Carman	<p>Comments on proposed construction methods outlined in PEIRS report The PEIRS report provides absolutely NO DETAILS on the proposed crossing of the River Bure and adjacent sensitive water meadows. Family landowner ( ) and other family stakeholders respectfully request that the River Bure is HDD under-drilled from a point south of the disused/dismantled railway to go under</p> <p>(i) railway track site (ii) Heath Road which is a raised approach road to the railway bridge with an elevation of 1-c.4metres (iii) family property ref. including arable pasture/cropping land, precious close house/domestic drinking water well, water meadow, two ponds ( ) and important bio-corridor (iv) River Bure and (v) Approximately 150 metre of water meadow with drainage ditches and 3 types of native bat habitat in treed hedgerow north of the River Bure. Total distance of HDD would be about 600 metres and the stakeholder minimum depth requirement would be 10 metres to be 5 metres below base of house/domestic water well to preserve land/property value, future land use and to obviate any disturbance at Ref. during the construction period. We object to the prospect of the cables being installed in more than one phase. Accordingly, the stakeholders respectfully request that the HDD drilling be completed for all potential future cable by the drilling and placement of all six (6) cable ducts in one phase of operations.</p>	I	<p>Through design refinement, Hornsea Three has committed to using trenchless technologies (e.g. HDD) beneath the River Bure in order to minimise direct impacts on this sensitive receptor. Where possible HDDs have been designed to avoid associated sensitive habitats, informed by the Hydrological Characterisation Note which is provided in Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 2.4.</p> <p>The extent of all HDDs is shown on the Crossing Schedule which forms part of the DCO application.</p>
Dr George Carman	<p>Comments on Surveys and Assessments PEIR states that the ponds at property reference identified as water features reports waterfowl as Absent! This is grossly erroneous. Moorhen, Mallard (and Heron, Swan, Grey Lag Goose, Egyptian Goose and Kingfisher – not all waterfowl sensu stricto) frequent these ponds and have been sighted by stakeholder family hunting/walking parties since 1915 when the land was acquired from .</p>	N/A	<p>Response noted. The quoted pond numbers refer to those in Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 3.5: Great Crested Newt Survey which reports on a survey designed to establish the presence or absence of the Great Crested Newt. 'Absent' for wildfowl in the context of an HSI survey for GCN means 'no waterfowl seen during the HSI inspection'. This is not intended to be used as an indicator of bird presence / absence overall, and is not therefore a comment on the bird populations present at any waterbody or surrounding area. It is noted that both quoted pond numbers refer to ponds which will be HDD'd and therefore impacts on this particular feature would be limited.</p> <p>Environmental Statement volume 6, annexes 3.9 and 3.10 provide a description of the currently baseline in respect to ornithology (wintering, migratory and breeding birds).</p>
Dr George Carman	<p>What is your opinion of the baseline information. It is far too rudimentary and flawed to be of any significance. It is noted that further surveys are recommended by the report.</p>	N/A	<p>Environmental Statement volume 6, annexes 3.1 - 3.14 report on the full suite of ecological baseline surveys undertaken to inform the assessment of impacts on ecology and nature conservation as reported in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation.</p>



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>42</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Dr George Carman	Importance of ancient hedgerows and country lanes	N/A	<p>The cable route has been designed to avoid hedgerows and trees where possible or drill underneath them using HDD. However, the Project will need to remove some trees permanently and temporarily remove some hedgerows along the cable route to allow for cable laying and to enable installation of temporary access tracks. We recognise that protection and sensitive restoration of hedgerows is important to minimise any negative impact on biodiversity or landscape resulting from loss or reduction in hedgerows and in the few instances where a small section of the hedgerow needs to be temporarily removed, it will of course be handled sensitively. The replacement of hedgerows at the end of the construction phase will be undertaken. Furthermore, restoration of hedgerows, currently in poor condition, provides an opportunity to achieve long term benefits for the biodiversity associated with this habitat type as well as gap up hedgerows providing landscape and visual mitigation. Further details on hedgerow removal, retention and replacement can be found in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation as well as the Outline Ecological Management Plan and the Outline Landscape Management Plan which form part of the DCO application.</p> <p>Hornsea Three has also committed to using trenchless technologies on local roads to minimise disruption to local road networks. Impacts on traffic and transport more generally is assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport.</p>
Jill Angela Claudia Margaillan	2. There is a pond and ditch within close proximity (unknown environmental impact)	Y	The land plot has been avoided by the proposed cable route.
Amanda and Joe Cook	We own and use the piece of land known as " Robins Rest", kelling paddocks [REDACTED], amenity and utility , the land backs on to kelling heath an SSSI, the land is left in a wild state as it is inhabited by a large selection of wildlife.	N/A	Details of land and wildlife were noted by Hornsea Three.
Stephen and Sandra Carman	Opinion on EIA Considered as Not Comprehensive It is noted that since the project scope/design is not yet finalised the EIA cannot assure that all issues are addressed.	N/A	<p>The Hornsea Three EIA has employed a maximum design scenario approach, which reflects the Rochdale Envelope approach. This approach allows for a project to be assessed on the basis of maximum project design parameters in order to provide flexibility, while ensuring all potentially significant effects (positive or adverse) are assessed within the EIA. This approach has been taken as it is not possible to provide precise final design details a number of years ahead of the time it will be constructed due to the constantly evolving offshore wind industry. By identifying, and assessing based on the maximum design scenario, it can therefore be concluded that the all issues have been addressed and any impacts will be no greater for any other design scenario.</p> <p>The full details of the EIA methodology are set out in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 5: EIA Methodology.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>42</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Stephen and Sandra Carman	<p>Consideration for refining the Corridor down to 80 metres No Hedgerow crossings to be greater than 60 degrees (i.e. to be between 90 degrees to 60 degrees) to minimise impact and preserve ancient hedgerows, bio-corridors and scenic amenity of North Norfolk. At hedgerow crossings, hedgerow to be dug out and re-planted.</p>	I	<p>The cable route has been designed to avoid hedgerows and trees where possible or drill underneath them using HDD. However, the Project will need to remove some trees permanently and temporarily remove some hedgerows along the cable route to allow for cable laying and to enable installation of temporary access tracks. We recognise that protection and sensitive restoration of hedgerows is important to minimise any negative impact on biodiversity or landscape resulting from loss or reduction in hedgerows and in the few instances where a small section of the hedgerow needs to be temporarily removed, it will of course be handled sensitively. The replacement of hedgerows at the end of the construction phase will be undertaken. Furthermore, restoration of hedgerows, currently in poor condition, provides an opportunity to achieve long term benefits for the biodiversity associated with this habitat type as well as gap up hedgerows providing landscape and visual mitigation. Further details on hedgerow removal, retention and replacement can be found in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation as well as the Outline Ecological Management Plan and the Outline Landscape Management Plan which form part of the DCO application.</p> <p>Hornsea Three has also committed to using trenchless technologies on local roads to minimise disruption to local road networks. Impacts on traffic and transport more generally is assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport.</p>
Stephen and Sandra Carman	<p>Comments on areas identified for temporary construction compounds and potential access routes. We are very concerned that the proposed Oulton Construction Compound is some 5 km from the cable corridor invoking much traffic disruption through Itteringham village for access to corridor north of the River Bure and through Corpusty/Heydon village environs for access to the corridor south of the River Bure. We are also concerned on the Environmental impact on ALL North Norfolk access country routes which are predominantly single-lane, high-earth-banked, and hedge-rowed lanes with fragile flora and fauna. We are exceptionally concerned that access to the south of the River Bure crossing will be heaviest immediately south of the river which is on, and in the vicinity of, stakeholder property.</p>	I	<p>Access routes will be required from the nearby road network at various places along the onshore export cable route to access the construction works as well as the various compounds along the route that may be set-up in advance of the cable laying. Vehicle movements will vary depending on their purpose but will include heavy goods vehicles as well as abnormal indivisible loads. However, during construction, temporary haul roads will be installed within the cable corridor to facilitate the movement of construction vehicles to the site and to allow trench excavation to take place. These haul roads will also help minimise interactions with the local road networks.</p> <p>Measures will be implemented to minimise dust, mud and debris associated with the movement of construction vehicles between the compounds and the route, the details of which will be provided in an outline Code of Construction Practice which forms part of the DCO application. Furthermore, prior to the commencement of traffic generating works, a Construction Traffic Management Plan(s) will be agreed with the relevant Local Highway Authority in consultation with the Highways Agency.</p> <p>Environmental Statement volume 3, Chapter 7: Traffic and Transport provides detailed assessment of potential traffic impacts on the local road network, whilst impacts on ecological receptors are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>42</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Stephen and Sandra Carman	<p>Comments on proposed construction methods outlined in PIERS report The PIERS report provides absolutely NO DETAILS on the proposed crossing of the River Bure and adjacent sensitive water meadows. Family landowner (██████████) And family stakeholder REQUEST is that the River Bure is HDD under-drilled from a point south of the disused/dismantled railway to go under</p> <p>(i) railway track site (ii) Heath Road which is a raised approach road to the railway bridge with an elevation of 1-c.4metres (iii) family property ref ██████████ including arable pasture/cropping land, precious close drinking water well, water meadow, two ponds and important bio-corridor (iv) River Bure and (v) Approximately 150 metre of water meadow with drainage ditches and 3 types of native bat habitat in treed hedgerow north of the River Bure. Total distance of HDD would be about 600 metres and the stakeholder minimum depth requirement would be 10 metres to be 5 metres below base of house/domestic water well to preserve land/property value, future land use and to obviate any disturbance at Ref ██████████ during the construction period. Furthermore, the stakeholders insist that the HDD drilling be completed for all potential future cable by the drilling and placement of all six (6) cable ducts in one phase of operations.</p>	Y	<p>Through design refinement, Hornsea Three has committed to using trenchless technologies (e.g. HDD) beneath the River Bure in order to minimise direct impacts on this sensitive receptor. Where possible HDDs have been designed to avoid associated sensitive habitats, informed by the Hydrological Characterisation Note which is provided in Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 2.4.</p> <p>The extent of all HDDs is shown on the Crossing Schedule which forms part of the DCO application.</p>
Stephen and Sandra Carman	<p>Comments on Surveys and Assessments PEIR states that the ponds at property reference ██████████ identified as water features ██████████ and ██████████ do NOT have evidence of water fowl. This is grossly erroneous. Moorhen, Mallard (and Heron, Swan, Grey Lag Geese, Egyptian Geese and Kingfisher – not all water fowl sensu stricto) frequent these ponds and have been sighted by stakeholder family hunting/walking parties since 1915 when the land was acquired from ██████████.</p>	I	<p>Response noted. The quoted pond numbers refer to those in Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 3.5: Great Crested Newt Survey which reports on a survey designed to establish the presence or absence of the Great Crested Newt. 'Absent' for wildfowl in the context of an HSI survey for GCN means 'no waterfowl seen during the HSI inspection'. This is not intended to be used as an indicator of bird presence / absence overall, and is not therefore a comment on the bird populations present at any waterbody or surrounding area. It is noted that both quoted pond numbers refer to ponds which will be HDD'd and therefore impacts on this particular feature would be limited.</p> <p>Environmental Statement volume 6, annexes 3.9 and 3.10 provide a description of the currently baseline in respect to ornithology (wintering, migratory and breeding birds).</p>
Stephen and Sandra Carman	<p>What is your opinion of the baseline information. It is far too rudimentary and flawed to be of any significance. It is noted that further surveys are recommended by the report.</p>	N/A	<p>Environmental Statement volume 6, annexes 3.1 - 3.14 report on the full suite of ecological baseline surveys undertaken to inform the assessment of impacts on ecology and nature conservation as reported in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation.</p>
Christopher Bond, Bidwells, on behalf of Evans-Lombe Trust & Great Melton Farms	<p>Alternative Route The alternative route proposed runs to the west of Algarsthorpe Farm House and would cross river meadows in the north, Beech Grove, a mixed wood, principally deciduous with some conifers, and arable land to the south to the Bawburgh Road. Both the original route from the Marlingford/Bawburgh Road and part of the alternative route cross river meadows of significant environmental importance and designated as a County Wildlife Site. together with the River Yare and we, therefore, propose this section of the route should be installed by Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD) to avoid disturbance to the surface. Beech Grove, the wood, is on a slope and, therefore, to prevent significant damage to the trees, this length should also be installed by HDD. To minimise disturbance to Algarsthorpe Farmhouse and buildings, we request that the working width be moved as far as possible westwards within the alternative route corridor (ie to create a buffer between the works and the buildings). It should be noted that one of the arrays serving the ground source heat pump for Algarsthorpe Farmhouse is possibly within the area to be used for the project — care must be taken not to disturb this array.</p>	Y	<p>River and Woodland on alternative route are to be crossed by HDD, the river meadows are also proposed to be included within this HDD. The construction corridor will be situated approximately 40m from Algarsthorpe Farmhouse at the closest point. The location of ground source heat pump is noted, installation of the cables will avoid this if possible or Hornsea Three will reinstate and repair if impacted.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>42</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Christopher Bond, Bidwells, on behalf of C M Watt Residual Trust & The Mackintosh Trust	<p>6. C M Watt Residual Trust / The Mackintosh Trust — Land at Hetherset</p> <p>The land between the Norwich Road and the All road affected by the project is included in a Consortium Agreement with other land in Hetherset and is being promoted for development in the review of the Greater Norwich Local Plan.</p> <p>Hetherset/Little Melton features as a location for growth in all proposed GNDP growth options and it is very likely that additional growth will be allocated to the village(s).</p> <p>We request the cable route runs as shown on the attached Bidwells plan 'F' as coloured orange and hatched black, specifically at the northern end adjacent to the "Heather House" boundary, then adjacent to The Glade, but not within it, and then as shown across Hetherset Racecourse .</p> <p>The area of woodland crosshatched on the plan should be directionally drilled both to avoid damage to the trees and, also, because the deep cutting within the woodland will make open cut installation of the cables extremely difficult.</p> <p>The area of woodland immediately to the north of the All should be crossed by directional drilling or thrust boring in conjunction with the All road crossing to avoid disturbance to an established tree belt screen.</p> <p>It should be noted that the following pipes cross land affected by the project and will need to be taken into consideration.</p> <p>A disused Ministry of Defence Oil pipeline.</p> <p>A gas main.</p>	Y	<p>Details of consortium agreement and potential for development of land noted.</p> <p>The suggested route has been broadly followed, with the exception of a wider set-off from the gas pipeline.</p> <p>The areas of woodland are proposed to be crossed by HDD to avoid impact.</p> <p>The pipeline information is appreciated and has been considered in the route design.</p>
Christopher Bond, Bidwells, on behalf of H G Back Settlement	<p>Trustees of the H G Back Settlement — Land at Hetherset</p> <p>The land crossed by the proposed cable route is included in a Consortium Agreement with other land in Hetherset and is being promoted for development in the review of the Greater Norwich Local Plan.</p> <p>Hetherset/Little Melton features as a location for growth in all proposed GNDP growth options and it is very likely that additional growth will be allocated to the village(s).</p> <p>With reference to the attached Bidwells plan 'G' showing the cable route as it crosses the Settlement Land coloured orange and hatched black, we request this route runs adjacent to The Glade but not within it to minimise any loss of land between the working width and the field boundary to the east.</p> <p>The area of woodland crosshatched on the plan should be directionally drilled both to avoid damage to the trees and, also, because the deep cutting within the woodland will make open cut installation of the cables extremely difficult.</p> <p>It should be noted the following pipes cross the Settlements land affected by this project and will need to be taken into consideration.</p> <p>A disused Ministry of Defence oil pipeline.</p> <p>A gas main.</p> <p>An Anglian Water sewer.</p>	Y	<p>Details of consortium agreement and potential for development of land noted.</p> <p>The suggested route has been broadly followed, with the exception of a wider set-off from the gas pipeline.</p> <p>The areas of woodland are proposed to be crossed by HDD to avoid impact.</p> <p>The pipeline information is appreciated and has been considered in the route design.</p>
Jane Kenny, Savills (general comments)	<p>Surveys – despite landowners requests for feedback on the surveys undertaken on the land they have not been supplied. Some clients have been referred to the PEIR for this information to find that it is not included within the document. Our clients feel it is important to have sight of these surveys so that they can comment and provide local knowledge/information to enable those surveys to be complete and consequently any decision making being based upon the complete information. Can it be arranged that these reports/surveys are forwarded to landowners as a matter of urgency?</p>	Y	<p>Those landowners who have requested feedback and results of surveys undertaken on their land have now been provided with this information.</p>
Jane Kenny, Savills (general comments)	<p>Environmental Designations – much of the proposed cable route crosses designated environmental sites. As mentioned under 'surveys', a number of these sites appear to have been omitted from the PEIR and therefore assumed not to have been considered which is clearly wrong.</p>	N/A	<p>Areas that hold environmental designations are avoided where possible. Certain designations carry a different status in the way they are classified (not by Ørsted) which is why these are referred to differently, or potentially omitted from certain sections of the PEIR.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>42</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Jane Kenny, Savills (general comments)	Dust – dust has been considered within the PEIR and has been identified that there is a high impact on ecological receptors at Kelling Heath SSSI, Booton SSSI and SAC, Alderford Common SSSI as well as dust soiling which will damage crops. There is no detail how you propose to mitigate this other than adopting the IAQM recommendations and the PEIR states no further mitigation will be required. Our clients question if this is sufficient.	I	Measures in order to mitigate the impact as a result of dust from the construction works will accompany the DCO application. Where these impacts cannot be mitigated, a claim for any associated damages or losses will be considered when submitted with sufficient supporting evidence.



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>42</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
<p>Jane Kenny, Savills on behalf of Timewell Properties</p>	<p>Kelling Heath Holiday Park –Timewell Properties This is a well established Holiday Park in North Norfolk offering a diverse range of accommodation from camping through to log cabins. The impact of the scheme will have a detrimental affect upon the business in terms of the construction and the disruption caused further afield by the road closures etc. that will be required to facilitate the construction. Under the proposals within PEIR this has the potential of destroying a well established business resulting in the loss of an important business within North Norfolk, loss of employment and consequently impact on the local economy. Our client is concerned at DONG's lack of investigation and understanding of the impact of the location of the corridor on the 230 touring pitches, the complex electrical and water infrastructure to these pitches, the raising main across the land as well as potential for a substantial compensation claim, let alone the economic impact and employment implications. Furthermore there is also a substantial refurbishment and expansion of facilities on the touring pitches site next year which needs to be taken into consideration. This is not ignoring the other key area of concern being the environmental damage/impact which is set out below. Kelling Heath Holiday Park forms part of a SSSI and a County Wildlife site. The Environment Agency and Natural England both state that all designated sites, not just international designated sites, should be avoided. County Wildlife Site is a designation on Kelling Heath Holiday Park which is not international. There is no detail or clarity how DONG propose to minimise any physical interference with Kelling Heath SSSI or County Wildlife Site (CWS) which makes commenting on the proposal as a consultee impossible. However note the following within the PEIR:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· P.18 - 3.7.2.4 – Kelling Heath SSSI and its reason for designation is not summarised whereas other affected SSSI's are summarised.</li> <li>· P.21 – 3.7.3.17 – Otter has also been recorded at the Kelling Heath Holiday Park bottom pond which is not listed in the report. Weybourne Beck has been mentioned which is within 2km of the study area but does not appear to have been surveyed.</li> <li>· P.22 – 3.7.3.32 –reptiles – there is no mention of adder or common lizard here and both are protected from being killed or injured by the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 as amended in 1991 (Section 9(1)). Both these species have populations on the Kelling Heath SSSI and the CWS.</li> <li>· P.23 – 3.7.3.37 – Neither Kelling Heath Holiday Park bottom pond or Weybourne Beck have been surveyed for otter</li> <li>· P.24 Protected or notable species – these have been restricted to a small number of European protected species and do not take into account Section 41 species. The rarest and most threatened species in England are listed under Section 41 (S41) of the 2006 Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act. Outcome 3 of the Government's Biodiversity 2020 strategy contains an ambition to ensure that 'By 2020, we will see an overall improvement in the status of our wildlife and will have prevented further human-induced extinctions of known threatened species.' Protecting and enhancing England's S41 species is key to delivering this outcome. Adder, common lizard and silver studded blue butterfly have populations within the area of Kelling Heath SSSI and Kelling Heath Holiday Park CWS proposed for the cable route. The NERC Act S41 is used in the report for habitats so why not species?</li> <li>· P.27 Although the Kelling Heath SSSI is considered a VER, its level of importance is listed as 'national' rather than international. This is because it has not been designated as an SAC which in this case seems rather arbitrary as the habitat type that Kelling Heath was designated a SSSI for is NVC H8 Calluna vulgaris – Ulex gallii heath. Other SSSI's on the VER list are given 'International' importance as the sites contain habitat types listed in annex 1 of the Habitats Directive. business impact on Kelling Heath Holiday Park, this is not an adequate reason for not considering the route.</li> </ul>	<p>Y</p>	<p>The cable route has been amended to avoid all land owned by Timewell Properties</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>42</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>European dry heath is listed in annex 1 of the habitats directive and the JNCC list H8 as an NVC type that meets the definition of European dry heath. I would therefore argue that Kelling Heath SSSI should be given international importance as a VER regardless of not being designated as a SAC. The same could be argued for pieces of the Kelling Heath Park CWS habitat as they are also H8.</p> <p>An alternative route has been proposed by our clients environmental advisors. This route has not been included within the PEIR or as an alternative route in the Onshore Statutory Consultation Plan. We have not received an explanation for this proposal not being considered other than there being trees in the way. Taking all matters into consideration relating to the environmental and</p>		
Jane Kenny, Savills on behalf of Kelling Heath Trustees	<p>Kelling Heath Trustees</p> <p>In addition to the points that were raised above at Kelling Heath Holiday Park about the SSSI and CWS, the following concerns/impacts have been raised in relation to the Heath:</p> <p>There will be:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Damage to habitat of Kelling Heath SSSI that is noted by Natural England as "perhaps the best example of glacial outwash plain in England"</li> <li>2. Destruction of an important hibernation site for adders (about 20 present in spring 2017) and disturbance of adders and other reptiles.</li> <li>3. Disturbance to birds that breed close to or within the cable corridor, including Dartford Warbler, Stonechat and Woodlark.</li> <li>4. Destruction of one of the sites for Silver-studded Blue Butterfly.</li> <li>5. A serious long-term visual impact if the trees forming the boundary of Kelling Heath SSSI and Kelling Heath Park are removed and the time needed for them to be re-established.</li> </ol>	Y	The cable route has been amended to avoid any land owned by Kelling Heath Trustees.
Jane Kenny, Savills on behalf of Mr & Mrs K Jones	<p>Mr &amp; Mrs K Jones –Pine Farm, Bodham</p> <p>This is a small 30 acre environmental farm and the proposed scheme will destroy the livelihood and the enjoyment of the farm for our clients. Due to the age of some of the hedgerows on the holding they have are protected under the Hedgerow Regulations 1997 therefore our clients have requested that the cable is directionally drilled under these hedges and the bi-secting road together with the corridor to run to the east of the high hedge on the eastern boundary of the property to avoid these hedgerows being destroyed.</p>	Y	The cable route has been amended in this area to completely avoid land owned by Mr and Mrs Jones at Pine Farm.
Jane Kenny, Savills, on behalf of Mrs C Barratt	<p>Mrs C Barratt – Church Farm, Booton</p> <p>The proposed route passes along the edge of the Booton SSSI and over an area renowned for Orchids – there appears to be no reference to these in the PEIR. The current route intercepts the area where the grain store is to be constructed this Autumn. This is an environmental farm, however the detail in the PEIR is not sufficient to be able to clarify the mitigation measures that will be undertaken to protect the holding.</p> <p>Due to the sensitivities of the proposed route, an alternative has been provided for consideration.</p>	Y	<p>The SSSI is not directly impacted or intersected by the proposed corridor, however this is noted within the PEIR along with environmental and ecological information.</p> <p>The alternative suggested route has been considered and will be included within the DCO application.</p> <p>Note: Dalcour Maclaren attended a site meeting on 8 August 2017 - feedback to DONG/Orsted and the comments were taken into account in the cable routing design meetings.</p>
Anna Brookman, Strutt & Parker LLP (general comments)	<p>As you will probably be aware, harmful, noxious and non-native plants must be managed in a proactive way, and the movement of soils which may be contaminated can assist in spreading them. Land owners and occupiers are expected to ensure that these plants do not spread. It would be beneficial to have sight of the management plan the developer will have in place in order to carry out this management on the stored soil.</p>	I	Hornsea Three confirmed that this detail will be included within the Environmental Statement, and will be refined once a construction contractor has been appointed by Ørsted. It was asked that any specific harmful, noxious or non-native plants on land intersected by the route corridor should be highlighted to Ørsted in advance to allow this to be taken into consideration when tendering for a construction contractor.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>42</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co on behalf of CJC Lee and Peter Seaman	At Becketts Farm the proposed cable route does not pass through sensitive environmental areas, however the land slopes down towards Becketts Farmstead and the Strawberry Patch nursery. As such: i. There is a higher risk of soil mobility towards the farmstead if the works are in the western part of the proposed corridor. ii. Soil runoff to the west would potentially compromise the Strawberry Patch parking area and playground. Need to protect against this risk with cover crops could mean inability to crop all the field commercially. iii. The land in the eastern part of the field through which the cable route is shown is level and less likely to be prone to soil runoff if a corridor is established and stripped. iv. It is therefore requested that the cable easement is located as far to the East as can be within the identified corridor. If the corridor could be moved East this would be desirable.	Y	Location of adjacent nursery and topography of field noted. The potential for soil dispersion in this area is noted also and will be mitigated where possible. The corridor has been pushed as far east as practical given the constraints and route positioning on landholdings to the south and north.
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co on behalf of CJC Lee and Peter Seaman	The proposed cable route exits the owned property to the south via water meadows that flank the River Bure. These meadows are low lying with a high water table and therefore the installation methodology will need to be adapted to suit conditions.	Y	Installation of the cables at this location is now proposed via HDD
Brown & Co on behalf of CJC Lee and Peter Seaman	Environment: The farming side of the business has invested in conversation schemes, tree planting programs and adopted a method of farming designed to balance productivity and a desire to enhance the environmental value of the property. a. At Bodham the proposed cable route is shown as being close to an old pit. The ecological value in not know but disturbance of this site should be avoided.	I	Environmental and ecological surveys have been undertaken in the route corridor and it's vicinity to establish the environmental impact. Areas of environmental interest will be avoided, where possible.
Simon Evans, Irelands Arnolds Keys on behalf of A & B Clarke	Impact on flora and fauna / ecology / woodland A project of this nature will of course have significant impacts on flora and fauna along the length of the entire cable corridor. We note the planned construction process will on the most part use open cut trenches hence significant lengths of established hedgerows and trees will need to be removed in order to facilitate the works. In most cases these hedges and trees will be in excess of 30 years old and will be considered as protected by the Local Planning Authority, considered as important to the local landscape character. If the project were to use a HVDC scheme instead of HVAC then the width of the cable corridor would be significantly less meaning the impact on flora and fauna (although still considerable) would be greatly reduced. If the route cannot be changed to avoid these areas of woodland then the construction technique will have to be changed to direct drilling or some similar method so that the trees are not lost.	I	Environmental and ecological surveys have been undertaken over the past 18 months in order to obtain relevant information on flora & fauna along the route corridor. Some hedgerows will have to be removed to facilitate construction, but will be replanted. However, where hedgerows border an existing road, these are predominantly proposed to be crossed via Horizontal Directional Drill (HDD) to avoid impact to them.
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co on behalf of Kelling Estate	Arable Field Margins Kelling Estate has been committed to a Higher Level Stewardship Scheme for the last 6 years. Through the latest version of the scheme, they have committed to managing Grass Margins, Floristic Margins and Cultivated Margins. Some of which the proposed pipeline works will run through. Not only are these areas a UK BAP Priority habitat which provide a refuge for native wildlife from the increasingly hostile arable matrix, but also provide vital corridors between larger habitats. A wide variety of native species will use these margins on the Kelling Estate, from pollinators which are declining worldwide, to foraging farmland birds such as turtle dove and grey partridge, to smaller mammals such as shrews, mice and rabbits who are in turn prey for top predators such as Kestrel and Marsh Harrier. The effect of the proposed works on the 6 sections of well-established arable field margins will need to be considered.	I	The Estate's involvement in a HLS scheme is noted, and will be considered in more detail once a construction contractor has been appointed. It is likely a derogation will be required for working in these areas, if the scheme is still active at the time of construction, although impact to them will be mitigated where possible and practical.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>42</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co on behalf of Kelling Estate	<p>Use and Management of the Estate</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kelling Estate is owned by a conservation minded owner</li> <li>• Significant works have taken place to enhance and restore the environment and ecology through taking up of managed conversation scheme, alteration of farming practices and planting of trees as part of a holistic approach to the Estate Environment.</li> <li>• The attached Environmental Report highlights specific concerns that have been identified along the route.</li> <li>• Notably there are significant concerns about: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Disruption to sensitive aquatic habitats</li> <li>o Destruction or disturbance to mature and ecologically diverse woodland</li> <li>o Destruction of low input acid grassland</li> <li>o Damage to soil structure in the commercial arable fields</li> <li>o Disturbance to wildlife and bird life due to either removal or significant disturbance to habitat</li> <li>o Removal of important trees.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• The route is along the eastern boundary of the Estate which is less intensively farmed and therefore the ecology in that area of the estate is in more natural form.</li> </ul> <p>The following questions arise:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. How DONG will ensure there is no long-term damage to, or serious interruption to, the ecology and environment on the Estate?</li> <li>2. Why DONG might consider the environmental impact of the purple route over the Kelling Estate is less than taking the yellow route through Kelling Heath?</li> <li>3. How DONG will work through or around the various areas of woodland, ancient trees and areas of high ecological value?</li> </ol>	Y	<p>Ørsted responded to Kelling Estate's questions as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Ørsted will consider the potential impact to the local environment and ecology as part of the Environmental Statement, this detail and potential impact will be covered in the Environmental Impact Assessment accompanying the application. Impact to the local environment and ecology will be mitigated where possible.</li> <li>2. Ørsted will create a proposal and apply for consent for a cable route that is technically feasible, whilst still considering the potential environmental impact of its proposal. The proposed alternative route was selected because of technical concerns about the original route through Kelling Heath.</li> <li>3. The areas of woodland mentioned will be crossed via HDD and impact to areas of high ecological value will be mitigated where possible and practical.</li> </ol>
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co on behalf of Kelling Estate	<p>Woodland</p> <p>The proposed works run through one Copse and two larger blocks of woodland. All of which are classified by Natural England as UK BAP Priority Habitat Lowland Deciduous Woodland. Furthermore, although not officially designated, due to the presence of the following species:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Tree Pipit</li> <li>Wood Warbler</li> <li>Spotted Flycatcher</li> <li>Pied Flycatcher</li> <li>Marsh Tit</li> <li>Hawfinch</li> <li>Lesser Redpoll</li> </ul> <p>All of which have been identified within 1km of the site, the Woodland around Kelling should be declared as a Woodland Bird Assemblage Priority Area.</p>	I	<p>Information on bird wildlife in the area has been noted and provided to the Hornsea Three Consents team for information alongside ongoing surveys and ecological data. The cables will be installed under woodland via HDD.</p>
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co on behalf of Kelling Estate	<p>Moreover, the following Bat species have been recorded within 5km of the woodland blocks;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Barbastelle Bat</li> <li>- Brandt's Bat</li> <li>- Whiskered Bat</li> <li>- Natterers Bat</li> <li>- Pipistrelle Bat</li> <li>- Brown Long Eared Bat</li> </ul> <p>There is a high possibility that the bats are not only foraging in these woodland blocks but also using them to navigate their way through the local landscape. Any clear fell operation will have to ensure that measures are taken so as not to disrupt the bats normal flight path and that mature and veteran trees, as shown below, do not contain active bat roosts.</p> <p>SEE FIGURE IN KELLING ENVIRONMENTAL REPORT</p>	I	<p>Information on bats in the area has been noted and provided to the Consents team for information alongside ongoing surveys and ecological data. No woodland is proposed to be felled in order for the cables to be installed.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>42</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co on behalf of Kelling Estate	<p>Grassland</p> <p>The proposed line of works transects 4 blocks of permanent pasture, 1 of which has been in grass since 1946 and shows as grass on the first edition Ordnance Survey Maps.</p> <p>All of the permanent pasture grass fields are managed through the current environmental stewardship scheme under a no fertiliser input system. They are therefore classified as unimproved grassland order destroy these areas there will need to be a thorough Environmental Impact Assessment undertaken to understand the impact on the sward and surrounding area. It should be noted that under new regulations this will have to include a detailed NVC survey of all areas of permanent grass.</p>	I	Details surrounding grassland and its quality have been noted. A derogation will likely be required prior to construction works commencing. The land will be reinstated following construction, with compensation being payable on a proven loss basis, including any reduction of subsidies due to land not being suitable for re-entry into the relevant scheme. The historic block of woodland referred to is avoided by the refined cable corridor.
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co on behalf of Kelling Estate	<p>Arable</p> <p>Although typically hostile to biodiversity, the arable fields of Kelling Estate support a breeding population of Lapwing. Lapwing are a UK BAP Priority species and are therefore protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981. Lapwing are ground nesting birds and prefer to site their nests in low lying arable crops such as sugar beet or in cultivated areas. Kelling Estate has committed to rotating 8.00 ha of cultivated areas across the arable land. Prioritising fields that are situated closest to grass fields which lie wet in the winter, such as field 6928, as these will be favoured by the Lapwing.</p>	I	The protection of the Lapwing is acknowledged, and the Estate's commitment to habitat conservation through cropping is noted. The ability to cultivate the required area should not be compromised by the construction work, although may need to be amended to meet the area committed to.
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co on behalf of Kelling Estate	<p>Pond</p> <p>The Pond shown in the image below is situated in Field 4371 which is one of the fields that will be affected by the proposed pipeline route. A conclusive assessment should be undertaken to ensure that Great Crested Newts are not present before works take place.</p>	I	The location of the pond is noted as is the potential for Great Crested Newt habitat. A number of surveys have been undertaken on the estate
Tom Corfield (on behalf of Lady M A Prince-Smith Morton Hall Estate)	<p>iv) Impact on flora and fauna / ecology / woodland</p> <p>Non-intrusive surveys have been taking place on the land at Morton Hall Estate with the agreement of my client. We have notified the presence of a Badger set and the Estate is often frequented by Deer. The surveys have shown that Bats roost with the woodland.</p> <p>A project of this nature will of course have significant impacts on flora and fauna along the length of the entire cable corridor. We note the planned construction process will on the most part use open cut trenches hence significant lengths of established hedgerows and trees will need to be removed in order to facilitate the works.</p> <p>In most cases these hedges and trees will be in excess of 30 years old and will be considered as protected by the Local Planning Authority, considered as important to the local landscape character.</p> <p>If the project were to use a HVDC scheme instead of HVAC then the width of the cable corridor would be significantly less meaning the impact on flora and fauna (although still considerable) would be greatly reduced.</p> <p>At Morton Hall Estate the cable corridor is shown to affect three areas of established woodland and we strongly urge DONG Energy to look again at the intended route to see if the woodland can be avoided to save the trees being felled. The estate has numerous areas of the woodland floor planted with snow drops and blue bells and my client does not wish to see these lost as part of the works.</p> <p>If the route cannot be changed to avoid these areas of woodland then the construction technique will have to be changed to direct drilling or some similar method so that the trees are not lost.</p>	Y	Environmental and ecological surveys have been undertaken over the past 18 months in order to obtain relevant information on flora & fauna along the route corridor. Some hedgerows will have to be removed to facilitate construction, but will be replanted. However, where hedgerows border an existing road, these will predominantly be crossed via Horizontal Directional Drill (HDD) to avoid impact to them. Most areas of woodland will be crossed via Horizontal Directional Drill in order to avoid impact to the trees.



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>42</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co on behalf of Ringland Estate/Ebony Holdings	<p>Ecology: The Estate has invested in conservation schemes, tree planting and felling programs and has carefully worked to rebuild soil fertility and restore hedgerows to enhance the overall environmental value of the property.</p> <p>a. The proposed cable route will pass through a well-managed block of semi natural woodland at the eastern end of the Estate. It is advised that this woodland be drilled under to avoid habitat destruction.</p> <p>b. The cable route from Honingham Lane to Sandy Lane has a terrain change from 30m ASL at to 50m ASL over a 640m run. This potentially presents challenges in terms of managing topsoil bund stability, subsoil stability on the stripped corridor and water borne soil runoff. Of concern is proximity to Aves Gap where the land falls away steeply to the East and where runoff from the cable route could wash into the lake by the House or beyond to Costessey Lane.</p>	Y	Hornsea Three confirmed that the proposed method of installation under the woodland is via HDD. Concern due to topography is noted. This will be managed by the construction contractor, once appointed, with appropriate mitigation measures being implemented as required.
Jonathan Rush, Brown and Co, on behalf of Easton Estate/Honingham Aketieselskab	<p>Ecology: The Estate has invested in conversation schemes, tree planting programs and carefully managed grazing of the lowland meadows to enhance the environmental value of the property.</p> <p>a. The proposed cable route will pass through a block of ancient semi natural woodland. This woodland should be avoided and measures taken to protect the habitat and wildlife living there</p> <p>b. The cable route passes through a block of plantation wood used to buffer the lowland river meadows and river from potential water born soil runoff. It is suggested that this woodland be drilled under to avoid habitat destruction and to reduce risk of runoff.</p> <p>c. The cable route runs north south with a terrain change from 50m ASL at Weston Road to 32m ASL at the A47. Within that run is a drop to the River Tud where the contour low is circa 15m ASL. This shows a drop of 35m over a 950m run. The greatest drop is from the 30m contour line to the River Tud at 15m over just 200m. This presents significant challenges in terms of managing topsoil bund stability, subsoil stability on the stripped corridor and water borne soil runoff. Due to the high risk of significant soil damage and diffuse pollution it is suggested that the section of cable from the 25m contour line to the south of the River Tud meadows should be drilled, not open cut.</p>	Y	Hornsea Three confirmed that the proposed method of installation under the areas of woodland is via HDD. The landowner's concerns regarding topography are noted. This will be managed by the construction contractor, once appointed, with appropriate mitigation measures being implemented as required. As shown on the updated proposals, the cables are will be installed in the section, under both the woodland, river and adjacent fields, via HDD.
Jonathan Rush, Brown and Co, on behalf of Easton Estate/Honingham Aketieselskab	<p>Sporting Activity: The Estate operates commercial sporting activities which generates revenue, creates employment and is a strong driver for the conservation works on the Estate. The following issues arise:</p> <p>a. The installation process will disrupt the infrastructure of the principle activities.</p> <p>b. Disturbance to the wildlife will compromise the effectiveness of activities.</p> <p>c. The commercial reputation of the sporting enterprises could be damaged by poorly managed works.</p> <p>d. Construction works will need to be timed and organised in such a way as to avoid sensitive seasons to avoid long disturbance of sporting activities</p> <p>DONG will need to ensure that works plans allow for these sporting activities in order to minimise disturbance and loss.</p>	I	Hornsea Three acknowledges the presence of shooting on the land over winter months. Due to weather at this time of year, work may already be restricted in some cases or areas. Hornsea Three cannot commit to working outside of the shooting season only, although will endeavour to minimise the impact to the Estate and shoot where possible. Compensation will be payable on a proven loss basis and on receipt of a claim, however we also acknowledge additional discussions may be required in advance of work commencing in order to assist with planning of the shoot.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>42</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
National Grid	Electricity and Gas Transmission infrastructure within / in close proximity to the order boundary Electricity Transmission National Grid Electricity Transmission has high voltage electricity overhead transmission lines, a high voltage substation and high voltage underground cables within the onshore scoping area. The overhead line, substation cables form an essential part of the electricity transmission network in England and Wales. Substation · Norwich 400kV Overhead Lines · 4VV (400kV) overhead line route - Norwich Main to Walpole 1 - Norwich Main to Walpole 2 · 4YM (400kV) overhead line route - Bramford to Norwich Main 1- Bramford to Norwich Main 2 · PHC (132kV) overhead line - Norwich Main to Trowse 1 · PGG (132kV) overhead line - Norwich Main to Trowse 3 Underground Cable · Norwich Main – PHC001	N/A	Ørsted acknowledged the relevant locations of the electricidal infrastructure and entered into discussions with NGET regarding asset interactions.
D.N Gray	<b>PEIR</b> - The enclosed field map (TG1218-0889) includes sites of: Bat area (surveyed), small ancient bell picked up, very old earthworks inside big covert.	I	Environmental Statement volume 6, annexes 3.1 - 3.14 report on the full suite of ecological baseline surveys undertaken to inform the assessment of impacts on ecology and nature conservation as reported in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation. Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 3.8: Bat surveys provide a description of the current baseline in relation to bats.  An assessment of impacts on heritage assets is provided in Environmental Statement, volume 3, chapter 5: Historic Environment. Baseline information is also presented within this chapter and its accompanying annexes, in particular Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 5.1: Desk Based Assessment.
Sandra Gentle	<b>Cable Corridor</b> - You advise that the pipeline will not touch my land - I am however concerned about the impact on the hedgerows, wildlife and landscape of the land adjoining my property	I	We recognise that protection and sensitive restoration of hedgerows and trees is important to minimise any negative impact on biodiversity or landscape. Impacts from Hornsea Three on ecological features, including hedgerows and trees (including woodlands) has been avoided where possible through commitments to use trenchless technologies such as Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD). The replacement of hedgerows at the end of the construction phase to be undertaken will ensure there is no net loss of hedgerow habitat as a result of Hornsea Project Three. Furthermore, restoration of hedgerows, currently in poor condition, provides an opportunity to achieve long term benefits for the biodiversity associated with this habitat type. Further details on hedgerow removal, retention and replacement can be found in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation as well as the Outline Ecological Management Plan and the Outline Landscape Management Plan which form part of the DCO application.  Impacts on ecological receptors are detailed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation.
William Barr	<b>80m Refinement</b> - See picture 2* (attached with form) For location of our property - In particular we would like to highlight: 1. Borehole discharging treated sewage into field behind property. 2. Tree preservation order on oak tree by property	I	Information on boreholes are provided in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 1: Geology and Ground Conditions, as well as Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 1.1: Borehole Logs.  Tree protection orders are identified in the relevant plan which accompanies the DCO application. Impacts on trees from an ecological perspective are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>42</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Simon Willcox	<b>Strongly Oppose</b> - Your proposals are unwanted and unnecessary. The potential longer - and shorter - consequences of your proposed onshore cable corridor will have catastrophic consequences on an unspoilt and treasured landscape. The consequential loss of trees, hedgerow, wildlife habitat disturbance will not outweigh the benefits of offshore wind energy	N	The short term and long term potential impacts of Hornsea Three are assessed within the Environmental Statement, volume 2 and 3. In respect to potential landscape and visual impacts, Hornsea Three has sought to avoid landscape features (including trees and hedgerows) through cable routing or the use of trenchless technologies. Where impacts cannot be avoided, appropriate mitigation measures for visual disturbance are outlined in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources. For example, any hedgerows which cannot be avoided will be replaced at the end of the construction phase. Furthermore, restoration of hedgerows, currently in poor condition, provides an opportunity to achieve long term benefits for the biodiversity associated with this habitat type as well as gap up hedgerows providing landscape and visual mitigation. Further details on hedgerow removal, retention and replacement can be found in volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation, the Outline Ecological Management Plan and the Outline Landscape Management Plan.  At the HVAC booster station and HVDC converter/HVAC substation, landscape planting is also proposed to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.
Tina Hayward	<b>Onshore cable corridor</b> - I live right on the edge of northern end of the orange route where it passes through Heydon and I think the western (pink) alternative would be much more suitable affecting less properties and less mature trees	Y	Hornsea Three has taken forward the western route, as shown in the plans which accompany the DCO application. The justification for this decision is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives and its accompanying annexes.
Kate Willcox	This is unclear as to whether this area of Heydon will be affected, which is a Conservation Area. This area of Heydon is a Conservation Zone and as such supports a range of wildlife and insect life which will be affected by this work.	I	Impacts associated with Heydon, including Heydon Conservation Area and the registered park and gardens at Heydon Hall are addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 5: Historic Environment.  Impacts on ecological receptors are addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation.
<b>Section 47: Duty to consult local community</b>			
Norfolk Geodiversity Partnership	We would be grateful to receive paper work from you relating to the statutory consultation on the environmental impact of the Hornsea 3 onshore cable project in Norfolk. The Norfolk Geodiversity Partnership is the body which designates Local Sites of geodiversity interest (County Geodiversity Sites), re. sections 109 and 117 of the National Planning Policy Framework.	N	Ørsted issued a further copy of the consultation overview and USB containing the full PEIR and supporting consultation materials to the Norfolk Geodiversity Partnership.
Andrew Cannon	I was concerned to see from the consultation document that the proposed cable routes for Hornsea Three may impinge upon the Kelling Heath Site of Special Scientific Interest. Unlike most SSSIs, Kelling Heath was not designated primarily for biological interest but for its geomorphology. To quote from the notification (which you can read in full here <a href="http://www.sssi.naturalengland.org.uk/citation/citation_photo/1002812.pdf">http://www.sssi.naturalengland.org.uk/citation/citation_photo/1002812.pdf</a> ): "Reasons for Notification: Kelling Heath, together with Salthouse Heath, are two distinct outwash plains dating from different halt stages of the same glaciation. Kelling Heath provides perhaps the best example of a glacial outwash plain in England. Both sites have steep ice-contact slopes and are dissected by deep dry valleys, and are geomorphological sites of national importance". It follows that absolutely no disturbance, however temporary, to the soil and sediment structure of a 'geomorphological site of national importance' is acceptable, and I will be grateful to receive your reassurance on this point.	Y	Through the design development process, the onshore cable corridor now avoids Kelling Heath Site of Special Scientific Interest. Therefore there is no potential for significant impacts on this particular designated site.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>42</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Dr Moss Taylor (Honorary Warden of the Weybourne Camp Reserve)	1. As stated in my earlier objections to the proposed Landfall Zone, this passes through an area of important conservation concern that I have been developing over the last 45 years, since 1972. Although it is not listed as an SSSI, it would meet most, if not all, of the conditions required, but the landowner did not wish it to be registered as such.	I	Through design development, the area which will be directly impacted by the landfall works associated with construction of Hornsea Three has been reduced. As a result of the route refinement, the onshore cable corridor now avoids Kelling Heath SSSI.  The potential impacts of the construction works at landfall are addressed in topic specific chapters, with impacts on birds considered specifically in Environmental Statement Volume 3, Chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation. Where practicable, Hornsea Three has sought to avoid or minimise impacts on ecological receptors through the development of an Outline Environmental Management Plan which accompanies the DCO application.
Dr Moss Taylor (Honorary Warden of the Weybourne Camp Reserve)	3. During this summer I have carried out my annual breeding bird survey of Weybourne Camp, and as expected have confirmed the presence of several species defined as Red- and Amber-listed in 'Birds of Conservation Concern': Grey Partridge (2 pairs), Skylark (12 pairs), Swallow (5 pairs), Whitethroat (14 pairs), Mistle Thrush (1 pair), Dunnock (5 pairs) and Linnet (13 pairs), many of which nest within the PEIR boundary. I believe that these findings will be confirmed by the teams of Environmental Surveyors from NIRAS that also covered Weybourne Camp as part of your own environmental survey, along the proposed route of the PEIR boundary. Their team also found evidence of breeding by Little Ringed Plovers along the PEIR boundary route on Weybourne Camp.	I	Noted. Results of the onshore ornithology surveys are reported in Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 3.9: Wintering and Migratory Birds and annex 3.10: Breeding Birds Survey. These have then informed the assessment of potential impacts in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation.
Dr Moss Taylor (Honorary Warden of the Weybourne Camp Reserve)	4. In addition Adders are present on Weybourne Camp and I had many sightings during the course of this spring and summer, also within the PEIR boundary. However, I was <u>not</u> able to confirm the presence of any Great Crested Newts this year, despite the fact that they have been present in previous years in the pool on the 'scrape', which is exactly where the Landfall Zone is proposed. I also recorded a Polecat in the same area this summer, the first record of this mammal at the site that is a rarity in Norfolk, especially in the north and east of the county.	I	Noted. Results of the baseline ecology surveys undertaken for Hornsea Three are reported in Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 3.1 - 3.14. Of particular relevance to your response may be annex 3.5: Great Crested Newt Survey and annex 3.6: Reptile Survey.
Nigel Rogers	Acknowledgement of letters from Jennifer Brack and HOW03 team. <b>Comments on the PEIR and the wildlife of Kelling Heath SSI:</b> 1.1 The PEIR notes the major impact of the cable corridor on Kelling Heath SSI. It would be most unfortunate if a project intended to bring environmental benefit resulted in serious environmental damage to such a sensitive site when this was clearly avoidable. 1.2 We have already provided detailed comments to Dong Energy on the impact of the cable corridor on the wildlife of Kelling Heath SSI (to Emily Woolfenden 28 March 2017) and we have provided details on the location of reptiles to Thomson Ecology. The final PEIR should address: 1.2.1 disturbance to schedule I birds, including Dartford Warbler (present throughout year) and Woodlark (usually present from March-August), and 1.2.2 destruction of a locally important adder colony (hibernation and breeding site) 1.3 There will, as stated in PEIR, be no impact on Kelling Heath SSSI if the alternative route through surrounding farmland is chosen and we strongly recommend this alternative route. The PEIR mentions possible mitigation of the impact on SSSIs through using trench-less methods or reptile re-location but such an approach will still result in unnecessary disturbance to reptiles and birds.	Y	Through the design development process, the onshore cable corridor now avoids Kelling Heath Site of Special Scientific Interest. Therefore there is no potential for significant impacts on this particular designated site, and no further action is required.  Notwithstanding the above, the Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation considers potential impacts on ecological receptors as a result of Hornsea Three.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>42</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Nigel Rogers	<p><b>2. Comments on the PEIR and Warren House Farm Surroundings:</b></p> <p>2.1 We note that the PEIR recognises that the fields surrounding Warren House Farm are used by Pink-footed Geese to feed on sugar beet tops. The much rarer Tundra Bean Goose also use these same fields; in winter 2016/17, there were at least 22 Tundra Bean Geese together with smaller numbers of White-Fronted Geese and Arncliffe Geese. This use by geese depends on the crop. Other wildlife using the field include Red, Roe, and Muntjac deer.</p> <p>2.2 The public right of way from the end of Warren Road north to Kelling Heath is bordered on its eastern side by an established hedgerow with a variety of bushes and trees. Damage to these and to the mature trees close to our property should be avoided as far as it is practicable.</p>	I	<p>Environmental Statement, volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation considers potential impacts on ecological receptors as a result of Hornsea Three. This includes potential impacts on species such as Pink-footed Geese and Tundra Bean Goose.</p> <p>Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation and chapter 4: Landscape and Visual resources also considers potential impacts on hedgerows and trees (in respect to biodiversity and landscape character/visual amenity respectively). Where possible, Hornsea Three has avoided sensitive ecological receptors through cable routing, or the use of trenchless technologies (HDD). Any hedgerows which cannot be avoided will be replaced at the end of the construction phase. Furthermore, restoration of hedgerows, currently in poor condition, provides an opportunity to achieve long term benefits for the biodiversity associated with this habitat type as well as gap up hedgerows providing landscape and visual mitigation. Further details on hedgerow removal, retention and replacement can be found in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation as well as the Outline Ecological Management Plan and the Outline Landscape Management Plan which form part of the DCO application.</p>
Nigel Rogers	<p><b>3. Visual Impact of the Cable Corridor on the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB):</b></p> <p>3.1 The main industry of North Norfolk is tourism, in part due to this area being a designated AONB. It is important to ensure that the visual impact of the cable corridor does not have a detrimental effect on the local economy. A specific area of concern is the potential removal of trees and bushes that form a barrier between Kelling Heath SSSI and Kelling Heath Park. Removal of this barrier would result in uninterrupted views of the camping site across the heath. This would not only reduce its attractiveness but could permanently disturb breeding birds on the heath.</p>	Y	<p>Response noted. Environmental Statement, volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources provides an assessment of the potential impacts on the AONB as a result of Hornsea Three. In preparing the assessment, Hornsea Three has consulted with Norfolk Coastal Partnership (i.e. to agree assessment viewpoint locations). Where possible, Hornsea Three has sought to avoid landscape features (including trees and hedgerows) through cable routing or the use of trenchless technologies. Any hedgerows which cannot be avoided will be replaced at the end of the construction phase. Furthermore, restoration of hedgerows, currently in poor condition, provides an opportunity to achieve long term benefits for the biodiversity associated with this habitat type as well as gap up hedgerows providing landscape and visual mitigation. Further details on hedgerow removal, retention and replacement can be found in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation as well as the Outline Ecological Management Plan and the Outline Landscape Management Plan which form part of the DCO application.</p> <p>In respect to the Kelling Heath SSSI and Kelling Heath park boundary in particular, it is noted that through the design development process, the onshore cable corridor now avoids Kelling Heath SSSI. As such no significant effects on this area are anticipated.</p>
Richard Porter	<p>As a regular visitor to Kelling Heath and a supporter of wildlife conservation, I was concerned to learn about the cable that is planned to be laid across the Kelling Heath SSSI. I know that others have expressed their views, so I won't repeat, other than to say that I hope you will reconsider the plans for the route to be taken. Wildlife is under so much pressure that every gesture towards its protection and conservation makes such a difference. I am very happy to discuss my views if you feel that would be helpful.</p>	Y	<p>Through the design development process, the onshore cable corridor now avoids Kelling Heath Site of Special Scientific Interest and Kelling Heath Park. Therefore there is no potential for significant impacts on this particular designated site, and no further action is required.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, the Environmental Statement considers potential impacts on ecological receptors as a result of Hornsea Three in volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation. Where possible, mitigation measures have been built into the design to minimise any potential impacts.</p>



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>42</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Richard Porter	<p>Information provided to me:</p> <p>There will be public consultation events held by Dong Energy at Weybourne Village Hall on 7th September 2017 (3.30-7.30 pm) and at Holt Community Centre on 13th September 2017 (4 pm – 7.30 pm). More information can be found at <a href="http://www.dongenergy.co.uk/hornseaproject3">www.dongenergy.co.uk/hornseaproject3</a>. The extent of damage to the heath and disturbance to its wildlife will depend on the exact position of the final 80m corridor that will be dug within the 200m boundaries set out in the plans by Dong Energy. The corridor will need to remove soil, heather and gorse, a grassy track, mixed hedgerow and trees prior to cable laying. The soil will be restored after cable laying but it will not normally be possible for trees to be planted along the route.</p> <p>Based on the planned route of the 200m corridor, the following impacts are envisaged:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Damage to habitat of Kelling Heath SSSI that is noted by Natural England as “perhaps the best example of glacial outwash plain in England</li> <li>2. Destruction of an important hibernation site for adders (about 20 present in spring 2017) and disturbance of adders and other reptiles.</li> <li>3. Disturbance to birds that breed close to or within the cable corridor, including Dartford Warbler, Stonechat and Woodlark.</li> <li>4. Destruction of one of the sites for Silver-studded Blue Butterfly.</li> <li>5. A serious long-term visual impact if the trees forming the boundary of Kelling Heath SSSI and Kelling Heath Park are removed and cannot be re-planted.</li> </ol>	Y	<p>Through the design development process, the onshore cable corridor now avoids Kelling Heath Site of Special Scientific Interest and Kelling Heath Park. Therefore there is no potential for significant impacts on the ecological or landscape features of this particular designated site.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, the Environmental Statement considers potential impacts on all ecological receptors (including reptiles and birds) as a result of Hornsea Three (see volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation). Where possible, mitigation measures have been built into the design to minimise any potential impacts.</p> <p>In respect to potential landscape and visual impacts, Hornsea Three has sought to avoid landscape features (including trees and hedgerows) through cable routing or the use of trenchless technologies. Where impacts cannot be avoided, mitigation has been proposed as appropriate (see Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources).</p>
Ben Greig	<p>I been reading about the proposals for Hornsea Project Three. I applaud the construction of more wind farms - the more the better! But I am extremely concerned about the impact on the local wildlife, specifically the 200m corridor planned across Kelling Heath. You probably know Kelling Heath is an SSSI with rare birds, reptiles and butterflies. Any disturbance at any time of year will have a negative impact on some of these species.</p> <p>I have some questions - I hope you can help:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. the proposed 200m corridor - is that 200m wide (and then how long?) or 200m long (in which case how wide?)</li> <li>2. what prevents you from avoiding Kelling Heath altogether? Sure it's possible to go around it?</li> </ol>	Y	<p>Through the design development process, the onshore cable corridor now avoids Kelling Heath Site of Special Scientific Interest. Therefore there is no potential for significant impacts on this particular designated site, and no further action is required.</p> <p>In respect to the parameters of the project, this is set out in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description. Generally, the cable corridor is approximately 80 m, although this is widened in some places to allow for crossings.</p>
Robert J Cumber	<p>3) The impact on the quiet coastal community of Weybourne</p> <p>As stated in the PEIR the proposed cable routes will cross through no less than three SSSI's in the Weybourne area. The disturbance and likely damage is incalculable as is the effect on the peace and tranquillity of this quiet coastal neighbourhood in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Whilst the deep water access point provided at Weybourne might appear cheap and attractive to DONG as contractor it rides roughshod over the rights of the local community. We strongly recommend that DONG look elsewhere to bring their cables on shore.</p>	Y	<p>Through the design development process, the onshore cable corridor now follows the 'alternative route under consideration' and therefore the onshore cable corridor now avoids the designated sites in close proximity to the landfall. Therefore there is no potential for significant impacts on these particular designated sites (e.g. Kelling Heath SSSI).</p> <p>Consideration of alternate landfall locations, as well as justification for the preferred choice of landfall location is set out in Environmental Statement, volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Alternatives.</p>
Friends of North Norfolk	<p>THE RESPONSE MADE BY THE FRIENDS OF NORTH NORFOLK TO THE HORNSEA PROJECT THREE OFFSHORE WIND FARM DEVELOPMENT PRELIMINARY ENVIRONMENTAL INFORMATION REPORT CONSULTATION.</p> <p>1. The Friends of North Norfolk support green energy and the use of efficient offshore wind farms to produce clean electricity. However, such wind farms and the necessary offshore/onshore infrastructure must not be allowed to result in major cumulative harm to the environment, specifically the landscapes, seascapes and ecology, all of which constitute priceless heritage assets that are designated as of the highest importance both nationally and internationally.</p>	N	<p>Cumulative effects on seascape and visual receptors have been assessed in Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 10: Seascape and Visual Resources. Effects on ecology are considered in volumes 2 and 3 of the Environmental Statement.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>42</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Friends of North Norfolk	19. The majority of the North Norfolk Coastline is recognised, both nationally and internationally, for its exceptional landscape and ecological value with a number of overlapping Designations including the Norfolk Coast AONB, the North Norfolk Heritage Coast, many SSSI, SAC, RAMSAR sites and Marine Protection Areas/ MCZs.	I	A full assessment of the effects of Hornsea Three on benthic ecology, including on features of designated sites, is presented in volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology. Conclusions on the effects of Hornsea Three on the conservation objectives of the North Norfolk Coast and Saturn Reef SAC and The Wash and North Norfolk Coast SAC are presented in full within the RIAA for Hornsea Three. Discussions on the effects of Hornsea Three on the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ and the Markham's Triangle rMCZ are presented in full within volume 5, annex 2.3: Marine Conservation Zone Assessment.
David and Julie Brooks	In conclusion our impression is that this is the wrong area and landfall site to bring in offshore cables from Hornsea 3 and expect an 80 metre cable corridor construction to be implemented without major excessive disruption to local people/traffic/tourist trade/wildlife. This is on an altogether different scale to the Sheringham Shoal project which had a single trench of 2 metres width! Like many other older people we have recently retired to Weybourne to get away from the stresses of urban living and enjoy, in our later years, the peaceful environment of a small village on the coast, with accessible countryside on our doorstep. This would all be shattered if this massive landfall project goes ahead at Weybourne, especially if the eastern route(which is very close to residential areas of Weybourne) were to be used. For all the above reasons it could have a serious impact on our daily lives, and therefore on our health and wellbeing.	Y	Further information pertaining to the landfall location and route selection is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives. Where possible, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts to local residential receptors, either through site selection/route refinement (including taking forwards the alternative route further to the west of Weybourne) or through the identification of suitable mitigation measures. Where there are impacts to residential receptors, these are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3).
David and Julie Brooks	We don't understand how the proposed cable route to the east of Weybourne (section 1B) can be a valid option as it encroaches on a designated Site of Special Scientific Interest. This SSSI includes the part of Weybourne beach which is next to the car park plus all the cliff top ground going eastwards along to Sheringham. The 80 metre width of the proposed cable corridor could not possibly be accommodated from beach landfall going towards the Mill lane without seriously impacting on this SSSI. Also, the fields adjoining this SSSI area are used by lapwings and skylarks for nesting sites. These birds are already in serious decline due to modern farming methods so it would be a tragedy to lose these as well.	Y	The beach road car park is not under consideration as a construction compound. Furthermore it is noted that, since the PEIR, a refined landfall location has been identified (western re-route around Kelling) and the area identified for landfall works has reduced. This was informed by a number of factors including community feedback in the area of Kelling and Weybourne, avoidance of the Kelling Heath SSSI/CWS and Holiday Park as well as engineering/technical considerations.
William J Horabin	The information provided is simply overwhelming but what it provides in terms of volumes it lacks in terms of real understanding of the values and importance of the cumulative/inter relational impacts of this huge infrastructure project upon the North Norfolk Coast AONB, North Norfolk Heritage Coast, many SSSI, SAC, RAMSAR and Marine Protection Areas/MCZs.	I	A full assessment of the effects of Hornsea Three on benthic ecology, including on features of designated sites, is presented in Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology. Conclusions on the effects of Hornsea Three on the conservation objectives of the North Norfolk Coast and Saturn Reef SAC and The Wash and North Norfolk Coast SAC are presented in full within the Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment for Hornsea Three. Discussions on the effects of Hornsea Three on the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ and the Markham's Triangle rMCZ are presented in full within Environmental Statement volume 5, annex 2.3: Marine Conservation Zone Assessment.
Rt Hon Norman Lamb MP	They also have misgivings, which I share, about the plans for a phased delivery of the project that could last for nearly a decade. Were that to happen it would have a major adverse effect on residents' lives, livelihoods- especially fishing and tourism- and environment and a lasting impact on transport infrastructure, wider tourism, flora and fauna.	Y	During the design refinement Hornsea Three has sought to minimise the duration of any disruption, and has reduced the total number of phases from three to two, and reduced the duration of the construction phase onshore from eleven to eight years.  Potential impacts from Hornsea Three on socio-economic and tourism are identified and assessed in Environmental Statement Volume 3, Chapter 10: Socio-Economics. Taking into consideration the mitigation designed into Hornsea Three, no significant adverse effects are predicted.  Impacts from Hornsea Three on transport and ecological receptors are assessed in Environment Statement volume 3, chapters 7: Traffic and Transport and chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation. Inter-related effects on local residents, as a result of impact interactions, are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 11: Inter-related Effects.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>42</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Anna Brookman, Strutt & Parker LLP (general comments)	As you will probably be aware, harmful, noxious and non-native plants must be managed in a proactive way, and the movement of soils which may be contaminated can assist in spreading them. Land owners and occupiers are expected to ensure that these plants do not spread. It would be beneficial to have sight of the management plan the developer will have in place in order to carry out this management on the stored soil.	I	Hornsea Three confirmed that this detail will be included within the Environmental Statement, and will be refined once a construction contractor has been appointed by Ørsted. It was asked that any specific harmful, noxious or non-native plants on land intersected by the route corridor should be highlighted to Ørsted in advance to allow this to be taken into consideration when tendering for a construction contractor.
Derek Barber	Onshore Cable Corridor: It is critical that the final route avoids as far as possible the falling of mature trees and damage to ancient hedgerows.	Y	Impacts from Hornsea Three on ecological and landscape features, including hedgerows and trees (including woodlands) has been avoided where possible through commitments to use trenchless technologies such as Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD). The replacement of hedgerows at the end of the construction phase to be undertaken will ensure there is no net loss of hedgerow habitat as a result of Hornsea Project Three.  Furthermore, restoration of hedgerows, currently in poor condition, provides an opportunity to achieve long term benefits for the biodiversity associated with this habitat type. The impacts of Hornsea Three on hedgerows and trees is presented in Environmental Statement Volume 3, Chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation, whilst further details on hedgerow removal, retention and replacement are also set out in the Outline Ecological Management Plan and the Outline Landscape Management Plan which form part of the DCO application.
Dominic Everett	The proposal should include an intention to enhance the bio-diversity of the land around the building. There are a number of old hedgerows around the proposed site. There should be a commitment to maintain these important habitats. To cause the minimum damage and to repair any damage caused as quickly as possible. The main access road to the site, the Norwich to Swardeston Road should have the maximum speed limit reduced from 60mph to a lower level e.g. 40 mph for the section passing the main entrance to reduce the risk of accidents. The proposed building should be screened by an earth bank and planting using a variety of native species of both trees and shrubs that will increase the biodiversity and provide good habitat for local flora and fauna. The developer should aim to create an access route on/off from the A47 onto the site for heavy vehicles. The developer should mitigate against the disruption to the local area during construction.	I	Impacts from Hornsea Three on ecological features, including hedgerows and trees (including woodlands) has been avoided where possible through commitments to use trenchless technologies such as Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD).  Any hedgerows which cannot be avoided will be replaced at the end of the construction phase. Furthermore, restoration of hedgerows, currently in poor condition, provides an opportunity to achieve long term benefits for the biodiversity associated with this habitat type as well as gap up hedgerows providing landscape and visual mitigation. Further details on hedgerow removal, retention and replacement can be found in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation, the Outline Ecological Management Plan and the Outline Landscape Management Plan.  Impacts associated with access are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport. Specific traffic management measures will be developed during the detailed design stage, however the principles which will be used to develop these are outlined within the outline CoCP and outline CTMP, both of which form part of the DCO.
David Young (NNDC Councillor)	<b>Mitigation Methods</b> - The effect on residents, wildlife and the local tourist economy requires the disruption to be kept to an absolute minimum. This is only compatible with a single phase operation, not a 2 or 3 phase operation over up to 11 years. If multi-phase, construct all possible TJBs in one go at outset to reduce effect of disruption/duration.	I	Following design refinement, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise the duration of any disruption during construction, reducing the total duration of the construction phase onshore to eight years in a maximum of two phases. Within this, the maximum duration for construction of the onshore cable corridor is approximately 2.5 years, this therefore means that the maximum duration over which construction of the onshore cable corridor could occur would be 5.5 years incorporating two phases (assuming a three-year gap between the two phases).  Hornsea Three has designed the project to avoid or minimise impacts on residents, wildlife and tourism. Specific measures are identified in the relevant topic chapters of the volume 3 of the Environmental Statement.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>42</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
T.W.E Wilkinson	<b>Cable corridor and booster station concerns</b> - Wildlife Preservation	I	Through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive assets. Mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project are outlined in topic specific chapters, and include the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts on ecological receptors (e.g. hedgerows, designated sites) and associated hydrological features (e.g. main rivers). Impacts on ecological receptors are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation.
Patricia Dodge (Weybourne Village Hall)	<b>Landfall Zone</b> - The area is of special scientific interest and also a tourist area. It is important to keep the impact to a minimum as roads are narrow and winding particularly through the village and along the Coast Road.	I	Through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive designated sites. For example, Weybourne Cliffs and Kelling Heath SSSI have been avoided and no direct impacts are predicted on these designated sites from Hornsea Three.  Impacts on socio-economics and tourism are assessed within Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 10: Socio-economics.
John Walker, (SHOOT)	<b>Local Matters Landfall</b> - This is an AONB and any construction mars it - there will be hedges/trees that will be permanently damaged	I	Noted. Impacts relating to landscape and visual resources are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual resources. Particular consideration has been given to the AONB as a sensitive receptor, and it is noted that Hornsea Three has consulted with the Norfolk Coast Partnership to agree viewpoints to inform the assessment of impacts on the AONB.  Impacts from Hornsea Three on ecological features, including hedgerows and trees (including woodlands) has been avoided where possible through commitments to use trenchless technologies such as Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD). The replacement of hedgerows at the end of the construction phase to be undertaken will ensure there is no net loss of hedgerow habitat as a result of Hornsea Project Three. Furthermore, restoration of hedgerows, currently in poor condition, provides an opportunity to achieve long term benefits for the biodiversity associated with this habitat type. Further details on hedgerow removal, retention and replacement can be found in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation as well as the Outline Ecological Management Plan and the Outline Landscape Management Plan which form part of the DCO application.
John Walker, (SHOOT)	<b>Cable Corridor</b> - Yes, you have been on the land without proper access	N	Response noted, this matter has been communicated to Hornsea Three land agents who manage access arrangements for surveys. As a matter principle Hornsea Three has sought to secure land owner permission for all access to land.
John Walker, (SHOOT)	<b>EIA</b> - Your surveys were ignorant of the existence of badger setts and other in this area surveyed - so what else are you missing?	I	Impacts on ecological receptors, including badgers, is assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation. This assessment was informed by a robust baseline survey which is reported in a Confidential Badger Annex which forms Environmental Statement, volume 6, annex 3.11.  Specific mitigation identified to avoid or minimise impacts on badgers are provided in Environmental Statement volume 3: Chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation as well as in the Outline EMP which forms part of the DCO application
Pat Floyd	<b>PEIR Surveys</b> - Obviously the project will not improve the landscape while under construction and affects wildlife. All building along the route must be kept to a minimum height. I also have suspicions about the amount of turbines now situating in the North Sea and how this impacts whale migrations and could be partly responsible for so many whales being beached along the Norfolk and Suffolk coasts this year	I	Thank you for you feedback. The final assessment for offshore birds is presented in Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore Ornithology and the final assessment for Marine Mammals presented in Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine Mammals with no impacts of major significance identified for either receptors.



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>42</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Peter Halls	<b>Local Matters Landfall</b> - The destruction of ancient woodland beside Mole Hill on the Morton hall estate. It will cut the wood in half and destroy the corridor of trees. I notice that trees cannot be replaced on the site. It needs a tunnel.	Y	We recognise that protection and sensitive restoration of hedgerows and trees is important to minimise any negative impact on biodiversity or landscape. Impacts from Hornsea Three on ecological features, including hedgerows and trees (including woodlands) has been avoided where possible through commitments to use trenchless technologies such as Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD). As a result of this, Hornsea Three has no direct impacts on ancient woodland.  Further details on hedgerow and tree removal, retention and replacement can be found in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation as well as the Outline Ecological Management Plan and the Outline Landscape Management Plan which form part of the DCO application.
Roger Hughes	<b>Mitigation Methods</b> - There are a number of breeding birds nesting within the construction area, notably red kites, buzzards and song birds. Removal of trees, hedges and vegetation should take place outside the breeding area.	I	Environmental Statement volume 6, annexes 3.1 - 3.14 report on the full suite of ecological baseline surveys undertaken to inform the assessment of impacts on ecology and nature conservation as reported in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation. Environmental Statement volume 6, annexes 3.9 and 3.10 provide a description of the currently baseline in respect to ornithology (wintering, migratory and breeding birds).  Impacts on birds, and associated mitigation are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation as well as the outline Ecological Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.
Valerie Stubbs	<b>Onshore Cable</b> - In Weybourne the route to the east of the village goes very close to a lot of homes. Pink-footed geese graze on the fields in that area. Many of the properties in the village are holiday lets, which will be very sensitive to noise disturbance (and other disruption). The peak holiday season is May to the end of September, but runs April to the end of October.	I	Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts to local residential receptors, either through site selection/route refinement or through the identification of suitable mitigation measures. Where there are impacts to residential receptors, these are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3). Impacts on socio-economics and tourism in particular is assessed within Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 10: Socio-Economics.  Environmental Statement, volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation considers potential impacts on ecological receptors as a result of Hornsea Three. This includes potential impacts on species such as Pink-footed Geese.
John Evans	<b>Onshore Cable</b> - As a resident of High Kelling living in Pineheath Road north side, I am concerned that the cable(s) (new to me - 6 cables) route is close to several properties. I would be much happier if the route were moved further away from Warren Farm and closer to Squirrel Wood Farm, and thus unable to kink to be straightened, so that the cable can be laid further away from Pineheath Road. NB we already have overhead power cables running 2 metres from our properties on that north side. Also our trees have TPOs and I would not wish any trees to be destroyed by trenching	I	Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts to local residential receptors, either through site selection/route refinement or through the identification of suitable mitigation measures. Where there are impacts to residential receptors, these are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3).  Impacts from Hornsea Three on ecological features, including hedgerows and trees (including woodlands) has been avoided where possible through commitments to use trenchless technologies such as Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD). We recognise that protection and sensitive restoration of hedgerows and trees is important to minimise any negative impact on biodiversity or landscape.



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>42</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Christine Walton	<b>PEIR Construction</b> - Yes - As open cut as possible Hedgerow/trees/footpaths/woodlands - many ancient in Norfolk - should be present - replanting not really good though - when the original is gone - it's gone! The people living now don't want to lose these treasures linked to them. Replanting trees requires time to grow.	I	Impacts from Hornsea Three on ecological features, including hedgerows and trees (including woodlands) has been avoided where possible through commitments to use trenchless technologies such as Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD). We recognise that protection and sensitive restoration of hedgerows and trees is important to minimise any negative impact on biodiversity or landscape.  The replacement of hedgerows at the end of the construction phase to be undertaken will ensure there is no net loss of hedgerow habitat as a result of Hornsea Project Three. Furthermore, restoration of hedgerows, currently in poor condition, provides an opportunity to achieve long term benefits for the biodiversity associated with this habitat type. Further details on hedgerow removal, retention and replacement can be found in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation as well as the Outline Ecological Management Plan and the Outline Landscape Management Plan which form part of the DCO application.
Christine Walton	<b>PEIR Surveys</b> - You do not have any idea of the impact of this, otherwise you would not be considering doing it. I love Norfolk and do not want it built on. As I have mentioned before once our countryside and its birds/animals/wildlife/woodland are gone - they cannot be replaced. Please consider looking at the sheer amount of other building projects in this area. What do you think the impact of all of these if they all great passed will be? We are in grave danger of losing something really precious which is irreplaceable.	I	We recognise that protection and sensitive restoration of hedgerows and trees is important to minimise any negative impact on biodiversity or landscape. Therefore Hornsea Three has avoided sensitive ecological receptors (e.g. hedgerows/trees) where possible through commitments to use trenchless technologies such as Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD).  Where this has not been possible, impacts on ecological receptors are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3; Ecology and Nature Conservation.
Christine Walton	<b>Temporary Construction</b> - No 'temporary construction' should be done unless absolutely necessary as the destruction of wildlife habitats would not be temporary	I	A number of secondary construction compounds, and a main construction compound are proposed during the construction phase of Hornsea Three. These are required to enable the construction of the project. The location of these, as well as a summary of their function, is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description.
Francis Farron	<b>Offshore Array</b> - There are no references to the substantial migration of song birds and migrant bats that occur throughout this area. There have been many studies including a recent report: Bird and bat species' global vulnerability to collision mortality with wind farms revealed through a trait-based assessment (Proc R soc B). Main points: Collision rates for bats is higher than birds. Avoid migratory flyways. Any 'white' lighting on the structures should be 'down-looking' also in Dutch waters it has been recommended that turbines have higher cut-in speeds and may also be turned off at peak migration.	I	The potential for the project to impact migrating birds has been considered within Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 5 and the Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment. The lighting of turbines offshore is provided primarily for the safety of shipping and aviation and hence the ability to adjust this is limited by safety requirements associated with this. Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation considers the potential impacts of the project on bats.
Francis Farron	<b>Cable Corridor</b> - There are a number of ecologically sensitive areas near the corridor and although they are avoided many will be connected by water courses and could be impacted if these water courses are polluted or silt inundated. All water courses, however small, need great care	I	It is noted that the onshore cable route has sought to avoid direct impacts on ecologically sensitive locations through route refinement, or the use of trenchless technologies e.g. HDD. However, where this was not possible, or where indirect impact were predicted, potential impacts from Hornsea Three on ecological receptors have been assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation. In respect to impacts on hydrological sensitivities, Hornsea Three will cross a majority of surface watercourses HDD. An outline method statement for the proposed crossing methodologies is included in the outline CoCP which forms part of the DCO application. This method statement will be developed further (in discussion with the EA) during the detailed design stage. The Environmental Statement concludes that impacts on surface watercourses would be, at most, minor adverse which is not significant in EIA terms.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>42</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Francis Farron	<b>Baseline Information</b> - This is good as far as it goes but the problems related to migrant land birds and bats needs to be addressed. With East Anglia becoming 'ringed' by offshore windfarms this will be a major problem in the future. See: occurrence of peaks in songbird migration at the heights of offshore wind farms in the southern Norfolk sea, KL Krigsveld, RC Fijn, R Lensink (2015). This shows that the Dutch are very much aware of the potential problems and its not even mentioned in the PIER!	I	The potential for the project to impact migrating birds has been considered within Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 5 and the Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment. The lighting of turbines offshore is provided primarily for the safety of shipping and aviation and hence the ability to adjust this is limited by safety requirements associated with this. Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation considers the potential impacts of the project on bats.
Francis Farron	<b>EIA</b> - Lack of consideration of Passerine and Bat migration when wind farm in the traditional migration flyway area	I	The potential for the project to impact migrating birds has been considered within Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 5 and the Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment. The lighting of turbines offshore is provided primarily for the safety of shipping and aviation and hence the ability to adjust this is limited by safety requirements associated with this. Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation considers the potential impacts of the project on bats.
T Mason	<b>PEIR</b> - I am interested in the welfare of badgers and urge the planners to respect the legal requirements when crossing setts, do be aiming for minimum disturbance and work with all interested parties - i.e. the Norfolk Badger Group.	I	Impacts on ecological receptors, including badgers, is assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation. This chapter also sets out specific mitigation identified to avoid or minimise impacts on badgers.
T Mason	<b>Information</b> - I have not looked at all the documents but simply wanted to add my voice to those wanting protection of badgers to be ensured	I	Impacts on ecological receptors, including badgers, is assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation. This chapter also sets out specific mitigation identified to avoid or minimise impacts on badgers.
Ruth Bullard	<b>Cable Corridor</b> - Kelling Heath is a very important habitat for a range of rare wildlife, including Nightingales. Alderford Common is also important for wildlife (Turtle doves, newts, frogs)	Y	Since the PEIR, a refined landfall location has been identified (western re-route around Kelling) and the area identified for landfall works has reduced. This was informed by a number of factors including community feedback in the area of Kelling and Weybourne, avoidance of the Kelling Heath SSSI/CWS and Holiday Park as well as engineering/technical considerations.
Elaine Parkinson	<b>Baseline Information</b> - Can only hope you are seriously listening to people like the Wildlife trust and other stakeholders that know the issues	I	Noted, Hornsea Three has identified how the project has had regard to all consultation comments received within this Consultation Report which forms part of the DCO application.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / NA <sup>42</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Mark Cook	<p><b>HVAC</b> - The booster station will have a huge impact in the villages of Edgefield and Little Barningham especially. We live in a very rural environment with little or narrow roads. It will be hit on the landscape and lead to an industrialisation of our countryside. What plans have been made to cope with run off of rain water? I assume a lot of concrete will have to be built and also the surface area of the buildings will be large. Light pollution is another problem I foresee. And the screening of it - trees will take years to cover a building of this size.</p>	I	<p>Appropriate mitigation measures have been designed-in to Hornsea Three to minimise impacts on drainage and flooding (particularly in relation to runoff). Details are provided in volume 3, chapter 2: Hydrology and Flood Risk (see Table 2.17) as well as the outline CoCP which forms part of the DCO application.</p> <p>Furthermore, the design has sought to minimise run-off through maximising the area of permeable hardstanding and preparing an outline drainage strategy for the HVDC converter/HVAC substation. This outline strategy is provided in Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 2.1: Onshore Infrastructure FRAs and has been developed in accordance with the NPS, NPPF, PPG ID7 and the SuDS Manual, whereby sufficient attenuation storage is provided for 1 in 100 year plus climate change worst case storm event. Drainage provisions will be further developed during detailed design in agreement with the Norfolk County Council as LLFA. The Flood Risk Assessment which has been undertaken for the Project concludes that Hornsea Three meets the requirements of NPS EN-1 and the NPPF.</p> <p>In respect to lighting, site lighting at the HVDC converter/HVAC substation will only operate when required and will be directional to avoid unnecessary illumination.</p> <p>Landscape planting is proposed around the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation to minimise impacts, though it is noted there would be a period of time during which the planting would need to mature. This is reflected in the assessment presented in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources which assesses both a year 1 and year 15 scenario. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.</p>
Mark Cook	<p><b>Further Comments</b> - I think that the serious issue of the effect of tourism needs looking at and how it will effect Holt and Sheringham. The impact this will have on Weybourne and Kelling and also the sites of SSSI and the wildlife.</p>	I	<p>It is noted that, since the PEIR, a refined landfall location has been identified (western re-route around Kelling) and the area identified for landfall works has reduced. This was informed by a number of factors including community feedback in the area of Kelling and Weybourne, avoidance of the Kelling Heath SSSI/CWS and Holiday Park as well as engineering/technical considerations.</p> <p>Where impacts on tourism remain, these are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 10: Socio-Economics.</p>
Sue Lowther	<p><b>Onshore Cable</b> - I believe any effort must be made to preserve our heritage, i.e. not to disturb old buildings and monuments, as well as old trees and hedges. Residential areas should be avoided</p>	I	<p>Hornsea Three has sought to avoid residential areas, as well as sensitive historic receptors through site selection and cable routing, this has included scheduled monuments, listed buildings, registered park and gardens etc. Hornsea Three has also committed to the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts on local road networks, ecological receptors (e.g. trees, hedgerows) and hydrological features (e.g. main rivers).</p>
Sue Lowther	<p><b>80m Refinement</b> - I am concerned for the residents along his corridor. They should be fully taken into account and receive compensation. Again, old trees, hedges, woodland, monuments etc.</p>	I	<p>Hornsea Three has sought to avoid residential areas, as well as sensitive historic receptors through site selection and cable routing, this has included scheduled monuments, listed buildings, registered park and gardens etc. Hornsea Three has also committed to the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts on local road networks, ecological receptors (e.g. trees, hedgerows) and hydrological features (e.g. main rivers).</p> <p>Compensation is paid for the freehold depreciation of the land directly affected by the easement and for all reasonable and substantiated losses arising from construction of the project.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>42</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Sue Lowther	<p><b>Substation</b> - Does this affect our water supply? There are ancient hedges around here (at least 400 years old) that must be preserved, plus ancient trees. It will affect the view from this house. Can the substation be sunk into the ground? The consultation said there would be considerable noise levels from substation - this is not acceptable. The consultation also said the visual impact would be considerable. It should therefore be situated as far away from residents as is possible. Therefore locate next to the national grid station.</p>	I	<p>Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives sets out the process undertaken during the pre-application phase of Hornsea Three to identify the location of the HVDC converter/HVAC substation. The proposed site for the HVDC converter / HVAC substation, just south of the A47, has been identified following extensive environmental surveys, technical and feasibility studies and ongoing consultation. Due to the size of the land area required for the onshore substation, there are very limited options available and the location indicated in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Project Description was determined to be the most suitable following our site selection process.</p> <p>Impacts from Hornsea Three on ecological features, including hedgerows and trees has been avoided where possible through commitments to use trenchless technologies such as Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD). We recognise that protection and sensitive restoration of hedgerows is important to minimise any negative impact on biodiversity or landscape resulting from loss or reduction in hedgerows and in the few instances where sections of the hedgerow needs to be temporarily removed, it will of course be handled sensitively. The replacement of hedgerows at the end of the construction phase to be undertaken will ensure there is no net loss of hedgerow habitat as a result of Hornsea Project Three. Furthermore, restoration of hedgerows, currently in poor condition, provides an opportunity to achieve long term benefits for the biodiversity associated with this habitat type. The impacts of Hornsea Three on hedgerows and trees is presented in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation.</p> <p>Consideration was given to a wide range of potential mitigation in respect to landscape and visual effects of Hornsea Three. The lowering of the HVDC converter/HVAC substation below current ground level was one option which was considered; however, given that multiple underground cables need to connect into this infrastructure, this option would have had significant implications for the depth of cable trenches and thus earthworks needed along a length of the onshore cable corridor. Based on this, Hornsea Three has implemented a range of other mitigation measures which are set out in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Effects. For example, it is recognised that the onshore HVAC booster station and onshore HVDC converter/HVAC substation would not be screened entirely by existing landform or vegetation in some views. As such, an indicative landscape strategy has been developed to assist in mitigating visual and landscape impacts. This is presented in the outline Landscape Management Plan which accompanies the DCO application.</p> <p>In respect to noise, the noise generated by the HVDC converter/HVAC substation is considered within Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 8: Noise and Vibration. Furthermore, an operational noise management plan will be prepared and agreed with the local environmental health officer.</p>
Sue Lowther	<p><b>PEIR</b> - Water access to our homes is restricted. Considerable noise effect. Safety of underground cables. Possible effect on surrounding properties of 'dirty electricity'. Wildlife has already been affected by the A47 - you will find no birds the closer you get to the A47. The substation will further affect wildlife. I regularly walk my dog around fields between the properties and the A47, and regularly see deer around. Their habitat will be further reduced.</p>	I	<p>Through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive ecological receptors. For example, Weybourne Cliffs and Kelling Heath SSSI have been avoided and no direct impacts are predicted on these designated sites from Hornsea Three; furthermore landscape planting is proposed at the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation to provide additional screening. Additional mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project are outlined in topic specific chapters, and include the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts on local road networks, ecological receptors (e.g. hedgerows) and hydrological features (e.g. main rivers).</p> <p>Where impacts remain, these are assessed in the relevant topic chapter of the Environmental Statement, volume 3.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>42</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
John Mangan	<b>Onshore Cable</b> - Yes, the proximity of the corridor to the properties on Pineheath Road in High Kelling - and Warren Farm. The impact on Bodham Wood as the corridor runs beneath/through it	Y	In respect to Pineheath Road, the onshore cable corridor passes to the north. Given the proximity of residential properties, Hornsea Three will ensure that sensitive construction management measures, such as noise, dust and traffic control are applied where appropriate. These are documented in an outline CoCP, which forms part of the DCO application.  Hornsea Three has committed to cross Bodham Wood using HDD, this is shown on the plans which accompany the DCO application.
Maureen Durrant	<b>Landfall</b> - This area proposed through High Kelling is an SSSI area and I am very concerned about the effect of wildlife	Y	Since the PEIR, a refined landfall location has been identified (western re-route around Kelling) and the area identified for landfall works has reduced. This was informed by a number of factors including community feedback in the area of Kelling and Weybourne, avoidance of the Kelling Heath SSSI/CWS and Holiday Park as well as engineering/technical considerations.
Sarah Griggs-Smith	<b>Further Comments</b> - With indigenous trees, shrubs etc growth. Access from the A47 = B140 Road is very narrow. Compensation for any loss of value - if happens. Fence building around Part View Cottage for the duration of building (for the safety of small children). Face to face visit with Mangreen residents	I	Through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including landscapes and other sensitive receptors (e.g. ecological and residential). Mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project, including at the HVDC converter/HVAC substation and HVAC booster station are outlined in topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement, and include the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts on local road networks, ecological receptors (e.g. hedgerows) and hydrological features (e.g. main rivers).  Information on construction and operational access routing is provided in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport.  Appropriate mitigation measures for visual disturbance are outlined in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources. This includes, for example, the restoration of habitats (including hedgerows) which cannot be avoided and landscape planting around the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.  Details of security measures during the onshore construction phase of Hornsea Three are set out in outline CoCP which establishes the principles which any principal contractor must follow, the outline CoCP forms part of the DCO application. The operational substation, will be secured in accordance with established standards, with specific measures developed during the detailed design phase.



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>42</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Sarah Griggs-Smith	<p><b>PEIR Surveys</b> - Not read details of this, but saw information at the meeting. High building, please dig embankment and put it below level of ground. Hedges, woodland. Do not cut ancient trees of perimeter</p>	I	<p>The parameters of the permanent infrastructure is set out in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description. Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts from these features on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive ecological receptors. For example, the orientation of the HVAC booster station has been optimised to minimise impacts on nearby field boundaries (hedgerows and trees) as well as maximise natural screening. Additional mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project are outlined in topic specific chapters, and include the use of trenchless technologies (i.e. HDD) to avoid or minimise impacts on local road networks, ecological receptors (e.g. hedgerows and woodland) and hydrological features (e.g. main rivers).</p> <p>Consideration was given to a wide range of potential mitigation in respect to landscape and visual effects of Hornsea Three. The lowering of the HVDC converter/HVAC substation below current ground level was one option which was considered; however, given that multiple underground cables need to connect into this infrastructure, this option would have had significant implications for the depth of cable trenches and thus earthworks needed along a length of the onshore cable corridor. Furthermore, this option would have increased the amount of earthworks required on-site (with secondary impacts on land use, hydrology and traffic movements) and increased the permanent footprint of the infrastructure. Based on this, Hornsea Three has implemented a range of other mitigation measures which are set out in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Effects. For example, an indicative landscape strategy has been developed to assist in mitigating visual and landscape impacts. This is presented in the outline Landscape Management Plan which accompanies the DCO application.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>42</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Sarah Griggs-Smith	<p><b>Mitigation Methods</b> - Protect woodland, housing. Archaeology and historical 400 year old hedges and Embankment and dig in the structure</p>	I	<p>We recognise that protection of hedgerows and woodland is important to minimise any negative impact on biodiversity or landscape. Impacts from Hornsea Three on ecological features, including hedgerows and trees (including woodlands) has been avoided where possible through commitments to use trenchless technologies such as Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD). As a result of this, Hornsea Three has no direct impacts on ancient woodland.</p> <p>The replacement of hedgerows at the end of the construction phase to be undertaken will ensure there is no net loss of hedgerow habitat as a result of Hornsea Project Three. Furthermore, restoration of hedgerows, currently in poor condition, provides an opportunity to achieve long term benefits for the biodiversity associated with this habitat type. Further details on hedgerow removal, retention and replacement can be found in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation as well as the Outline Ecological Management Plan and the Outline Landscape Management Plan which form part of the DCO application.</p> <p>Hornsea Three has also sought to avoid direct impacts on heritage assets through route refinement and site selection (see Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives). Any remaining impacts on heritage assets are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 5: Historic Environment.</p> <p>Where properties are located in close proximity, the Project will ensure that sensitive construction management measures, such as noise, dust and traffic control are considered. These are documented in an outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), which accompanies the DCO application.</p> <p>Consideration was given to a wide range of potential mitigation in respect to landscape and visual effects of Hornsea Three. The lowering of the HVDC converter/HVAC substation below current ground level was one option which was considered; however, given that multiple underground cables need to connect into this infrastructure, this option would have had significant implications for the depth of cable trenches and thus earthworks needed along a length of the onshore cable corridor. Furthermore, this option would have increased the amount of earthworks required on-site (with secondary impacts on land use, hydrology and traffic movements) and increased the permanent footprint of the infrastructure. Based on this, Hornsea Three has implemented a range of other mitigation measures which are set out in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Effects. For example, an indicative landscape strategy has been developed to assist in mitigating visual and landscape impacts. This is presented in the outline Landscape Management Plan which accompanies the DCO application.</p>
Karl Feistner	<p><b>Export Cable</b> - No - on the assumption that wildlife / environmental factors are properly taken into account</p>	I	<p>Through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive ecological receptors. For example, designated sites have been avoided and no direct impacts are predicted from Hornsea Three. Additional mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project are outlined in topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3), and include the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts on local road networks, ecological receptors (e.g. hedgerows) and hydrological features (e.g. main rivers).</p>
Karl Feistner	<p><b>Onshore Cable</b> - The corridor should utilise agricultural land that can be readily reinstated. It should not affect broadleaf woodland, heath or other fragile habitats that would take many years to recover. Depending upon the time of year of construction, consideration should be given to such things as toad migrations to breeding ponds etc.</p>	I	<p>Hornsea Three has sought to avoid sensitive ecological receptors (including designated sites and sensitive habitats) through cable routing or the use of trenchless technologies (e.g. HDD). Where impacts cannot be avoided, mitigation has been proposed, as set out in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3; Ecology and Nature Conservation.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>42</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Karl Feistner	<b>Temporary Construction</b> - No - as long as sensitive natural habitats are not affected and full reinstatement occurs.	I	Temporary construction compounds, storage areas and accesses will be cleared as work progresses and when they are no longer required. On completion of construction work all plant, temporary buildings or vehicles will be removed. If works are delivered in phases, temporary construction compounds and accesses will be removed on completion of construction work associated with that phase unless otherwise approved by the Local Planning Authority. Following completion of the onshore cable installation, the working area will be reinstated to a state commensurate with condition prior to the commencement of works. Further details are provided in the outline CoCP which forms part of the DCO application.
Julia Peters	<b>Offshore Array</b> - Too close to Weybourne Cliffs SSSI (long term damage).	Y	Since the PEIR, a refined landfall location has been identified (western re-route around Kelling) and the area identified for landfall works has reduced. This was informed by a number of factors including community feedback in the area of Kelling and Weybourne, avoidance of the Kelling Heath SSSI/CWS and Holiday Park as well as engineering/technical considerations.
Julia Peters	<b>Onshore Cable</b> - Kelling Heath SSSI is an irreplaceable and scarce type of habitat and will be irreparably damaged (as the EIR states) if the ECR work is undertaken there. This also applies to Kelling Heath Park and 100 Acre Wood CWS. Major magnitude and high sensitivity to this disturbance. The alternative route to the west is vastly preferred. Pine Farm Bodham GR TG11753950 is Grade II listed with the proposed ECR passing around three sides less than 250m away from its boundaries. All agencies request that the buildings and SETTINGS are preserved. The proposed works will greatly alter the setting, currently tranquil and in keeping with the farmstead. The species rich hedges of the site will be removed and possibly not replaced for over 10 years, with resulting visual degradation of this heritage landscape. This seems to contravene your stated heritage objectives. Local hedges in Bodham are species rich (i.e. 5 or more native species). The hedge running N-S off the A148 (GR TG114398) is the only hedge in open fields, species rich with good size oak trees along its length and this is mostly on the proposed ECR so will be removed. The oaks will not be replanted as over the cables. Could the route be moved into the big field to the east instead, although this may lengthen the route a little but then the cost of hedge removal and disposal and that of replacing will be less. If the line of the ECR was moved to the east as it exits Bodham / 100 Acre Woods this would mean species rich hedges and the Pine Farm complex could be avoided altogether with little additional cost of construction. Bodham ponds will be impacted (5 or so near Church Farm House) both by cable trenches through them and changing the water table. The proposed cable route was designed to minimise impact on ponds I note.	Y	Since the PEIR, a refined landfall location has been identified (western re-route around Kelling) and the area identified for landfall works has reduced. This was informed by a number of factors including community feedback in the area of Kelling and Weybourne, avoidance of the Kelling Heath SSSI/ Kelling Heath Park and 100 Acre Wood CWS, and Holiday Park as well as engineering/technical considerations. Additional information relating to the onshore cable corridor routing is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description and chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives.  Impacts relating to heritage assets and ecological receptors are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 5: Historic Environment and chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation respectively. In respect to potential landscape and visual impacts, Hornsea Three has sought to avoid landscape features (including trees and hedgerows) through cable routing or the use of trenchless technologies. Where impacts cannot be avoided, appropriate mitigation measures for visual disturbance are outlined in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources. For example, any hedgerows which cannot be avoided will be replaced at the end of the construction phase. Furthermore, restoration of hedgerows, currently in poor condition, provides an opportunity to achieve long term benefits for the biodiversity associated with this habitat type as well as gap up hedgerows providing landscape and visual mitigation. Further details on hedgerow removal, retention and replacement can be found in volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation, the Outline Ecological Management Plan and the Outline Landscape Management Plan.
Julia Peters	<b>80m Refinement</b> - Kelling Heath and 100Acre Wood - long term impact and irreversible damage. Pine Farm Bodham - nationally designated heritage site and setting - ECR needs to be 250m+ away from its boundaries Hedges and Ponds in Bodham - locate the ECR around or away from them, each time these are removed or damaged degrades the landscape and reduces the potential for wildlife/ biodiversity. I	Y	Since the PEIR, a refined landfall location has been identified (western re-route around Kelling) and the area identified for landfall works has reduced. This was informed by a number of factors including community feedback in the area of Kelling and Weybourne, avoidance of the Kelling Heath SSSI/ Kelling Heath Park and 100 Acre Wood CWS, and Holiday Park as well as engineering/technical considerations. Additional information relating to the onshore cable corridor routing is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description and chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives.  Furthermore, Hornsea Three has sought to avoid sensitive ecological features such as hedgerows and ponds through cable route refinement. Where this was not possible, Hornsea Three has, in many instances, committed to the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts. The same approach has been applied to hydrological features (e.g. main rivers).  Impacts relating to heritage assets and ecological receptors are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 5: Historic Environment and chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation respectively.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>42</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Julia Peters	<b>PEIR</b> - Hedge surveys on maps at the public consultations did not identify all the species-rich hedges in Bodham parish and the impact the ECR would have on these. (Species-rich as in 5 or more native species).	I	<p>We recognise that protection and sensitive restoration of hedgerows and trees is important to minimise any negative impact on biodiversity or landscape. Impacts from Hornsea Three on ecological features, including hedgerows and trees (including woodlands) has been avoided where possible through commitments to use trenchless technologies such as Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD). As a result of this, Hornsea Three has no direct impacts on ancient woodland.</p> <p>The replacement of hedgerows at the end of the construction phase to be undertaken will ensure there is no net loss of hedgerow habitat as a result of Hornsea Project Three. Furthermore, restoration of hedgerows, currently in poor condition, provides an opportunity to achieve long term benefits for the biodiversity associated with this habitat type. Further details on hedgerow removal, retention and replacement can be found in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation as well as the Outline Ecological Management Plan and the Outline Landscape Management Plan which form part of the DCO application.</p>
Julia Peters	<b>Baseline Assessments</b> - Puzzled by why the BTO Birdtrack was used and referred to as casual data, was there no BBS, etc, for the route?	I	<p>Following consultations, it was determined that RSPB and British Trust for Ornithology (BTO) records would be unlikely to add significant value to the data set. Available BTO data are limited to BirdTrack (an online database of casual bird sightings which is not a systematic survey), which is not considered to be of relevance to the survey reporting or technical reporting. Also, there are no relevant Wetland Bird Survey (WeBS) data as this national survey of wetlands does not cover habitats within the Hornsea Three onshore ecology and nature conservation study area. RSPB do not hold specific records and were consulted as part of the Onshore Ecology EWG. Further details on the baseline used to inform the ecology assessment is included in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation.</p>
Julia Peters	<b>PEIR</b> - Mitigation of hedge removal by planting would be improved if the replacement plants were of the same species as originally removed rather than the usual 'native' mix (egg guelder rose and wayfarer's tree are not locally found).	I	<p>We recognise that protection and sensitive restoration of hedgerows and trees is important to minimise any negative impact on biodiversity or landscape. Impacts from Hornsea Three on ecological features, including hedgerows and trees (including woodlands) has been avoided where possible through commitments to use trenchless technologies such as Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD). As a result of this, Hornsea Three has no direct impacts on ancient woodland.</p> <p>The replacement of hedgerows at the end of the construction phase to be undertaken will ensure there is no net loss of hedgerow habitat as a result of Hornsea Project Three. Furthermore, restoration of hedgerows, currently in poor condition, provides an opportunity to achieve long term benefits for the biodiversity associated with this habitat type. Further details on hedgerow removal, retention and replacement can be found in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation as well as the Outline Ecological Management Plan and the Outline Landscape Management Plan which form part of the DCO application.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>42</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Julia Peters	<b>Proposal</b> - Very concerned over the potential time span of the project once work commences. Altering the ECR to avoid the very fragile environments of Weybourne Beach wetland and Kelling Heath would be ideal, mostly for the wildlife and also tourism. Destruction of local hedges and ponds should be avoided by shifting the line of the ECR by 100m as required. The ECR at Pine Farm and setting is contrary to your own policy documents. Construction needs to be mindful of silt and unintentional pollution of the River Glaven headwaters. Mitigation should consider both repairing the damage and also improving the landscape features on the proposed route.	Y	<p>Through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive ecological receptors. For example, Weybourne Cliffs and Kelling Heath SSSI have been avoided and no direct impacts are predicted on these designated sites from Hornsea Three. Additional mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project are outlined in topic specific chapters, and include the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts on local road networks, ecological receptors (e.g. hedgerows) and hydrological features (e.g. main rivers).</p> <p>Measures to minimise the generation of silt and prevent runoff entering the watercourses are set out in the Outline Code of Construction Practice which forms part of the DCO application, and includes a commitment to prepare Pollution Prevention and Emergency Response Plans.</p> <p>Prior to construction commencing a Schedule of Condition of the land will be taken and we have an obligation to return the land in the same state. In this regard, any hedgerows which cannot be avoided will be replaced at the end of the construction phase. Furthermore, restoration of hedgerows, currently in poor condition, provides an opportunity to achieve long term benefits for the biodiversity associated with this habitat type as well as gap up hedgerows providing landscape and visual mitigation. Further details on hedgerow removal, retention and replacement can be found in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation, the Outline Ecological Management Plan and the Outline Landscape Management Plan.</p>
Brian Donovan	<b>Offshore Array</b> - At your holt consultation I was not reassured that the project knew how many birds would be killed, and which species would be most affected (i.e. use this flight path). Also ,what components of the array will be updated, recycled, removed or left behind after the 25 year lifespan?	I	<p>Please see the Environmental Statement, Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore Ornithology, which assesses the potential impact of the project on different species of birds.</p> <p>Regarding what will happen to the project components once the project life is over, there is a legal requirement for the project to submit a Decommissioning Plan to the Secretary of State before construction commences. This will detail the waste strategy and recycling for components.</p>
R.H Peaver	<b>Onshore Cable</b> - I am concerned about any potential despoliation of the countryside.	I	<p>Through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive ecological receptors. For example, Weybourne Cliffs and Kelling Heath SSSI have been avoided and no direct impacts are predicted on these designated sites from Hornsea Three. Additional mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project are outlined in topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3), and include the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts on local road networks, ecological receptors (e.g. hedgerows) and hydrological features (e.g. main rivers).</p>
John Humberstone	<b>Export Cable</b> - No - as long as its path avoids habitat area	I	<p>Hornsea Three has sought to avoid sensitive habitats through site selection and route refinement (see Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives). Where sensitive habitats such as county wildlife sites and woodland remained within the onshore cable corridor, Hornsea Three has committed to use HDD at these locations, thus avoiding direct impacts.</p> <p>Additional mitigation measures have been identified within Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation to minimise impacts on ecological receptors. These are also documented, where relevant, in the outline CoCP and outline EMP which form part of the DCO application.</p>



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>42</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
John Humberstone	<b>Information</b> - Advise any proposed changed to route - at the moment of course the footpath at the top of High Kelling away from human habitation	I	Information relating to onshore cable corridor route refinement is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives. Impacts on PRoW are specifically assessed within Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 6: Land Use and Recreation.
Simon Clarke	<b>Local matters at landfall</b> - Again, wildlife disruption is a concern and noise pollution will certainly be an issue	I	Through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive ecological receptors. For example, the orientation of the HVAC booster station has been optimised to minimise impacts on nearby field boundaries (hedgerows and trees) as well as maximise natural screening. Additional mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project are outlined in topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3), and include the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts on local road networks, ecological receptors (e.g. hedgerows) and hydrological features (e.g. main rivers). Impacts on ecological receptors and noise sensitive receptors are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation and chapter 8: Noise and Vibration respectively.
Simon Willcox	<b>Strongly Oppose</b> - Your proposals are unwanted and unnecessary. The potential longer - and shorter - consequences of your proposed onshore cable corridor will have catastrophic consequences on an unspoilt and treasured landscape. The consequential loss of trees, hedgerow, wildlife habitat disturbance will not outweigh the benefits of offshore wind energy	N	The short term and long term potential impacts of Hornsea Three are assessed within the Environmental Statement, volume 2 and 3. In respect to potential landscape and visual impacts, Hornsea Three has sought to avoid landscape features (including trees and hedgerows) through cable routing or the use of trenchless technologies. Where impacts cannot be avoided, appropriate mitigation measures for visual disturbance are outlined in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources. For example, any hedgerows which cannot be avoided will be replaced at the end of the construction phase. Furthermore, restoration of hedgerows, currently in poor condition, provides an opportunity to achieve long term benefits for the biodiversity associated with this habitat type as well as gap up hedgerows providing landscape and visual mitigation. Further details on hedgerow removal, retention and replacement can be found in volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation, the Outline Ecological Management Plan and the Outline Landscape Management Plan.  At the HVAC booster station and HVDC converter/HVAC substation, landscape planting is also proposed to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.
Tina Hayward	<b>Onshore cable corridor</b> - I live right on the edge of northern end of the orange route where it passes through Heydon and I think the western (pink) alternative would be much more suitable affecting less properties and less mature trees	Y	Hornsea Three has taken forward the western route, as shown in the plans which accompany the DCO application. The justification for this decision is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives and its accompanying annexes.
<b>Section 48: Duty to publicise</b>			
Norfolk Geodiversity Partnership	We would be grateful to receive paper work from you relating to the statutory consultation on the environmental impact of the Hornsea 3 onshore cable project in Norfolk. The Norfolk Geodiversity Partnership is the body which designates Local Sites of geodiversity interest (County Geodiversity Sites), re. sections 109 and 117 of the National Planning Policy Framework.	N	Ørsted issued a further copy of the consultation overview and USB containing the full PEIR and supporting consultation materials to the Norfolk Geodiversity Partnership.
Douglas Walters (Norfolk Geographical Association)	<b>Cable corridor</b> - It sounds a good idea to have the cabling underground. And should be built in a way that doesn't have too much impact on the coastal typography and local landmarks. Also be careful with cabling under streets and on possible flood plains	I	Through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive assets. Mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project are outlined in topic specific chapters, and include the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts on local road networks, ecological receptors (e.g. hedgerows) and hydrological features (e.g. main rivers).

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>42</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Douglas Walters (Norfolk Geographical Association)	<b>80m Refinement</b> - I think making the final corridor 80 metres could be a good ideas and again to minimise environmental impact	Y	Hornsea Three has sought to minimise direct impacts on sensitive receptors by reducing the onshore cable corridor from 200 m to approximately 80 m. A number of factors have fed into this refinement process, including technical and environmental. This process is summarised in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives.
George Carman, Geodirect Resources P/L	<b>Onshore Cable Corridor</b> - Grave concerns on impact of installation operations generating disruptive traffic and long term damage to rural landscape (ancient hedgerows) and fragile country single track lanes	I	<p>Impacts relating to access are addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport. It is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this forms part of the DCO application.</p> <p>In respect to hedgerows, impacts from Hornsea Three on ecological features, including hedgerows and trees (including woodlands) has been avoided where possible through commitments to use trenchless technologies such as Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD). We recognise that protection and sensitive restoration of hedgerows and trees is important to minimise any negative impact on biodiversity or landscape.</p> <p>The replacement of hedgerows at the end of the construction phase to be undertaken will ensure there is no net loss of hedgerow habitat as a result of Hornsea Project Three. Furthermore, restoration of hedgerows, currently in poor condition, provides an opportunity to achieve long term benefits for the biodiversity associated with this habitat type. Further details on hedgerow removal, retention and replacement can be found in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation as well as the Outline Ecological Management Plan and the Outline Landscape Management Plan which form part of the DCO application.</p>
George Carman, Geodirect Resources P/L	<b>Temporary Construction</b> - We are very concerned that the proposed Oulton Construction Compound is some 5 km from the cable corridor invoking much traffic disruption through Itteringham village for access to corridor north of the River Bure and through Corpusty/Heydon village environs for access to the corridor south of the River Bure. We are also concerned on the Environmental impact on ALL North Norfolk access country routes which are predominantly single-lane, high-earth-banked, and hedge-rowed lanes with fragile flora and fauna. We are exceptionally concerned that access to the south of the River Bure crossing will be heaviest immediately south of the river which is on, and in the vicinity of, stakeholder property.	I	<p>Through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive ecological receptors. Additional mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project are outlined in topic specific chapters, and include the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts on local road networks, ecological receptors (e.g. hedgerows) and hydrological features (e.g. main rivers).</p> <p>In respect to the main construction compound at Oulton, Hornsea Three recognises the sensitivity of this location and since its identification as the main construction compound, Hornsea Three has sought to identify measures to minimise any impacts on Oulton village, local residents and the local road network. In this regard, where properties are located in close proximity to the Oulton Airfield, the Project will ensure that sensitive construction management measures, such as noise, dust and traffic control are considered. These are documented in an outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), which accompanies the DCO application. Furthermore, it is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this also forms part of the DCO application.</p> <p>In respect to the River Bure, Hornsea Three has committed to crossing this feature by HDD, thus avoiding the potential for direct impacts. Mitigation measures have also been identified to minimise indirect impact and are summarised in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 2: Hydrology and Flood Risk and the outline CoCP which forms part of the DCO application.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>42</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
George Carman, Geodirect Resources P/L	<b>80m Refinement</b> - No Hedgerow crossings to be greater than 60 degrees (i.e. to be between 90 degrees to 60 degrees) to minimise impact and preserve ancient hedgerows, bio-corridors and scenic amenity of North Norfolk. At hedgerow crossings, hedgerow to be dug out and re-planted.	I	Where possible, Hornsea Three has sought to avoid landscape features (including trees and hedgerows) through cable routing or the use of trenchless technologies.  Given the nature of Hornsea Three, there are some hedgerows which cannot be avoided and will be removed to enable construction. Any hedgerows which cannot be avoided will be replaced at the end of the construction phase. Furthermore, restoration of hedgerows, currently in poor condition, provides an opportunity to achieve long term benefits for the biodiversity associated with this habitat type as well as gap up hedgerows providing landscape and visual mitigation. Further details on hedgerow removal, retention and replacement can be found in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation as well as the Outline Ecological Management Plan and the Outline Landscape Management Plan which form part of the DCO application.
George Carman, Geodirect Resources P/L	<b>PEIR surveys</b> - PEIR states that the ponds at property reference 682336 identified as water features GIC15 and GIC16 do NOT have evidence of water fowl. This is grossly erroneous. Moorhen, Mallard (and Heron, Swan, Grey Lag Geese, Egyptian Geese and Kingfisher – not all water fowl sensu stricto) frequent these ponds and have been sighted by stakeholder family hunting/walking parties since 1915 when the land was acquired from Squire Bulwer-Long of the Heydon Hall Estate.	I	Response noted. The quoted pond numbers refer to those in Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 3.5: Great Crested Newt Survey which reports on a survey designed to establish the presence or absence of the Great Crested Newt. 'Absent' for wildfowl in the context of an HSI survey for GCN means 'no waterfowl seen during the HSI inspection'. This is not intended to be used as an indicator of bird presence / absence overall, and is not therefore a comment on the bird populations present at any waterbody or surrounding area. It is noted that both quoted pond numbers refer to ponds which will be HDD'd and therefore impacts on this particular feature would be limited.  Environmental Statement volume 6, annexes 3.9 and 3.10 provide a description of the baseline in respect to ornithology (wintering, migratory and breeding birds).
Richard Perry	<b>Proposal</b> - The disturbance to wildlife and bridleways in the area of Edgefield. Heavy traffic access to rural areas of Norfolk causing disruption to our every day riding of our horses	I	Principles for construction traffic management, including interaction with other road or recreational users (e.g. bridleways and pedestrians) are set out in the outline construction traffic management plan (CTMP) which forms part of the DCO application. The CTMP will be developed in consultation with the local authorities during the detailed design stage, in order to identify site specific measures, with separation of users prioritised wherever possible.  Impacts on ecological receptors are addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation.

Table 3.7: Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Further Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.B) relating to ecology and nature conservation

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y/N?	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 42: Prescribed consultees (The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009: Schedule 1))</b>			
Bat Conservation Trust	Thank you for your email. As a small charity, we are unable to comment on how particular schemes may affect the local bat population or on individual ecological survey reports but we can offer some general advice on the planning process and how development may affect bats.	I	Noted, response provided to individual points below.
Bat Conservation Trust	Due to declining populations, bats and their roosts are protected by law throughout the UK, whether occupied or not. It is illegal to damage, destroy or disturb any bats or roosts without having taken the necessary precautions. A roost is defined as any place that a wild bat uses for shelter or protection, and the roost is protected whether bats are present in it or not.	N	Noted.
Bat Conservation Trust	There is also government planning policy and guidance for protected species, which stipulates that the presence of bats be considered as a material consideration when a planning application is submitted.	N	Noted. Environmental Statement volume 6, annexes 3.1 - 3.14 report on the full suite of ecological baseline surveys undertaken to inform the assessment of impacts on ecology and nature conservation as reported in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation. Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 3.8 provides a description of the currently baseline in respect to bats.
Bat Conservation Trust	If bats are discovered after planning permission is granted, the planning permission is considered sterile and the developer must apply for a licence before undertaking any work which may disturb the bats. If bats are present on a site, it is the developer's duty to ascertain the impacts of the proposal on protected species and to ensure that bats are not affected by the development.	I	Noted. Environmental Statement volume 6, annexes 3.1 - 3.14 report on the full suite of ecological baseline surveys undertaken to inform the assessment of impacts on ecology and nature conservation as reported in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation. Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 3.8 provides a description of the currently baseline in respect to bats.
Bat Conservation Trust	A useful guide on the decision making process for determining planning permission can be found at: <a href="http://www.biodiversityplanningtoolkit.com/bats/bio_bats.html">http://www.biodiversityplanningtoolkit.com/bats/bio_bats.html</a> . Also available is a trigger document that contains a list of the suggested criteria and thresholds used to assess whether a protected species survey and report is necessary for an application – I have attached a copy.	N	Noted.
Bat Conservation Trust	Specific factors which can have a significant impact on bats to consider as part of a development include: lighting, the removal of surrounding vegetation, noise, and the changing of internal temperature. Information on all of these can be found on the BCT website ( <a href="http://www.bats.org.uk">www.bats.org.uk</a> ) and can be discussed with either a qualified consultant or representative from your Statutory Nature Conservation Organisation. I hope this response provides sufficient information for your query. If you would like any further clarification please call the Bat Conservation Trust on 0345 1300 228.	I	Impacts on bats are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation.
Estelle Hook, Norfolk Coast Partnership	We have identified a number of sensitive landscapes and habitats and request that the impact on these is minimised through careful planning and delivery. These sites include (working south from the landfall site): Weybourne Cliffs SSSI The shingle beach and shingle ridge, where its natural movement and profile should not be disrupted The reedbed and pond to the west of the beach car park – which the Norfolk Coast Partnership is seeking funding for a community project to restore Weybourne Beck (aka Spring Beck) – which has a published Catchment Management Plan (available from Norfolk Coast Partnership or Norfolk Rivers Trust) Kelling Heath SSSI – a valuable heathland landscape The Glaven River, running to its source near Selbrigg Pond – a rare chalk river with its northern stretch running through the AONB to the sea, of high ecological value and sensitive to pollution (e.g. run off during construction).	Y	Through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive ecological receptors (including designated sites). For example, Weybourne Cliffs and Kelling Heath SSSI have been avoided and no direct impacts are predicted on these designated sites from Hornsea Three. Additional mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project are outlined in topic specific chapters (Environmental Statement volume 3), and include the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts on ecological receptors (e.g. hedgerows) and hydrological features (e.g. main rivers).



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y/N?	Regard had to response (s49)
CPRE Norfolk	For the onshore we follow by map number where we have a comment to make; while not a landowner, we do have a CPRE interest in landscape and wildlife, the latter mainly informed from the experience of the River Glaven Conservation Group.	N	Noted, responses provided to individual comments.
CPRE Norfolk	Map 2. We prefer the eastern option for the cabling corridor from the shore to the Warren Farm area. This is because it avoids Kelling Heath. In addition to being a SSSI, the Heath is a beautiful and distinctive landscape in the mosaic of the AONB. It is popular with local residents who can walk the narrow trials through gorse and heather, and at the north end offers views of the coastline and sea. It is a good site for nightjars; and for those staying beyond dusk, one of the best Dark Skies areas in the country.	Y	<p>Since the PEIR, a refined landfall location has been identified (western re-route around Kelling) and the area identified for landfall works has reduced. This was informed by a number of factors including engineering/technical considerations, community feedback in the area of Kelling and Weybourne, avoidance of the Kelling Heath SSSI/CWS and Holiday Park.</p> <p>Impacts relating to landscape and visual resources are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual resources. Particular consideration has been given to the AONB as a sensitive receptor, and it is noted that Hornsea Three has consulted with the Norfolk Coast Partnership to agree viewpoints to inform the assessment of impacts on the AONB.</p> <p>We note your comments related to the designated Dark Sky areas. It is noted that lighting during the onshore construction phase will be minimised through the use of task-orientated lighting, as set out in the outline CoCP which accompanies the DCO application. In terms of permanent onshore infrastructure, the cables within the AONB will be buried and there will be no operational lighting. Based on the mitigation and management measures in place, no significant light spill is anticipated, particularly within the AONB.</p>
CPRE Norfolk	Map 2 again. We would prefer the alternative corridor shown in blue, centred on the Stone Lodge area. This because it offers more scope in avoiding impact on two farmland ponds near Church Farm House which were restored in September. The project received funding from the British Ecological Society. For the restoration work see pages 2 and 3 of RGCG Newsletter Autumn 2017 (attached). For the location of these ponds, see the map at page 12 of the Spring 2017 edition (also attached). Pond 2 is near the House letter 'e' as shown for Church Farm House on the map; and Pond 3 to the south of that. There are a number of other restored farmland ponds in the upper Glaven. As said in our response to the PRIR, these are particularly important as they support the ecological network by acting as stepping stones across the headwaters of the Glaven to that of the Bure.	Y	As set out in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives, the alternate option has been taken forward by Hornsea Three (centered on the Stone Lodge area). This route is shown on the plans which are submitted in support of the DCO application and has been chosen based on a review of technical and environmental constraints as well as community feedback.
CPRE Norfolk	Map 3. There is a section missing in between maps 2 and 3, no doubt because there are no changes proposed for the cable corridor. The 'missing' section is centred on the Baconsthorpe Castle (Grade I, and a SAM) area. The headwaters of the Glaven are at Lower Bodham and Baconsthorpe Castle with a spring feeding the moat before this tributary runs into the river near Selbrigg Pond. The larger part of the silt entering the Glaven comes from the upper reaches, and then over time moves down the whole length of the river and into the SAC estuary. As such we consider that when crossing the tributary HDD should be used rather than open trenching and diversion of the stream.	I	<p>The nature of the onshore cabling laying activities are described in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description. Mitigation measures have been identified to the creation of preferential pathways for minimise the generation of silt and prevent runoff entering the watercourses. These measures are set out in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 1: Geology and Ground Conditions. volume 3, chapter 2: Hydrology and Flood Risk as well as in the Outline CoCP which forms part of the DCO application. Measures include a commitment to prepare Pollution Prevention and Emergency Response Plans.</p> <p>Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 2: Hydrology and Flood Risk and confirms that there would be no effect on the hydrology of the moat at Baconsthorpe Castle.</p>
Environment Agency	Biodiversity Map 7. Great Melton potential re-route. Low Common Local Wildlife Site is within the corridor.	I	Impacts from Hornsea Three on ecological features, including hedgerows, trees (including woodlands) and designated sites has been avoided where possible through commitments to use trenchless technologies such as Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD). The Low Common Local Wildlife Site is proposed as a site for HDD, and as such there are no direct impacts on this designated site from Hornsea Three. Further mitigation in place to minimise indirect impacts can be found in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation as well as the Outline Ecological Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y/N?	Regard had to response (s49)
Natural England	<b>Onshore cable corridor</b> Natural England is pleased to note Orsted has taken into account the Section 42 consultation responses and is looking to refine the onshore section to an 80 m wide corridor. We appreciate that some effort has been put into avoiding designated sites and restricted land which resulted in additional potential re-routes. Natural England has no objection to the proposed increase to the onshore corridor search area and is looking forward to working with Hornsea Three to refine the corridor in due course.	I	Hornsea Three has sought to minimise direct impacts on sensitive receptors by reducing the onshore cable corridor from 200 m to approximately 80 m. A number of factors have fed into this refinement process, including technical and environmental. Further information pertaining to route refinement is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives.
The Wildlife Trust	<b>Onshore alternative routes:</b> 1. We welcome the continued inclusion of a route which seeks to avoid Kelling Heath SSSI and support this as an alternative. 2. With regard to the potential onshore re-routes, we only have minor comments to make in relation to ecological receptors for which we have information. Only one of these e-routes, on map 7, affects a County Wildlife Site. At this point the blue route passes across the Low Common CWS 223. However, this CWS is already on the line of the previously consulted route and we assume that HDD will be proposed, as it was previously.	I	As noted, Hornsea Three has taken forward the refined landfall location (western re-route around Kelling) and the area identified for landfall works has reduced. This was informed by a number of factors including engineering/technical considerations, community feedback in the area of Kelling and Weybourne, avoidance of the Kelling Heath SSSI/CWS and Holiday Park.  Impacts from Hornsea Three on ecological features, including hedgerows, trees (including woodlands) and designated sites has been avoided where possible through commitments to use trenchless technologies such as Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD). The Low Common Local Wildlife Site is proposed as a site for HDD, and as such there are no direct impacts on this designated site from Hornsea Three. Further mitigation in place to minimise indirect impacts can be found in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation as well as the Outline Ecological Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.
RSPB	<b>1. Onshore route: proposed works areas outside of 200 m corridor</b> The RSPB does not hold information to indicate that the proposed access routes, alternative route options and storage areas could give rise to adverse effects on protected areas beyond the issues previously identified. However, some of the sites proposed may offer opportunities for biodiversity enhancements to be created. We encourage Orsted to review all options that would allow appropriate measures to be implemented within areas both along the corridor route and areas outside the main works corridor that may, for examples, areas used for storage purposes. We recognise the challenge in implementing options that may be challenging to maintain in the future, but consider net gains for biodiversity to be an important objective for the project. For completeness, our concerns regarding the route continue to relate to the management of impacts on pink-footed geese around Weybourne as a feature of the North Norfolk Coast SPA, the avoidance of direct land take on protected sites, the need to ensure that the cable laying does not impact on hydrology around wetland sites and water quality is not affected at watercourse crossings.	I	Environmental Statement, volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation considers potential impacts on ecological receptors as a result of Hornsea Three. This includes potential impacts on species such as Pink-footed Geese.  Hornsea Three has considered opportunities to achieve enhancements during the construction or operation of the project. For example, restoration of hedgerows, currently in poor condition, provides an opportunity to achieve long term benefits for the biodiversity associated with this habitat type. Further details on hedgerow removal, retention and replacement can be found in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation as well as the Outline Ecological Management Plan which form part of the DCO application.
<b>Section 42: Local Authorities (prescribed under section 43 of the Act)</b>			
No comments were received from the local authorities relating to ecology and nature conservation under Phase 2.B.			
<b>Section 42: Persons with an interest in the land (prescribed under section 44 of the Act)</b>			
Christopher Bond Bidwells on behalf of Ms M Lofty	(2) As the cable route (working width) will cross two hedges (one of conifers), a line of poplar trees and the paddocks, we request that the cables are installed by HDD and not open cut in order to minimise the disruption and depreciation to this property and maintain the existing access to the farmhouse. Please contact C Bond if any further explanation is required. C Bond would be prepared to meet on site with Orsted representatives.	Y	The cables will be installed here via HDD.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y/N?	Regard had to response (s49)
CJC Lee (via agent, Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co)	<p>Part of the land owned and occupied by CJC Lee (Saxthorpe) Ltd at Bodham has been identified as being on a potential revised cable route by Orsted for the Hornsea 3 project. During previous consultations CJC Lee (Saxthorpe) Ltd, hereafter referred to as "the Company" did not raise specific objections to the inclusion of land at Bodham in the proposed cable route. These proposed interactions are shown on the left-hand image below, which is an extract from the Orsted consultation document. Areas where the company's land and the original corridor interact are shown with red edging. The area affected under the proposed alternate route are shown on the right-hand image as edged red with the blue route passing through.</p> <p>Original Route</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cut the corners off two fields and potentially interacted with a pit hole</li> <li>• Limited impact on farming business – inconvenient but deemed to be manageable as no one field would be overly impacted.</li> </ul> <p>Proposed Route</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Still impacts field north of road, but to no greater extent</li> <li>• Missed the corner of the eastern field and the pit hole in the south field</li> <li>• Cuts diagonally through the middle of Stone Lodge field</li> <li>• Expected corridor areas is 2.35 ha from a 6.21 ha field – this is 39% of the field</li> <li>• The company strongly opposes the proposed alternative route.</li> <li>• Route cuts off areas either side of the corridor making them unusable during works year</li> <li>• The impact on this field is very high and failure to restore soil and drainage could reduce efficacy and value of the entire field</li> <li>• Given the very high impact on the land affected by the new route there is a need to understand the exact reasons why the original route cannot be adopted, and why this new route is preferred.</li> </ul>	N	<p>Hornsea Three responded as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It is acknowledged that the alternative route will impact different areas of land than previously. The opposition to this is noted and was fed into the route design consideration.</li> <li>2. If areas of land are segregated by the construction corridor and become unfarmable, then compensation will be payable for any reasonable losses on a proven loss basis. However, landowners are expected to mitigate their losses, where possible.</li> <li>3. The land will be fully reinstated following the work to a comparable condition of that recorded in the schedule of condition, with compensation being payable on a proven loss basis for any ongoing losses or where reinstatement is not possible. Drainage will also be reinstated, or installed as required, with compensation being payable on the same terms as above.</li> <li>4. The alternative route that was previously proposed had difficulties including: poor visibility on the highways crossings, proximity to two listed buildings, proximity to some ponds with ecological merit and restricted space adjacent to an established tree belt and hedgerow. The alternative route avoids these, whilst also crossing fewer roads and being shorter, therefore having a lesser environmental impact.</li> </ol>
AV Youngs Ltd (via agent, Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co)	<p>Part of Pitt Farm has been identified as part of a potential cable route by Orsted for the Hornsea 3 project. The original proposal for the cable corridor cut through the middle of the farm and came close to the farmstead and campsite, thus potentially resulting in high levels of disturbance during the works. Following submission of responses to the PEIR an alternative route has been suggested by Orsted, which is shown below. AV Youngs Ltd thanks Orsted for considering the representations made to the PEIR, however the proposed route change does not go far enough to alleviate the concerns raised in the previous response, and it is believed that greater variation to the cable route is possible. Evidence of the ability to significantly alter the route is shown on Statutory Consultation Plan Map 2 of 9 and Map 5 of 9. These examples are shown below. AV Youngs Ltd wishes to make suggestions detailed below as to how the disruption from the works might be reduced. Reference is made to the plan titled AV Youngs Ltd – Alternative Route, which is taken from Google earth.</p> <p>Field A. Orsted Alteration: Top of field the route is moved west of the pit. AV Youngs Ltd comments: Supports the changes down to the point where the cable leaves the pit.</p> <p>Field A. Orsted Alteration: Cable has moved west but straightens back to a north south drop into field B. AV Youngs Ltd comments: The cable should move to the far south west corner of Field A and prepare to drop into Field C.</p> <p>Field B. Orsted Alteration: Cable has moved west but remains in Field B. AV Youngs Ltd comments: Field B is circa 4.19ha and the corridor at 1.65ha accounts for 40% of the field. Thus, the field will be totally compromised by the works and the proposed route cuts off the south-western corner of the field. This location is adjacent to the campsite</p> <p>Field C. Orsted Alteration: Orsted Cable Route avoids this field. AV Youngs Ltd comments:</p>	Y	<p>Hornsea Three responded to AV Youngs Ltd. concerns as follows:</p> <p>Concern regarding the route and the wish for it to be further amended is noted,</p> <p>Regarding point A, the revised route corridor is located to the west of the pit described.</p> <p>Regarding point B, the revised route corridor now follows this suggested route and crosses the road at the south-west corner of field A.</p> <p>Regarding points C and D, the revised route corridor now avoids field B &amp; D, and has moved west into field C. The offer of the area of land for potential replanting is appreciated and noted.</p> <p>Comments on field E are noted, therevised route now exits the field to the south with the proposed installation method under the road and woodland being via Horizontal Directional Drill.</p> <p>Hornsea Three has now altered the proposed route in response to the landowner feedback.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y/N?	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>Field C is circa 24.10 ha and the corridor at 7.31 ha would account for 30% of the field. The AV Youngs proposed routing of the cable down the eastern side of the field leaves a regular, easier to work area of 16.79 ha. This is preferable as the corridor has a more proportionate impact on the field and simply acts to narrow it.</p> <p>There is a small copse at the top of Field C where the cable would cross from Field A. This copse is due to be felled within the next 24 months for firewood. The owner would agree to offer the same area of land to match woodland lost to the cable for replanting.</p> <p>Field D. Orsted Alteration: Cable has moved west in the top half of the field then re-joins the original corridor. AV Youngs Ltd comments: Field D is large enough to accommodate the cable route in the same way as Field C is, however the top part of the field is still close to the campsite and will cause disruption.</p> <p>Field E. Orsted Alteration: Cable has moved back onto original line to cross the public highway into Field E. It is assumed that the road will be closed and trenched the trees south of Field E will be felled to allow the cable through. AV Youngs Ltd comments: Moving the cable back into Field E will mean disruption to another field that could be avoided. Field E is only 7.63 ha and the corridor will account for 1.15 ha, which is 15%.</p> <p>If it is vital for engineering reasons to cross the woodland block F where shown, then the proposed route could follow the course in Field C and then cross into E at the lower end. This is shown as Exit B.</p> <p>A preference would be to exit Field C at Exit A. If the cable is to be installed by HDD under the road and woodland then launching at Exit A is preferred.</p> <p>The proposed changes do not go far enough to alleviate the concerns of the land owner. It is clear from other alterations shown on the route that the Owners proposed alterations should be feasible, especially as all the changes occur within the same title. A V Youngs Ltd seeks reasons for why their proposed alternative route cannot be adopted.</p> <p>Google Earth Image is next and final page of this document.</p>		
Jane Kenny, Savills, on behalf of Easton & Otley College, Easton	<p>POTENTIAL ONSHORE CABLE CORRIDOR RE-ROUTES</p> <p>There are a number of requested route changes which have not been considered.</p> <p>In particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Easton &amp; Otley College, Easton – the current proposed route has been raised at informal consultations and within the PEIR response, however it appears in the second consultation not to have been re-routed and as it currently stands will interfere with the College's future expansion plans.</li> </ul>	Y	<p>A refined route located to west of cable corridor has been adopted, following a request from the College in order to reduce potential impact to area at Broom Farm.</p> <p>Further detail was requested on the proposed expansion plans in order for these to be taken into consideration if the proposed route does not meet the requirements.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y/N?	Regard had to response (s49)
Christopher Bond, Bidwells on behalf of Edward Christopher Evans-Lombe & Great Melton Farms Limited	<p>We write as agents on behalf of our clients detailed below. We have shown the relevant consultation plan number for each client in brackets.</p> <p>Christopher Bond would be prepared to meet on site with Orsted's representatives to address the individual clients concerns.</p> <p>1. Edward Christopher Evans-Lombe, [REDACTED] (map 7 of 9)</p> <p>Proposed access routes</p> <p>We note that two potential access routes are shown on the statutory consultation plan and comment as follows:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Access from the north from the Bawburgh-Marlingford Road — this route is the main access to Algarsthorpe Farmhouse and the associated Algarsthorpe Barns (as described in our earlier representation dated 19 September 2017). It is used both by the Buxton family who live in the farmhouse and Adam Buxton's business based in the Algarsthorpe Barns and will need to remain open at all times unless alternative arrangements can be agreed. Clearly, it is impractical to mix private cars with heavy construction traffic on a narrow unmade track. We suggest an alternative access should be proposed.</li> <li>- Access to the west of Beech Grove — we assume that access is required around Beech Grove, as Beech Grove itself is to remain in situ with the cable route installed by Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD) beneath it. Could you please confirm this is the case.</li> </ul>	Y	<p>Hornsea Three responded to the landowner's response as follows:</p> <p>1. Due to the proximity to the adjacent main road, river, drains and woodland, this area is difficult to be reached via other means. Access will be taken along the haul road within the construction corridor where possible as an alternative. However in order to cross over the river, and especially whilst a HDD is in progress, access will likely be required along the track in question. Where this is required, access will be coordinated with Mr &amp; Mrs Buxton in order to minimise impacts.</p> <p>2. The cables are proposed to be installed under Beech Grove via HDD as suggested, with the access to the west being outside of the woodland and to avoid this being directly impacted.</p>
Christopher Bond, Bidwells on behalf of Nicholas Edward Evans-Lombe & Great Melton Farms Limited	<p>2. Nicholas Edward Evans-Lombe, [REDACTED] (Map 7 of 9)</p> <p>Potential onshore cable corridor re-routes (Inset 1)</p> <p>We note the potential cable corridor re-route to the south of the existing route, we assume to avoid the Church Farm Barns complex. We do not raise any objection to this proposed re-route on the assumption that the area of wood to the south of Little Melton Reservoir will be crossed by HDD — can you please confirm this is the case.</p> <p>Proposed access routes (Inset 1)</p> <p>We also note and approve the potential access route.</p>	Y	<p>Hornsea Three confirmed this woodland would be crossed via HDD, as suggested.</p>
Christopher Bond, Bidwells on behalf of Benjamin Robert Goodfellow & Phillip George Day	<p>Benjamin Robert Goodfellow, c/o Birketts, [REDACTED] (map 8 of 9)</p> <p>Potential onshore cable corridor re-routes</p> <p>We note the potential corridor cable re-route to the west of the preferred route which is unacceptable to our clients as this will be more intrusive into their fields and further affect agricultural operations.</p> <p>Proposed access routes</p> <p>We note 2 proposed access routes and comment as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- (Northern) across the River meadows — this is impractical being low lying land prone to flooding (very wet in winter) and follows the line of an Anglian Water sewer.</li> <li>- (Southern) known as Racecourse track — This is an existing track which we believe would need to be upgraded before use by heavy vehicles — can we have details of what is proposed.</li> </ul>	Y	<p>Hornsea Three addressed the landowner's response as follows:</p> <p>1. Concern regarding the alternative route option is noted. This has since been discounted following accurate identification of the route of the discussed MOD pipeline on this land.</p> <p>2.a. Information regarding the land on this proposed access route is noted and appreciated, an alternative route has now also been incorporated following receipt of this feedback.</p> <p>b. Where required, existing tracks would be upgraded prior to be used for access by the project, and also reinstated following completion of the work as required and in accordance with the schedule of condition. Detail on the specific construction of access tracks will be available in due course and once a construction contractor has been appointed.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y/N?	Regard had to response (s49)
Mr & Mrs Bullimore	<p>You buy a nice plot of land for utility and amenity not agricultural for 10 years summer house, store sheds, pony 180 trees, pony, wildlife, camping parties, stay for days have water put on fence if spend another on it.</p> <p>8 gardens plots at Kelling or 1 sugar beet field that makes sense! Multimillion job like this has to go and corss the beet fields not our little gardens.</p> <p>The buzz from the cables will drive wildlife away, drive my pony crazy and give you cancer. We live in our field sleep camp eat nobody lives in a beet field get it!!!</p> <p>You have give me hassle for 2 years and more to come NO NO CABLES UNDER ACROSS OR ANYBODY ON MY LAND OR I WILL TAKE ACTION LEGAL AND OBSTRUCTIVE.</p>	N	Land has not been and will not be accessed without prior consent or authority. The project has confirmed that the intention is to directional drill under all of the land in this vicinity, rather than open-cut trench.
<b>Section 47: Duty to consult local community</b>			
Diana Jenkinson	<p>In addition this is being proposed in an area that is known as an area of outstanding natural beauty, there is so much wildlife and nature in this area and the effects of this construction would be devastating. The pink footed geese were on this very field last winter and the winter before, a construction like this would affect local wildlife massively.</p>	I	<p>Impacts relating to landscape and visual resources are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual resources. Particular consideration has been given to the AONB as a sensitive receptor, and it is noted that Hornsea Three has consulted with the Norfolk Coast Partnership to agree viewpoints to inform the assessment of impacts on the AONB.</p> <p>Environmental Statement, volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation considers potential impacts on ecological receptors as a result of Hornsea Three. This includes potential impacts on species such as Pink-footed Geese.</p>
Mark Flatman on behalf of Mr & Mrs DW Flatman	<p>In particular a studded blue butterfly colony is located north of the railway cutting and also an adder colony is centrally located within the PEIR corridor as it crosses Kelling Heath and the caravan park and therefore both lie within the identified corridor through Kelling Heath and the caravan park. Notwithstanding the exactitude of the designated SSSI boundary, the plan based boundary of that designation is an artifice that does not physically constrain the habitat and range of legislatively protected species. Each habitat, and indeed that of other protected species in the area would highly likely be detrimentally disturbed as a consequence of the proposed associated earthworks and machinery movements undertaken to bury the electricity cable in close proximity to these habitats.</p>	Y	<p>Since the PEIR, a refined landfall location has been identified (western re-route around Kelling) and the area identified for landfall works has reduced. This was informed by a number of factors including engineering/technical considerations, community feedback in the area of Kelling and Weybourne, avoidance of the Kelling Heath SSSI/CWS and Holiday Park. Environmental Statement, volume 3, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives sets out the process of identifying a landfall location and the route refinement process.</p>
Mark Flatman on behalf of Mr & Mrs DW Flatman	<p><b>Alternative Cable Corridor</b> Due to express exclusion from earlier consultation exercises, I am consequently therefore unaware of the full scope of alternative routing from the sea via Norfolk Coast to Norwich that previously was considered by Orsted. Notwithstanding, it is particularly perverse to propose a landing place on the coast that immediately requires traversing through or very close to an a SSSI, that provides a particularly valuable and niche habitat supporting a range of rare UK Biodiversity Priority Species. It is also noted that all three alternative corridors would need to bisect the North Norfolk AONB and heritage Coast and is one of 32 designated coasts in England. These are specifically subject to the provisions of paragraph 114 of the NPPF. In contrast, and by reference to the extent of the North Norfolk AONB shown on the map below, it is noted that there is a logical gap adjoining the coast and not subject to AONB or Heritage Coast status that extends approximately between Mundesley and Sea Palling and as indicated graphically by reference to the white arrow on the plan (see full response).</p>	Y	<p>Since the PEIR, a refined landfall location has been identified (western re-route around Kelling) and the area identified for landfall works has reduced. This was informed by a number of factors including engineering/technical considerations, community feedback in the area of Kelling and Weybourne, avoidance of the Kelling Heath SSSI/CWS and Holiday Park. Environmental Statement, volume 3, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives sets out the process of identifying a landfall location and the route refinement process.</p> <p>Impacts relating to landscape and visual resources are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual resources. Particular consideration has been given to the AONB as a sensitive receptor, and it is noted that Hornsea Three has consulted with the Norfolk Coast Partnership to agree viewpoints to inform the assessment of impacts on the AONB.</p>
CPRE Norfolk	<p>For the onshore we follow by map number where we have a comment to make; while not a landowner, we do have a CPRE interest in landscape and wildlife, the latter mainly informed from the experience of the River Glaven Conservation Group.</p>	N	Noted, responses provided to individual comments.



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y/N?	Regard had to response (s49)
CPRE Norfolk	Map 2. We prefer the eastern option for the cabling corridor from the shore to the Warren Farm area. This is because it avoids Kelling Heath. In addition to being a SSSI, the Heath is a beautiful and distinctive landscape in the mosaic of the AONB. It is popular with local residents who can walk the narrow trials through gorse and heather, and at the north end offers views of the coastline and sea. It is a good site for nightjars; and for those staying beyond dusk, one of the best Dark Skies areas in the country.	Y	<p>Since the PEIR, a refined landfall location has been identified (western re-route around Kelling) and the area identified for landfall works has reduced. This was informed by a number of factors including engineering/technical considerations, community feedback in the area of Kelling and Weybourne, avoidance of the Kelling Heath SSSI/CWS and Holiday Park.</p> <p>Impacts relating to landscape and visual resources are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual resources. Particular consideration has been given to the AONB as a sensitive receptor, and it is noted that Hornsea Three has consulted with the Norfolk Coast Partnership to agree viewpoints to inform the assessment of impacts on the AONB.</p> <p>We note your comments related to the designated Dark Sky areas. It is noted that lighting during the onshore construction phase will be minimised through the use of task-orientated lighting, as set out in the outline CoCP which accompanies the DCO application. In terms of permanent onshore infrastructure, the cables within the AONB will be buried and there will be no operational lighting. Based on the mitigation and management measures in place, no significant light spill is anticipated, particularly within the AONB.</p>
CPRE Norfolk	Map 2 again. We would prefer the alternative corridor shown in blue, centred on the Stone Lodge area. This because it offers more scope in avoiding impact on two farmland ponds near Church Farm House which were restored in September. The project received funding from the British Ecological Society. For the restoration work see pages 2 and 3 of RGCG Newsletter Autumn 2017 (attached). For the location of these ponds, see the map at page 12 of the Spring 2017 edition (also attached). Pond 2 is near the House letter 'e' as shown for Church Farm House on the map; and Pond 3 to the south of that. There are a number of other restored farmland ponds in the upper Glaven. As said in our response to the PRIR, these are particularly important as they support the ecological network by acting as stepping stones across the headwaters of the Glaven to that of the Bure.	Y	<p>As set out in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives, the alternate option has been taken forward by Hornsea Three (centred on the Stone Lodge area). This route is shown on the plans which are submitted in support of the DCO application and has been chosen based on a review of technical and environmental constraints as well as community feedback.</p>
CPRE Norfolk	Map 3. There is a section missing in between maps 2 and 3, no doubt because there are no changes proposed for the cable corridor. The 'missing' section is centred on the Baconsthorpe Castle (Grade I, and a SAM) area. The headwaters of the Glaven are at Lower Bodham and Baconsthorpe Castle with a spring feeding the moat before this tributary runs into the river near Selbrigg Pond. The larger part of the silt entering the Glaven comes from the upper reaches, and then over time moves down the whole length of the river and into the SAC estuary. As such we consider that when crossing the tributary HDD should be used rather than open trenching and diversion of the stream.	I	<p>The nature of the onshore cabling laying activities are described in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description. Mitigation measures have been identified to the creation of preferential pathways for minimise the generation of silt and prevent runoff entering the watercourses. These measures are set out in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 1: Geology and Ground Conditions. volume 3, chapter 2: Hydrology and Flood Risk as well as in the Outline CoCP which forms part of the DCO application. Measures include a commitment to prepare Pollution Prevention and Emergency Response Plans.</p> <p>Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 2: Hydrology and Flood Risk and confirms that there would be no effect on the hydrology of the moat at Baconsthorpe Castle.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y/N?	Regard had to response (s49)
The River Glaven Conservation Group - Henry Crawley	The addition of screening to the HVAC booster site at Barningham again is welcome. I assume this implies a tree belt. We would of course prefer that HVDC is used, not only precluding need for a Booster site, but also needing a much narrower cabling excavation corridor and less damage to the vulnerable countryside and river valley.	I	<p>Due to current uncertainty (see Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives), a decision on which transmission system (HVDC or HVAC) to adopt will not be made until post consent after extensive engagement with potential systems suppliers has taken place. As a result of this, we have conducted our assessments based on a realistic worst-case scenario, which could be either HVDC or HVDC technology depending on the receptor.</p> <p>Appropriate mitigation measures for visual disturbance are outlined in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources. This includes, for example, the restoration of habitats (including hedgerows) which cannot be avoided and landscape planting around the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.</p>
Anthea Spray	<p>This project is going to ruin our beautiful countryside for years to come; our Government is expecting many new houses to be built also taking up rural landscapes. What is going to happen to our wildlife, the flora and fauna of our local area? They are already endangered and reduced greatly in numbers due to loss of habitat, pests and diseases. Now you want to scar our county, create noise and devastation across our land and through our quiet villages.</p> <p>You will destroy historic sites that archaeologists have yet to reveal and our coastline is so vulnerable to erosion that this project cannot but do more harm than good. As you see I am not in favour of any of this project. PLEASE reconsider whether it is not possible to bring power ashore where structures are already available to distribute it to properties along the coast.</p>	I	<p>Through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive ecological receptors. For example, Weybourne Cliffs and Kelling Heath SSSI have been avoided and no direct impacts are predicted on these designated sites from Hornsea Three. Additional mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project are outlined in topic specific chapters, and include the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts on local road networks, ecological receptors (e.g. hedgerows) and hydrological features (e.g. main rivers).</p> <p>In respect to historic sites, an assessment of impacts on heritage assets is provided in Environmental Statement, volume 3, chapter 5: Historic Environment and volume 2, chapter 9: Marine Archaeology. Impacts on marine processes including those associated with coastal erosion are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 1: Marine Processes.</p> <p>Environmental Statement, volume 3, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives sets out the process of identifying a grid connection location and landfall. It is noted that the aim of the grid connection option appraisal was to identify the most economic and efficient design option for the connection of a project. Although both National Grid and Orsted input into the appraisal process (in respect to economic and strategic factors), the eventual grid connection offer is determined by National Grid. In May 2016, Hornsea Three was formally offered a grid connection at Norwich Main Substation as a result of this appraisal process which has informed the subsequent landfall and route refinement.</p>
<b>Section 48: Duty to publicise</b>			
<i>No comments were received in response to the Public Notice relating to ecology and nature conservation under Phase 2.B.</i>			

Table 3.8: Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Focused Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.C) relating to ecology and nature conservation

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y/N?	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 42: Prescribed consultees (The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009: Schedule 1))</b>			
Oulton Parish Council	<p>Traffic &amp; Transport Assessment and HGV Movements - It has been confirmed that Oulton airfield was not chosen as the site for its compound by Orsted, but was put forward by the landowner. The landowner no doubt proposed the site's suitability on the grounds of its previous uses by Bacton gas pipeline (2003) &amp; Sheringham Shoals windfarm (2009) as a compound. Both these projects were much smaller in scale than that proposed by Orsted - thus generating far fewer traffic movements - and lasted for only 18 months each. Even then, the impact of the increase in traffic on the inhabitants of the Old Railway Gatehouse was considerable, but the resident was too polite to complain.</p> <p>Weston Longville as the preferred site was finally abandoned -after assessment- because of the discovery of various constraints, but to date Oulton's traffic assessment has not even been completed. It is now stated that :“The relevant assessments for Oulton Airfield as the Main Construction Compound will be included in the ES that we submit alongside our DCO application in Q2 2018.” (p.8)</p> <p>This situation is entirely unsatisfactory as it will prevent OPC from reviewing the assessments for accuracy before they are submitted. We must also point out that this approach is entirely invalid as it pre-judges the outcome of the assessments to be positive.</p> <p>In answer to our request for “likely traffic movements (type and number) that would be generated...” the response is that: “At this point in time the Project cannot supply this level of detail”. This statement is made despite the fact that on a previous page we have been told of *A forecast peak of 213 daily staff movements * A forecast peak of 134 daily HGV movements ***Are these movements IN and OUT ....or only in one direction?</p> <p>However, these apparent hard facts are immediately described as being “movements on any part of the network” and hedged about with caveats such as: It is important to note however that not all staff and not all HGVs associated with a section would travel to the Main Compound.” (p.6)</p> <p>Maybe - but surely most of them would start and finish at the compound each day?</p> <p>The Main Construction Compound (irrespective of temporary compounds along the route) certainly has to perform the function of a central hub of the activities generated by the construction of the cable corridor for the entire 8 years of the project - or else it is a meaningless concept. For that reason, it has to be understood as a concentration point for construction traffic as compared to the work sites along the cable corridor. In any case, it is our contention that Orsted's position on these traffic types and movements is intentionally and unnecessarily vague. Orsted is not a novice in the sphere of cable corridor construction. Hornsea Project One has already been under construction for approximately 2 years in Lincolnshire. There is an active Main Construction Compound at Holton le Clay. Orsted's Project Managers ought to be able therefore to extrapolate from their ongoing experience at this other site and provide Oulton Parish Council with a vivid and accurate description of the likely patterns of activity and movement at the proposed site in Oulton.</p> <p>***Why has Orsted not felt able to provide us with such a clear description?</p> <p>In the absence of an answer to the question above, OPC can only deduce that the reason has something to do with the severe adverse impacts on their quality of life that are likely to be experienced by the inhabitants of Oulton. There could of course be another reason: that they do not feel the need to address our valid concerns directly because they know that, as this project is viewed as a piece of national infrastructure, local material planning considerations can be largely ignored.</p> <p>Such an attitude would be worrying indeed.</p> <p>There are in fact many serious “constraints” standing in the way of the positive assessment of the Oulton site as suitable.</p> <p>Not least is the force of the Appeal Decision in 2014 to dismiss the proposal for a Centralised</p>	I	<p>Information pertaining to the site selection for the main construction compound is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives. Given the nature of the Oulton Airfield, which comprises existing hardstanding, its use as the main construction compound has less potential for significant effects than other sites which were under consideration.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, Hornsea Three recognises the sensitivity of this location and since its identification as the main construction compound, Hornsea Three has sought to identify measures to minimise any impacts on Oulton village, local residents and the local road network. In this regard, where properties are located in close proximity to the Oulton Airfield, the Project will ensure that sensitive construction management measures, such as noise, dust and traffic control are considered. These are documented in an outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), which accompanies the DCO application. Furthermore, it is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this also forms part of the DCO application.</p> <p>Impacts associated with the use of Oulton Airfield as the main construction compound are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3). Impacts relating to traffic and transport are specifically assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y/N?	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>Anaerobic Digester on the former airfield. During the course of this Appeal a traffic simulation programme was produced which proved conclusively that highway dysfunction would occur relentlessly, if HGV traffic was sent regularly in 2 directions along that part of the lane. The Inspector's conclusion was that the proposal " would endanger highway safety and the satisfactory functioning of the highway network" and that "despite the proposed improvements to the highway network the cumulative impacts of the proposed development would be severe."</p> <p>It is stated tentatively in the Orsted document that the difference between the AD and Hornsea Project 3 is that Hornsea is only "temporary". This depends entirely on your definition of 'temporary'. 8 years is a very long time: long enough for a child of 9 to grow up and leave home; long enough for an 80 year-old to be forced to live out her last years intimidated by the noise, speed and size of this additional traffic.</p> <p>The second constraint is precisely another cumulative impact - that of the traffic that will be generated by the choice of nearby Docking Farm Oulton by the Vattenfall project for another storage compound and PMA (Primary Mobilisation Area). All such traffic will be competing directly with the Hornsea Three traffic (and all existing traffic) on the narrow southern stretch of The Street (a 'C' road) on its way to the B1149. These cumulative impacts should be assessed now: it is unacceptable to leave this judgement until after both projects are submitted for DCO. The final constraint is the existence of the hamlet of Oulton Street itself. It was suggested at the PC meeting on 6th March by Orsted that their solution to highway dysfunction and danger on the southern end of The Street, might be to operate their own one-way system and bring half their traffic through the northern end - the settlement of Oulton Street. The statement is made in the document that : "the Project cannot make a commitment that traffic associated with the project will not pass through the settlement of Oulton Street. "Residents of Oulton Street find this statement breathtaking in its lack of understanding of the local circumstances. No developer has ever suggested doing such a thing - on the contrary an S106 Undertaking has been offered to prevent exactly this from happening. The reasons are obvious to anyone familiar with the situation: most of the cottages have walls and windows directly on the roadway, without benefit of pavement or front garden. In summer, with windows open, conversations inside the cottages often have to be suspended whenever an HGV goes past. Abnormal loads being delivered by night would simply wake up every single resident of 24 dwellings. Many cars are parked on the road, partly because some cottages have no off-street parking but also because many inhabitants deliberately park their cars on the Street, in order to protect their houses from being further damaged by the vibrations caused by enormous agricultural HGVs passing directly alongside.</p> <p>Agricultural HGVs have increased enormously in size and weight over recent years and cottages shake when some of the larger ones drive past. Oulton Street has already reached saturation point in terms of its ability to absorb this sort of traffic - especially during the now protracted periods of harvest time; residents are already experiencing severe adverse impacts on a daily basis.</p> <p>We are similarly deeply concerned to read the statement that: "the application will not be proposing bespoke mitigation at...The Old Railway Gatehouse." Please refer back to the AD Appeal Decision of 2014 which contains a graphic description by a Planning Inspector of living conditions within that dwelling.</p> <p>In addition, it is a mystery to the PC how construction traffic HGVs would cope with the B1354 (Saxthorpe / Blickling road – now downgraded to a 'C' road) once it reached the northern end of The Street. This road is narrow and capricious, with an extremely nasty right-angle bend and a single-lane bridge. This option would take traffic even further away from the cable corridor (already nearly 6km away from the compound) and spread, rather than dilute, the pain. Operating a one-way system would be no solution and would utterly destroy the quality of life of local residents.</p> <p>Finally, in this section, OPC notes that: "the focus of the application is to manage traffic through the CTMP" and that the CTMP (Construction Traffic Management Plan) will clearly not be available for inspection until after – probably long after - submission for the DCO. This</p>		



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y/N?	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>statement gives us no reassurance whatsoever. Not only does this fact completely disable OPC's ability to comment constructively in advance, but it also significantly heightens our concerns about the potential for mismanagement of construction traffic. At Orsted's Main Compound on Hornsea Project One, the local community were misled into believing that the CTMP (involving e.g. restrictions on right-hand turning of HGVs across streams of traffic) applied to all HGVs using the compound. Only after many months of relentless questioning did Orsted reveal that the CTMP applied only to traffic generated by the main contractor on the compound - and that it did not cover in any significant way traffic generated by sub-contractors or haulage companies - often carrying abnormal loads.</p> <p>A CTMP would clearly not provide the protection we need as a community from what we fear will be a free-for-all for HGV and other traffic associated with this proposal. Any CTMP that does not cover all traffic generated, becomes worthless and impossible to police.</p> <p>Conclusion of this section: It is our position that, as the selection of Oulton has come so late in the pre-application phase of this project, submission of the DCO should be delayed until all relevant assessments of the suitability of the site as the Main Construction Compound have been completed, and discussed in full with the parish.</p>		
Natural England	<p>Natural England is pleased to note that Ørsted is continuing to work with local landowners to identify the best possible onshore route for the export cables and associated works. As per our previous advice, we appreciate that effort has been into avoiding designated sites and/or mitigating the impacts using Horizontal Directional Drilling. Natural has no objections to the proposed changes to the onshore corridor boundary.</p>	N	Response noted.
<b>Section 42: Local Authorities (prescribed under section 43 of the Act)</b>			
No comments were received from the local authorities relating to ecology and nature conservation under Phase 2.C.			
<b>Section 42: Persons with an interest in the land (prescribed under section 44 of the Act)</b>			
No comments were received from persons with an interest in land relating to ecology and nature conservation under Phase 2.C.			
<b>Section 47: Duty to consult local community</b>			
Robert Shoals	<p>One thing that was touched on was that of vehicle movement in and out of the site, the majority of this movement will involve heavy plant and in the case of cable delivery to site storage and distribution from that storage to various installation sites it will be Abnormal Loads. The Street, Oulton is the feed road to the site and is totally unsuitable for this traffic as has already been proven on previous planning applications. This road already carries more than that its fair share of heavy traffic. To the immediate south of the site entrance is a cottage which sits atop of a hump in the road, to the north of the site entrance is the homes of the streets residents which also sit roadside, numerous cars sit on the road outside these properties. Other concerns about noise and light pollution which I also have fade into insignificance by comparison. The choice of this site is completely WRONG.</p>	I	<p>Since its identification as the main construction compound, Hornsea Three has sought to identify measures to minimise any impacts on Oulton village, local residents and the local road network. In this regard, where properties are located in close proximity to the Oulton Airfield, the Project will ensure that sensitive construction management measures, such as noise, dust and traffic control are considered. These are documented in an outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), which accompanies the DCO application. Furthermore, it is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this also forms part of the DCO application.</p> <p>It is noted that lighting during the onshore construction phase will be short term and temporary, used only when required (and generally limited to certain working hours) and designed to avoid unnecessary illumination. Light spill during out of hours working will be minimised through the use of task-orientated lighting, as set out in the outline CoCP which accompanies the DCO application.</p> <p>Impacts associated with the use of Oulton Airfield as the main construction compound are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3).</p>



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y/N?	Regard had to response (s49)
Gordon Fryett	We are very concerned by the serious negative environmental impact that such a development would have not only on the local flora and fauna but even more importantly on the health and wellbeing of the residents of Oulton Street, of Oulton Village and of the wider Community	I	<p>Through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive ecological receptors. Additional mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project are outlined in topic specific chapters, and include the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts on local road networks, ecological receptors (e.g. hedgerows) and hydrological features (e.g. main rivers).</p> <p>In respect to the main construction compound at Oulton, Hornsea Three recognises the sensitivity of this location and since its identification as the main construction compound, Hornsea Three has sought to identify measures to minimise any impacts on Oulton village, local residents and the local road network. In this regard, where properties are located in close proximity to the Oulton Airfield, the Project will ensure that sensitive construction management measures, such as noise, dust and traffic control are considered. These are documented in an outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), which accompanies the DCO application. Furthermore, it is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this also forms part of the DCO application.</p>
Mrs M L and Mr R L G Williams	<p><b>Other Issues</b> No mobile phone signal or rural phone boxes for calling emergency services. no broadband-services. The development would also disturb the natural habitat of the area and impinge on the adjacent woodland and neighbours. The C1354 road is the key route to Blickling Hall. Nothing to improve the well-being of the local residents</p>	I	<p>Impacts of Hornsea Three, including the construction compounds, on ecology are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation. The construction access routing is set out in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport.</p> <p>Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on local residents through the identification of mitigation measures to manage noise, dust and traffic (amongst others). These measures are set out in the outline CoCP and outline CTMP which form part of the DCO application.</p>
<b>Section 48: Duty to publicise</b>			
No comments were received in response to the Public Notice relating to ecology and nature conservation under Phase 2.C.			

### 3.4 Landscape and Visual Resources

Table 3.9: Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.A) relating to landscape and visual resources

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>43</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 42: Prescribed consultees (The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009: Schedule 1))</b>			
Plumstead Parish Council	If the sub-station is necessary much more detail is required concerning visual impact, noise and lighting. What planting is to take place?	I	Impacts associated with visual amenity and noise are addressed in volume 3, chapters 4 and 8 respectively. Based on the principles of the lighting strategy for Hornsea Three, no significant effects in relation to lighting is anticipated.  An indicative planting scheme for the HVDC converter/HVAC substation is provided in volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources. The measures for managing such provisions is outlined in the outline Landscape Management Plan which accompanies the DCO application.
Little Melton Parish Council	<b>Development</b> - No buildings can ever be constructed over the cable. Some parishioners think that this is good as it prevents housing development.	N	Noted.
Swardeston Parish Council	7. How does Dong Energy intend to alleviate any noise and light pollution consequent upon the construction and operation of the substation?	I	During construction noise and light pollution would be controlled through appropriate design and construction management measures documented in the outline Code of Construction Practice which forms part of the DCO application.  For operation, it is noted that a number of measures which represent best practicable means have been designed-in to the project to reduce impacts where reasonable. In respect to lighting, this would be designed in accordance with best practice guidance and would be directional to avoid light pollution.  Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 8: Noise and Vibration provides an assessment of impacts arising from Hornsea Three in relation to noise and vibration. The assessment considers impacts during construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning and concludes that taking into consideration the mitigation proposed by Hornsea Three, no significant effects would occur.

<sup>43</sup> Y = Yes change made; N = No change made; I = Incorporated into or considered when producing the assessment or landowner voluntary agreement offer; N/A = Not applicable.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>43</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Swardeston Parish Council	8. Dong Energy representatives have indicated that substantial tree planting will take place to reduce the visual impact of the substation. The proposed site already contains a number of ancient hedgerows and mature trees. Will Dong Energy be taking all necessary steps to ensure that these trees and hedgerows are protected, both for the sake of their existing ecology and for the immediate screening effect they will have on the finished substation?	I	<p>The cable route has been designed to avoid hedgerows and trees where possible or drill underneath them using HDD. However, the Project will need to remove some trees permanently and temporarily remove some hedgerows to allow for cable laying and to enable installation of temporary access tracks. We recognise that protection and sensitive restoration of hedgerows is important to minimise any negative impact on biodiversity or landscape resulting from loss or reduction in hedgerows and in the few instances where a small section of the hedgerow needs to be temporarily removed, it will of course be handled sensitively. The replacement of hedgerows at the end of the construction phase to be undertaken will ensure there is no net loss of hedgerow habitat as a result of Hornsea Project Three. Furthermore, restoration of hedgerows, currently in poor condition, provides an opportunity to achieve long term benefits for the biodiversity associated with this habitat type.</p> <p>Appropriate mitigation measures for visual disturbance are outlined in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources. This includes, for example, the restoration of habitats (including hedgerows) which cannot be avoided and landscape planting around the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.</p>
Swardeston Parish Council	9. Given the height of the proposed structure, we believe that 'bundling' the substation and planting along the crest will not itself significantly reduce its visibility since most native tree varieties are relatively slow growing. Accordingly, we believe that, wherever possible, planting of semi-mature trees should commence immediately, not only around the boundaries of the site but also in other more distant areas where there is anticipated to be line of sight visibility of the substation.	I	<p>Appropriate mitigation measures for visual disturbance are outlined in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources. This includes, for example, the restoration of habitats (including hedgerows) which cannot be avoided and landscape planting around the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.</p>
River Glaven Conservation Group	The PIER describes screening assessments for a booster station, but I think doesn't comment on any need for tree planting to screen it from nearby visual impact. Again background noise assessment is made. At what point can it be possible to judge the incremental effect of a booster station on noise and indeed light pollution? This information may be hidden within the depths of the PIER- or be produced later. We will attend the consultation dates and be able to ask more but answers to the above would be appreciated.	I	<p>During design refinement, visual screening has been proposed for the HVAC booster station to minimise impacts. Indicative proposals are shown within the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.</p> <p>An assessment of both construction and operational noise impacts associated with the onshore infrastructure (including the HVAC booster station) is provided within Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 8: Noise and Vibration. Details of the baseline noise surveys which have been undertaken to inform the noise assessment are presented within Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 8.1: Baseline Noise Survey.</p> <p>During construction noise and light pollution would be controlled through appropriate design and construction management measures documented in the outline Code of Construction Practice which forms part of the DCO application. In respect to lighting, site lighting at the HVAC booster station will only operate when required and will be directional to avoid unnecessary illumination.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>43</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Norfolk County Council	<p>Local Member Views</p> <p>2.39 The Local County Councillor for Melton Constable has made the following comments:</p> <p>2.40 There is generally little opposition to these proposals in absolute terms and local residents appreciate the importance of national infrastructure and securing future energy supply;</p> <p>2.41 There are concerns about the lack of mitigating measures planned in respect of the onshore HVAC Booster Station; and</p> <p>2.42 The Local Member strongly urges the County Council to insist that the developers provide detailed mitigating measures as part of their submission in respect of: height, visibility and noise – relating to the HVAC booster station at Little Barningham.</p>	I	<p>Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts to local residential receptors, either through site selection/route refinement (see Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives) or through the identification of suitable mitigation measures. Where there are impacts to residential receptors, these are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3).</p> <p>Appropriate mitigation measures relating to the onshore HVAC booster station are also identified in the relevant topic specific chapters. For example, visual disturbance impacts and associated mitigation are outlined in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources. This includes, for example, the restoration of habitats (including hedgerows) which cannot be avoided and landscape planting around the HVAC booster station to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.</p>
Norfolk County Council	<p>Landscape</p> <p>5.11 The potential landscape impacts associated with the temporary construction compounds; HVAC Booster Station and Substation are only preliminary at this stage and the applicant will need to revisit and expand on this in their Environmental Statement (ES) accompanying the final submission proposal. The ES will also need to include specific elements of mitigation that will be required in order to alleviate any significant adverse effects where these arise. These mitigation measures will be set out within the outline Landscape Scheme and Management Plan (LSMP), which will form part of the EIA/ES. The applicant acknowledges that LSMP will need to be agreed with local planning authorities (LPAs).</p> <p>5.12 Notwithstanding this pending further work (LSMP), the PEIR accepts that on a number of visual receptors, including for example Public Rights of Way (PRoW), it is expected that the onshore infrastructure will have a major adverse significance in EIA terms.</p> <p>5.13 Landscape and visual assessment is to be conducted using the Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (GLVIA) 3rd Edition and other industry best practice guidance. It is noted that the PEIR simply contains viewpoints and wireframes. Viewpoints and visualisations through photomontage are a more useful tool in assessing the likely effects of a proposed development, and the emerging Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) should consider the production of such images, particularly for public consultation at the next stage of the application process. The PEIR indicates that photomontages will be undertaken as part of the Environmental Statement.</p> <p>Comment</p> <p>It is felt that DONG Energy should use photomontages as part of their LVIA and LSMP for assessing the potential impact of onshore infrastructure associated with the above proposal. It is also recommended that any appropriate mitigation measures are agreed with LPAs including the County Council in respect of the HVAC booster station; the proposed new sub-station and any temporary construction compounds</p>	I	<p>Impacts relating to landscape and visual resources are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual resources. Photographic panels along the cable corridor, as well as indicative visualisations have been prepared to inform the assessment of impacts and are provided in Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 4.5: Photographic Panels, Wireframes and Photomontages.</p> <p>Appropriate mitigation measures for visual disturbance are outlined in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources. This includes, for example, the restoration of habitats (including hedgerows) which cannot be avoided and landscape planting around the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.</p>
Planning, South Norfolk Council	<p>2) What options are there for the construction of the substation to minimise its impact on the landscape?</p>	I	<p>Appropriate mitigation measures for visual disturbance are outlined in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources. This includes, for example, the restoration of habitats (including hedgerows) which cannot be avoided and landscape planting around the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>43</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Planning, South Norfolk Council	3) How do you propose to minimise the impact of the substation (visual, heritage, transport impacts for example)?	I	Mitigation measures relevant to the onshore HVDC converter/HVAC substation have been identified in each topic chapter of the Environmental Statement (see volume 3). Key measures for during the operational phase include: strategic landscaping around the perimeter of the site to screen the site and provide landscape and heritage mitigation and preparation of an operational noise management plan. A number of other measures will be implemented to minimise and manage impacts during construction, as set out in the outline COCP which forms part of the DCO application.
Planning, South Norfolk Council	The Council's response to your consultation was agreed at the Development Management Committee meeting on 13 September 2017 and I enclose a copy of the committee report for your information. Our response to the consultation refers to three key considerations: • Heritage Assets • Landscape • Noise and Pollution	N	Noted, specific comments on these considerations are considered in the following points.
Planning, South Norfolk Council	Landscape Information has been provided setting out the approach to the full Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) that will be undertaken and the submitted methodology is generally in accordance with the industry guidelines (Guidelines for Landscape and Impact Assessment, Third Edition). As elements of the scheme are not yet detailed (notably including the proposed HVDC converter/HVAC substation at Mangreen) initial assessment is based on maximum parameters at this time. Photomontages of the proposed scheme would be much more useful to demonstrate the visual effects. The details of mitigation such as planting will be expected to form part of the detailed submission and, in the absence of details to the contrary, it is suggested that these are developed in response to the scenarios anticipated by the wireframe illustrations. Whilst we have been involved in discussions about viewpoints for the substation, it is noted that the only one directly associated with the A47 is from the Intwood Road overbridge. Whilst it is accepted that the sensitivity of drivers and passengers using the A47 will be less than, for example, pedestrians using the bridge, it is considered that additional viewpoints from the main A47 should be included in the full LVIA.	I	Impacts relating to landscape and visual resources are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual resources. Photographic panels along the cable corridor, as well as indicative visualisations have been prepared to inform the assessment of impacts and are provided in Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 4.5: Photographic Panels, Wireframes and Photomontages.  In respect to the viewpoint from the A47, photographs taken from a moving car have been presented in annex 4.5 to illustrate views from the A47 as there are no nearby laybys or other publicly accessible locations adjacent to the road in the vicinity of the onshore HVDC converter/HVAC substation site. However, it is considered that Viewpoint SS7 presented in annex 4.5 taken from a bridge crossing the A47 is sufficient to inform the assessment of impacts as presented in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources.
Planning, South Norfolk Council	Artificial Light It is expected that artificial lighting will be required during the construction phase. If this poorly located and/or angled it could have a negative impact on the amenity of residents. The onshore HVAC booster stations may require poorly located and/or angled it could have a negative impact on the amenity of residents. The Preliminary Environmental Information Report does not appear to address this issue.	I	The majority of construction work in relation to Hornsea Three will be undertaken during daylight hours as described in the Outline CoCP, during those working hours there will be no need for artificial lighting of construction areas. Activities outside of the standard working hours will be agreed with the relevant local authority EHO officer in consultation with relevant stakeholders (e.g. third party asset owner) as required. Mitigation measures, designed to avoid or reduce the effects during construction of artificial lighting, are set out within the Outline CoCP. In this regard, lighting during construction will take into account the requirements set out in British Standard (BS) EB 12464-2:2014 (BSI, 21014) and guidance from the Institute of Lighting Professionals (Institute of Lighting Professionals, 2011 'Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Obtrusive Light').



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>43</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Planning, South Norfolk Council	<p>In summary, it is considered that further information is required to demonstrate how the proposed development for the substation, in particular, will be designed to consider landscape and heritage impacts, noise, dust, artificial light and private drinking water supply issues raised in more detail below:</p>	I	<p>Through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts from the project, in particular the HVDC converter/HVAC substation on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive ecological receptors. Mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project are outlined in topic specific chapters, and include the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts on local road networks, ecological receptors (e.g. hedgerows) and hydrological features (e.g. main rivers).</p> <p>In respect to ecology, landscape and heritage impacts this includes, for example, the restoration of habitats (including hedgerows) which cannot be avoided and landscape planting around the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.</p>
Edgefield, Bodham, Corpusty & Saxthorpe, Hempstead and Plumstead Parish Councils (and others)	<p>1. Unacceptability of 'phasing' that requires the same sections of cable corridor to be dug up more than once</p> <p>We understand that the current commissioning process for projects of this nature could involve consent being granted to the developers in up to three phases. This would involve the digging up of, what is effectively, the same ground along the entire cable corridor up to three times during the length of the project, adversely affect its economic viability, and unnecessarily delay the upgrading and expansion of the nation's electricity supply.</p> <p>This is clearly a ridiculous waste of money. But more importantly, it means all of the negative consequences of the cable corridor will be multiplied and the long-term damage to the area made significantly worse. The effects relate to traffic, tourism and road safety – and above all, the permanent damage to the natural environment. Whatever route it takes, the cable corridor will inevitably involve disrupting areas of unspoiled natural beauty, habitat loss (hedgerows, hedge margins, meadow, wet and ancient woodland), associated habitat fragmentation and the high potential for water pollution (due to soil and nutrient loss to watercourses). We recommend referring to the report produced by the River Glaven Conservation Group for a detailed and thorough explanation of the many significant environmental issues along the route.</p> <p>Several areas of the proposed cable route are areas of High Landscape Value, as well as being subject to deliberate and managed conservation. There is a wide variety of flora and fauna, even in the most apparently straightforward North Norfolk field, the quality of which can only really be appreciated through year-round observation. North Norfolk hosts a significant amount of wildlife, from barn owls to deer, hares and birds of prey including kestrels, buzzards and kites, as well as rare flora and fauna. The natural conditions which make this area of the UK so suitable for wildlife have been preserved for generations, and are unique in the extent to which they have resisted urbanisation, industrialisation and the ensuing noise, light and atmospheric pollution.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Corpusty &amp; Saxthorpe Parish representatives and landowners adjacent to the proposed site of the crossing of the River Bure and its adjacent water meadows are concerned that these environs receive special attention. To mitigate any environmental impact on these, surrounding ancient hedgerows and a domestic water well it is respectfully requested that HDD under-drilling be utilised for approximately 600m length at an appropriate depth below the base of the water well. The above concerns are all grounds on which to object most strongly to the idea of any such development whatsoever carving a decade-long scar through the landscape. Indeed it is extremely rare for a community as wide and representative as the one made up in the signatories of this letter, to come out cautiously in support of something so catastrophic for the local environment. We are, however,</p>	Y	<p>During the design refinement Hornsea Three has sought to minimise the duration of any disruption, and has reduced the total duration of the construction phase onshore to eight years. Within this, the maximum duration for construction of the onshore cable corridor is approximately 2.5 years, this therefore means that the maximum duration over which construction could occur would be 5.5 years incorporating two phases (assuming a three-year gap between the two phases). The work associated with each phase is expected to progress along the Hornsea Three onshore cable corridor with a typical active construction works duration of three months at any particular location.</p> <p>Through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive ecological receptors. For example, Weybourne Cliffs and Kelling Heath SSSI have been avoided and no direct impacts are predicted on these designated sites from Hornsea Three. Additional mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project are outlined in topic specific chapters, and include the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts on local road networks, ecological receptors (e.g. hedgerows) and hydrological features (e.g. main rivers).</p> <p>Where impacts have not been avoided, these are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement volume 3.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>43</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>understanding of the need the country has as a whole to develop sustainable sources of alternative energy. But we are also mindful of the need to protect and preserve this beautiful and unique asset for generations to come for the benefit of residents, workers and visitors alike.</p> <p>We are reassured to read that the consultation process will give due consideration to the negative impacts of the development on the natural environment. There must, as part of the granting of consent for this development, be a guarantee that the best modern engineering practices (not just the statutory minima) are adopted to repair the effects of the development on the environment and reinstatement of soil, water, flora, fauna and habitats.</p> <p>Nothing will ever be able to be restored completely: no amount of soil stratification will be able to reinstate the balance of soil that has been known and worked by the people here for generations. Visual reinstatement – itself something that takes years – is only one part of the picture.</p> <p>To support this development happening at all has taken patience, understanding and significant compromise, but to allow it to happen three times is patently unacceptable. Minimising the number of times the same areas need digging up had the strongest consensus of all issues connected to the cable route: 95% of respondents rated it as 4 or 5 (out of 5) in importance, with standard deviation of just 0.61 across all responses. Everything that stands to be lost by the construction of the onshore component of this project will be significantly worsened if the work along each point of the cable corridor is not carried out once and once only, quickly and efficiently, and the land reinstated thoroughly and permanently.</p> <p>Whether it is within the control of the developers, or something that only Government can change, we will object vociferously and unendingly to any development consent order that is granted without absolute assurance that individual sections of the cable route will not be 'dug up' on more than one occasion. At the very least, alternative ideas should be explored such as laying all ducting in the first phase so that the land does not need to be dug up more than once.</p> <p>We are utterly dedicated and passionate about this aspect of the proposed development, and will defend our land at all costs – as we have done in the past.</p>		
<p>Edgefield, Bodham, Corpusty &amp; Saxthorpe, Hempstead and Plumstead Parish Councils (and others)</p>	<p>3. Mitigations of impact of HVAC booster station</p> <p>At present, based on the drawings, descriptions and 3D models we have seen, there are no mitigating measures planned around the construction of the HVAC booster station at Little Barningham and this is simply unacceptable. The potential height on its own would create an eyesore that could significantly undermine the quality of life of people living in, and passing through, the area. Not to mention the noise.</p> <p>There are very few rural services in North Norfolk and precious little economic activity beyond tourism. The quality of life and the beautiful natural environment we enjoy are what people get instead and this could be significantly eroded by the developers' plans if mitigation steps are not put in place. 97% of residents said that improving the natural habitat after construction was finished was "important" or "very important" - the strongest response of all the issues covered and the answer that had the greatest consensus (standard deviation: 0.56). 95% furthermore said that the natural environment has a lot to do with their quality of life.</p> <p>Visual</p> <p>The proposed 12.5m structure will be visible over hundreds of hectares, including from all neighbouring villages, and a significant length of the Holt road. We do not recognize the visualisations we have been shown by the developer based on our local knowledge, and we will undertake experiments ourselves to see the true distance over which the structure as currently planned would be seen. Significant height mitigations should be volunteered by the developer or required as a condition</p>	<p>I</p>	<p>Information pertaining to the site selection for the HVAC booster station is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives, whilst maximum dimensions are provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description.</p> <p>Through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive ecological receptors. For example, the orientation of the HVAC booster station has been optimised to minimise impacts on nearby field boundaries (hedgerows and trees) as well as maximise natural screening. Additional mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project are outlined in topic specific chapters, and include the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts on local road networks, ecological receptors (e.g. hedgerows) and hydrological features (e.g. main rivers); and landscape planting around the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>43</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>of the order, to reduce substantially the relative height to the extent that it would be similar in size to other aesthetically limited constructions in the local area: only churches remotely approach the height currently proposed. We urge the developers to consider ideas for this – a very small selection of which include: digging out the foundations so the building starts at a lower level; using the soil to create a bank around the construction and planting the scheme with trees.</p> <p>We note the lengthy disclaimers attached to the developer’s visualisations and feel they are therefore an ineffective tool to understand the visual impact of the booster station from different viewpoints. Physical demonstrations would be required in order to understand the true visibility of the proposed construction.</p> <p>77% of residents said that ensuring the height of the booster station was kept to a minimum was “very important” and this is an area we hope the developers will consider seriously before making their application - at present no mitigations whatsoever are proposed and this is clearly unacceptable.</p> <p>We have been informed that flood lighting will be needed on site to provide safe working conditions at night in the event of emergency. We accept this, but do not understand why this lighting needs to be motion-sensitive. For the purposes of security we understand remote monitored, motion-sensitive, infrared cameras would be equally effective and request that any flood lighting be manually triggered either remotely or from on-site so as to prevent any eventuality where the night sky in this remote and rural area is illuminated unnecessarily.</p> <p>Noise and vibration</p> <p>Currently the developer proposes noise and vibration mitigation that reduces the noise impact of the booster station to “acceptable levels”. We have seen no evidence that these levels are respectful of the fact that, at night in North Norfolk, the environment is virtually absent of any background noise or vibration interference whatsoever. Nor are we confident that background studies have been carried out at sites close to the proposed construction.</p> <p>We insist that the required noise and vibration levels within 500m of the proposed booster station are set at the current background levels at those locations on a clear night.</p> <p>We strongly urge the developers to provide detailed noise and vibration mitigation steps as part of their application, rather than leave any doubt whatsoever that the targets will be adequate. If local people are being dragged into a national infrastructure project with no way of knowing what the impact will be, and with no formal powers of recourse, then the enforcement of rights will only be able to be fought for post hoc by residents through protest and inconvenience once the DCO has been granted. It benefits everyone for the precise specification of “acceptable levels” to be disclosed upfront – and at a level that is agreeable.</p> <p>We believe that the available mitigation options should be able to reduce noise and vibration well below statutory levels – and that the extraordinary nature of this development means it is quite appropriate for entirely subjective levels to be set.</p> <p>96% of residents said that ensuring the booster station couldn’t be heard nearby was “important” or “very important”, making it the highest rated issue relating to the booster station, and the booster-station related issue whose response had the greatest consensus (standard deviation: 0.67). As it stands, it is still unclear whether the current background noise levels were sampled in appropriate places, or by suitably independent third parties.</p> <p>Decommissioning</p> <p>We seek reassurance from the developers that any potential booster station will be adequately demolished and removed at the end of its working life and the land restored.</p>		

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>43</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>The HVAC booster station will be of significant and long-term detriment to our area, and our area alone – and the best in class mitigation practices should be deployed, however costly. For the avoidance of doubt, our proposal in point two above should require the cost comparison to be inclusive of the cost of mitigations to the booster station in the case of HVAC.</p>		
<p>River Glaven Conservation Group (RGCG) and CPRE Norfolk</p>	<p>OVERVIEW ON KEY ISSUES The RGCG and CPRE Norfolk made separate submissions to the Phase 1B consultation, and also verbal input prior to that at the ‘roadshow’ events. The RGCG did so from the remit of enhancing and protecting the Glaven and its catchment, and CPRE from a wider remit with landscape being the main issue. However we have felt for some time that wildlife and landscape go hand-in-hand. This is particularly so in the context of a river valley and the catchment area, which have the key role in a wider ecological network, and so now make a joint submission. The reason is well expressed by Brendan Joyce, Chief Executive of the Norfolk Wildlife Trust when he said in the preface to the CPRE Norfolk policy document A Vision for Norfolk (July 2017): The county is famous for its wildlife and habitats and extremely rich in its biodiversity, but so much of it is rare and endangered and confined to isolated, fragmented nature reserves. It is not enough to protect what is there from growing threats. Its future survival depends on us taking a more landscape approach to its conservation and this means creating more space for wildlife and repairing broken ecological networks. It is only in recent years that we have realised the potential of the restoration of farmland ponds in repairing a key part of this network, particularly those on a watershed between the two river systems and this work was initiated on the Glaven-Bure catchment ‘boundary’. Such an area, particularly if sited on a watershed, can be the weakest link in ecological network. Our experience shows us that rivers and aquatic habitats can, with the appropriate restoration techniques, regain their wildlife in a relatively short space of time. We attach as evidence on this point the RGCG Strategy 2016-20 to illustrate this; also what we now see as the greatest threats, arable run-off and invasive species. A recent RGCG Newsletter Autumn 2016 contains an article on the ponds work, and Spring 2017 on the Dong project at it was at that time. However our most important evidence is a paper written by RGCG members on the Upper Glaven Ecological Network (August 2017) (ATTACHED IN EMAIL) and is the result of many years of experience. However this remains an ongoing exercise, and we expect to contribute further on this and other topics throughout the whole Project Three timescale.</p>	<p>I</p>	<p>Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive ecological receptors.</p> <p>Potential impacts which remain on ecological receptors are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation. This assessment considers the interactions between the project and ecological receptors, and is informed by the relationship between hydrogeology, hydrology and water-dependant habitats which are described in the Hydrological Characterisation Note which forms Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 2.4. This approach was discussed and agreed with the onshore ecology expert working group which comprised Natural England, the Wildlife Trust, Environment Agency and the RSPB amongst others.</p> <p>Potential impacts on landscape and visual resources are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources.</p> <p>The interaction between landscape and ecological receptors is acknowledged and addressed through cross-referencing between the outline landscape management plan and the outline ecological management plan (both of which form part of the DCO application). For example, restoration of hedgerows, currently in poor condition, provides an opportunity to achieve long term benefits for the biodiversity associated with this habitat type as well as gap up hedgerows providing landscape and visual mitigation.</p>
<p>River Glaven Conservation Group (RGCG) and CPRE Norfolk</p>	<p>Finally on this overview we wish to place to record that we welcome the decision following the Phase 1B consultation to set aside the Hempstead and Pond Hills site for the location of a HVAC booster station. This was a great relief to us, particularly for the Hempstead site which had a high potential for damage to the Glaven, during construction and in operation, and have a severe impact in the landscape. We do understand why many people have a great concern on a booster station, and these are foremost in terms of profile; and understandably due to the complexity and much less obvious the types of damage that can be done but unseen. We add that, as said in the previous response, the selected Little Barningham site is also in attractive and unspoilt countryside, but the contours and woodland on two sides offer more opportunity for screening and other mitigation techniques. The most desirable approach would be of course the use of HVDC and avoid the need for a booster station. We return to this issue later in this document.</p>	<p>I</p>	<p>Noted. Further information pertaining to the alternative locations considered for the HVAC booster station is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Alternatives.</p>



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>43</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
River Glaven Conservation Group (RGCG) and CPRE Norfolk	<p>LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL RESOURCES: Paragraph 4.2.1.3: We note the main on shore elements to consider for the development are: 1. The onshore cable corridor, including the intertidal area, the two options immediately landward of the beech. The onshore cable corridor between the onshore HVDC converter/HVAC substation and Norwich Main Substation 2. The main construction compounds, to be decided. 3. The onshore HVAC booster station; and 4. The onshore HVDC converter/HVAC substation We comment: it is these structures that will receive the larger part of the overall public response as they are of high visibility and prominence in undeveloped countryside, and may also be near settlements, and as such are sensitive. This is an important and understandable point and a matter of concern also to CPRE Norfolk. However we would not like to see these concerns imply that the less obvious potential impacts raised by undergrounded cabling all along the on-shore route are treated as secondary because they are less well known and recognised. Both need detailed consideration and comprehensive mitigation measures and treated as a proposal until this is secured and there is any acceptance in the DCO to come. The magnitude of this development, the third and much the biggest offshore windfarm to make the landing at Weybourne, implies a highest standard for mitigation measures. To help with this there are landscape and seascape character assessments published by Natural England, the District Council and the AONB Partnership. 4.7.1.2: We note that all three bodies above will comment on how it affects the AONB, and very extensively, and make proposals on routing and mitigation. As such we will concentrate on the Little Barningham site for a booster station, which is in a non-designated landscape; but notable as an area of strong and largely unchanged landscape, with single track roads network shown by the 1797 Faden Map of Norfolk. It is a quiet and tranquil area with dark skies. The site is at a point where the parishes of Edgefield, Little Barningham and Corpusty and Saxthorpe meet, which is reflected in the tree line boundary. The study area for the potential for sighting at 1 km and 5 km distance is shown a Figure 4.2 at pages 11,12. Page 56, Table: The maximum design scenario for the onshore booster station has a largest footprint up to 25,000 sqm and the largest area requirement for temporary works also 25,000 sqm. The single building option has the largest built area (150 m long x 30 m wide x 12.5 m in height). This will also be the most inflexible of the building options. Firewalls are of 15 m height and lightning protection height of 17.5 m. In terms of construction vehicles, the maximum design scenario is likely to be the six building solution, if the six buildings are built at the same time. The three phase partly-parallel construction programme is considered to be the maximum design scenario. CPRE Norfolk will be responding to proposals for landscaping and mitigation for the HVAC booster station when they are finalised. However, even with best possible mitigation, the development must leave an imprint on the landscape character of the wider area. We therefore hope that by the time that construction is due to start that HVDC will be established and be installed without the need for a booster station.</p>	I	<p>Impacts relating to landscape and visual resources are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources. Particular consideration has been given to the AONB as a sensitive receptor, and it is noted that Hornsea Three has consulted with the Norfolk Coast Partnership to agree viewpoints to inform the assessment of impacts on the AONB.</p> <p>The maximum design parameters for Hornsea Three are set out in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description.</p> <p>Through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive ecological receptors. For example, the orientation of the HVAC booster station has been optimised to minimise impacts on nearby field boundaries (hedgerows and trees) as well as maximise natural screening. Additional mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project are outlined in topic specific chapters, and include the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts on local road networks, ecological receptors (e.g. hedgerows) and hydrological features (e.g. main rivers).</p>
Natural England	<p>Section 3.3 Landscape and Visual Resources Key Concern: Natural England's advice covers the likely effect of the proposal on the landscape and visual amenity of the Norfolk Coast Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and The Broads National Park with reference to their statutory purposes. However, we strongly advise that the relevant AONB Partnership and National Park landscape advisors are also consulted by the developers about the scheme as they have extensive local knowledge and experience of these protected landscapes. Viewpoints for the visual impact assessment within the ES will need to be agreed with local landscape officers.</p>	I	<p>Noted. Impacts relating to landscape and visual resources are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual resources. Particular consideration has been given to the AONB as a sensitive receptor, and it is noted that Hornsea Three has consulted with the Norfolk Coast Partnership to agree viewpoints to inform the assessment of impacts on the AONB.</p>



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>43</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Natural England	Section 3.3 Landscape and Visual Resources Key Concern: The PEI presents a good deal of information on the baseline environment in the vicinity of the project in terms of landscape designations, character areas etc. The proposed impact assessment methodology is explained in detail and is broadly acceptable. Preliminary conclusions about the significance of the impact have been made but are subject to limitations (see below). At this stage, without further information, we are not able to reach firm conclusions about the effects of the project within the Norfolk Coast AONB in particular. We have no concerns at this stage regarding proposed mitigation measures and further work.	I	Noted. Impacts relating to landscape and visual resources are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual resources. Particular consideration has been given to the AONB as a sensitive receptor, and it is noted that Hornsea Three has consulted with the Norfolk Coast Partnership to agree viewpoints to inform the assessment of impacts on the AONB.
Natural England	Section 3.3 Landscape and Visual Resources Key Concern: As the project is not yet fully defined, a detailed assessment of the landscape and visual effects on protected landscapes that are likely to arise as a result of the onshore infrastructure is not able to be completed at this stage, including an appraisal of night time effects. Mitigation needs to be identified in order to alleviate significant adverse effects where they are likely to arise, e.g. screening of visual effects by landscape planting around HVAC and HVDC/HVAC booster stations. The visual impact from wireframes is presented in the report and we would expect to see photomontages presented in the final ES.	I	Impacts relating to landscape and visual resources are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual resources. Photographic panels along the cable corridor, as well as indicative visualisations have been prepared to inform the assessment of impacts and are provided in Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 4.5: Photographic Panels, Wireframes and Photomontages.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>43</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Natural England	<p>Section 3.3 Landscape and Visual Resources Key Concern: Summary of Natural England's initial advice regarding the landscape and visual impact of the onshore installations on the protected landscapes and their settings, based on the information presented in the PEI, is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The onshore cable will make landfall within Norfolk Coast AONB and continue south for about 3.5 km within the AONB. It therefore seems likely that there will be a direct impact from the cable route on the statutory purpose of the AONB, particularly during construction and decommissioning activities.</li> <li>- The duration of the construction, operation and decommissioning phases within the AONB including phase build will need to be known for the final ES along with any specific measures to avoid or reduce impacts with the protected landscape. The expected timescale for the restoration of the landscape should also be estimated for the ES.</li> <li>- In addition to the impact of the cable route, the impact of the construction of any jointing bays, link boxes, compounds etc. within the AONB should be assessed in full.</li> <li>- There is likely to be an impact on the visual amenity of users of England Coast Path from the landfall of the onshore cable, particularly during construction and decommissioning. This will need to be captured in the ES.</li> <li>- The onshore HVAC booster station (if required) is not within any protected landscape but it is situated about 6.5 km from the AONB and may be considered to be in its 'setting'. However, the Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) shows that there is unlikely to be any visibility of the building from AONB. We expect that the siting will seek to avoid the loss of important landscape features and that any landscape planting to screen the booster station will be in keeping with the local landscape character.</li> <li>- The onshore HVDC converter/HVAC substation outside Norwich is not within a protected landscape but it is situated about 5 km to the west of The Broads National Park and may therefore be considered to be in its 'setting'. The ZTV shows that the buildings may be visible from the National Park; therefore, there may be a direct impact on the National Park from construction, operation and decommissioning activities. The duration of the phases and any mitigation measures to avoid or reduce impacts will need to be known for the final ES. We expect that the siting will seek to avoid the loss of important landscape features and that any landscape planting to screen the station will be in keeping with the local landscape character.</li> <li>- In combination with other plans and projects, the onshore cable route, onshore HVAC booster station and onshore HVDC converter/HVAC substation of Hornsea Three, are likely to have a cumulative effect on the nationally designated landscape of Norfolk Coast AONB during construction, operation and decommissioning.</li> <li>- Individual veteran trees, tree lines, hedgerows with trees and patches of woodland are important landscape features. Although the refined cable corridor will seek to avoid areas of woodland and trees, it will be important for the final ES to include information about where there will be a permanent loss of these key landscape features along the route and provide details of the steps that have been taken to minimise the loss.</li> <li>- Details of the length of time of the construction, operation and decommissioning phases and estimates of how long it will take for the wider landscape to recover will be required by the final ES.</li> </ul>	I	Noted. Impacts relating to landscape and visual resources are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual resources. Particular consideration has been given to the AONB as a sensitive receptor, and it is noted that Hornsea Three has consulted with the Norfolk Coast Partnership to agree viewpoints to inform the assessment of impacts on the AONB.
Natural England	<p>3.3.1 Vol. 3 Chapter 4 – Landscape and Visual Resources 4.3.1.3 We agree with the decision to reduce the 2 km inner buffer to 1 km for the purpose of this assessment.</p>	N	Noted.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>43</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Natural England	3.3.2 Vol. 3 Chapter 4 – Landscape and Visual Resources 4.3.1.6 We note that Hornsea Three will have regard to potential temporary landscape and visual impacts when refining the onshore cable route, and will identify appropriate viewpoints for further assessment as the plans develop, in consultation with the relevant local planning authorities.	I	Noted, the methodology applied within Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources is set out in Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 4.1: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment Methodology. Photographic panels along the cable corridor, as well as indicative visualisations have been prepared to inform the assessment of impacts and are provided in Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 4.5: Photographic Panels, Wireframes and Photomontages.
Natural England	3.3.3 Vol. 3 Chapter 4 – Landscape and Visual Resources Table 4.5 Maximum design scenario for assessment of potential impacts on landscape and visual resources: We agree with the potential impacts scoped in for assessment for the construction and decommissioning phases. However, we suggest that the operation phase of the onshore cable corridor within the AONB is scoped in for completeness.	I	Noted. Impacts relating to landscape and visual resources are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual resources. Particular consideration has been given to the AONB as a sensitive receptor, and it is noted that Hornsea Three has consulted with the Norfolk Coast Partnership to agree viewpoints to inform the assessment of impacts on the AONB.
Natural England	3.3.4 Vol. 3 Chapter 4 – Landscape and Visual Resources Table 4.6 Impacts scoped out of the assessment for landscape and visual resources: We agree with the impacts scoped out at this stage. However, we suggest that the day time impacts of the onshore cable route within the AONB are scoped in	I	Noted. Impacts relating to landscape and visual resources are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual resources. Particular consideration has been given to the AONB as a sensitive receptor, and it is noted that Hornsea Three has consulted with the Norfolk Coast Partnership to agree viewpoints to inform the assessment of impacts on the AONB.
Natural England	3.3.5 Vol. 3 Chapter 4 – Landscape and Visual Resources 4.9.3.13 We agree that for the purposes of this LVIA, any effects with a significance level of moderate or less have been concluded to be not significant in terms of the EIA Regulations as identified in Table 4.9 'Matrix used for assessment of significance of effect. However, effects that are not considered to be significant should not be completely disregarded (see GLVIA3, p.41 ).	I	Noted, the methodology applied within Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources is set out in Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 4.1: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment Methodology. Although there have been changes to the approach since PEIR in response to design refinement, the categorisation of moderate effects as not significant remains valid.
Natural England	3.3.6 Vol. 3 Chapter 4 – Landscape and Visual Resources 4.10.1.1 We note that as part of the project design, a number of designed-in measures have been proposed to reduce the potential for impacts on landscape and visual resources including undergrounding along the length of the cable route, avoidance of sensitive features where possible, replacement of hedgerows including hedgerow trees and enhancement of hedgerows where appropriate.	I	Impacts from Hornsea Three on ecological and landscape features, including hedgerows and trees (including woodlands) has been avoided where possible through commitments to use trenchless technologies such as Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD). The replacement of hedgerows at the end of the construction phase to be undertaken will ensure there is no net loss of hedgerow habitat as a result of Hornsea Project Three.  Furthermore, restoration of hedgerows, currently in poor condition, provides an opportunity to achieve long term benefits for the biodiversity associated with this habitat type. The impacts of Hornsea Three on hedgerows and trees is presented in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation, whilst impacts on the local landscape are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources.
Natural England	3.3.7 Vol. 3 Chapter 4 – Landscape and Visual Resources 4.10.1.2 Individual veteran trees, tree lines, hedgerows with trees and patches of woodland are important landscape features. Although the refined cable corridor will seek to avoid areas of woodland and trees, it will be important for the final ES to include information about where there will be a permanent loss of these landscape features and the steps that have been taken to minimise the loss.	I	Impacts from Hornsea Three on ecological and landscape features, including hedgerows and trees (including woodlands) has been avoided where possible through commitments to use trenchless technologies such as Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD). The replacement of hedgerows at the end of the construction phase to be undertaken will ensure there is no net loss of hedgerow habitat as a result of Hornsea Project Three.  Furthermore, restoration of hedgerows, currently in poor condition, provides an opportunity to achieve long term benefits for the biodiversity associated with this habitat type. The impacts of Hornsea Three on hedgerows and trees is presented in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation, whilst impacts on the local landscape are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>43</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Natural England	3.3.8 Vol. 3 Chapter 4 – Landscape and Visual Resources 4.10.1.3 We note that opportunities to avoid sensitive receptors will also be investigated, and detailed consideration will be given to the least disruptive, and potentially least visible, places to cross key rights of way. Visual screening of construction works and temporary compounds will also be considered.	I	Appropriate mitigation measures for visual disturbance are outlined in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources. This includes, for example, the restoration of habitats (including hedgerows) which cannot be avoided at the end of the construction phase.  During design refinement, visual screening has been proposed for during the operational phase of the HVAC booster station and HVDC converter/HVAC substation to minimise impacts. Indicative proposals are shown within the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.
Natural England	3.3.9 Vol. 3 Chapter 4 – Landscape and Visual Resources 4.11.2.1 We agree with the effects that have the potential to be significant set out in the following sections where these relate to protected landscapes.	I	Noted. Impacts relating to landscape and visual resources are addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual resources.
Natural England	3.3.10 Vol. 3 Chapter 4 – Landscape and Visual Resources 4.11.2.7 and 4.11.2.11 We agree that the significance of effects on either the western or eastern section of the landfall within AONB is considered to be major adverse and significant in EIA terms. The impact will be affected by the way the construction works are planned and managed. The selection of the final cable route and the way it interacts with Public Rights of Way, including England Coast Path, should be carefully considered.	I	Noted. Impacts relating to landscape and visual resources are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual resources. This includes an assessment of the impacts associated with removal of hedgerows (where it has not been committed to HDD), and trees. Particular consideration has been given to the AONB as a sensitive receptor, and it is noted that Hornsea Three has consulted with the Norfolk Coast Partnership to agree viewpoints to inform the assessment of impacts on the AONB.  Where the onshore cable corridor crosses public rights of way, Hornsea Three has sought to avoid impacts through the use of HDD technology. However, where open cut, or HDD with a haul road over, is proposed, the routes will be temporarily diverted along existing tracks, for a maximum of one month per cable.  Following the completion of the construction works all areas of access land, recreational resources, PRoWs and other linear routes affected by the onshore works would be re-instated to their current condition and/or along their current alignments. There would be no physical effects on these resources arising from the operation or maintenance of Hornsea Three. The measures to be taken to ensure the continued use of all linear recreational resources during the construction phase of the project have been discussed with Norfolk County Council and are set out in the Outline CoCP. This dialogue will continue during the detailed design process.
Natural England	3.3.11 Vol. 3 Chapter 4 – Landscape and Visual Resources 4.11.2.20 We agree that the significance of effects of the HVDC converter/HVAC substation on local LCAs is considered to be major adverse, which is significant. Again, the way the construction works are planned, and managed, will affect the significance of the impact.	I	Noted. Impacts relating to landscape and visual resources are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual resources. Measures relating to how construction works would be undertaken are set out in the outline CoCP which forms part of the DCO application.
Natural England	3.3.12 Vol. 3 Chapter 4 – Landscape and Visual Resources 4.12.1.1 During the operation and maintenance phase, we note that vehicles would infrequently cross the beach for maintenance access and access to undertake any repairs to the cable route when necessary.	I	Noted. Impacts relating to landscape and visual resources during the operational and maintenance are addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual resources.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>43</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Natural England	3.3.13 Vol. 3 Chapter 4 – Landscape and Visual Resources 4.12.1.2 The operational and maintenance phase of the onshore cable route should include an assessment of the permanent change to landscape features, such as loss of trees and woodland, installation of link boxes etc. within the AONB as these aspects may serve to permanently mark the route of the cable across the landscape if they aren't sensitively hidden or screened.	I	Noted. Impacts relating to landscape and visual resources are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual resources. This includes an assessment of the impacts associated with removal of hedgerows (where it has not been committed to HDD), and trees. Particular consideration has been given to the AONB as a sensitive receptor, and it is noted that Hornsea Three has consulted with the Norfolk Coast Partnership to agree viewpoints to inform the assessment of impacts on the AONB.
Natural England	3.3.14 Vol. 3 Chapter 4 – Landscape and Visual Resources 4.12.1.4 We agree that 'The addition of the onshore HVAC booster station and HVDC converter/HVAC substation will change the landscape character of the land on which the buildings are located and the character of the landscape immediately adjacent to the buildings. Surrounding character areas will experience indirect impacts, through the introduction of a large building in the landscape. There will also be impacts arising from regular maintenance visits and potential repairs during the operation and maintenance phase.'	I	Noted. Impacts relating to landscape and visual resources are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual resources.
Natural England	3.3.15 Vol. 3 Chapter 4 – Landscape and Visual Resources 4.15.2.12 We agree that there is the potential for cumulative impacts from Dudgeon OWF and the Hornsea Three onshore cable corridor within the AONB including an area adjacent to the beach. Marine-based receptors and people using the beach at Weybourne, including users of England Coast Path, will have near views of both schemes if constructed at the same time. Residents located in the north of Weybourne will also have more distant views of the construction activities of both schemes.	I	Cumulative impacts relating to landscape and visual resources are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual resources.
Natural England	3.3.16 Vol. 3 Chapter 4 – Landscape and Visual Resources 4.15.2.13 We agree that the magnitude of the cumulative impact within the AONB is considered to be major where receptors are located immediately adjacent to the activities	I	Noted. Impacts relating to landscape and visual resources are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual resources.
Natural England	3.3.17 Vol. 3 Chapter 4 – Landscape and Visual Resources 4.15.2.14 We agree that users of the England Coast Path within the AONB are receptors of high susceptibility, high reversibility and high value.	I	Noted. Impacts relating to landscape and visual resources are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual resources.
Natural England	3.3.18 Vol. 3 Chapter 4 – Landscape and Visual Resources 4.15.4.5 The timing of on-shore activities for Hornsea Three and Dudgeon will need to be agreed to be mutually exclusive to minimise cumulative effects.	I	Cumulative impacts relating to landscape and visual resources are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual resources.
Natural England	3.3.19 Vol. 3 Chapter 4 – Landscape and Visual Resources 4.15.5.1 We agree that Norfolk Coast AONB (with PF/14/0177) may experience a potentially significant cumulative effect during construction, operation or decommissioning of Hornsea Three.	I	Impacts relating to landscape and visual resources are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual resources. This has included consideration of impacts on the AONB as a sensitive receptor.



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>43</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Natural England	3.3.20 Vol. 3 Chapter 4 – Landscape and Visual Resources 4.18.1.1 At this stage and without further information, we consider that it is not possible to conclude within the AONB that 'The temporary nature of the construction works means that where significant effects are identified, the duration of the effects is short term and so would not be unacceptable and would not compromise the long term amenity value of any aspect of the landscape or visual resources.' We agree that 'During the temporary construction phase of the proposed development, landscape and visual receptors would witness the highest levels of impact from the onshore infrastructure'.	I	Impacts relating to landscape and visual resources are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual resources. This has included consideration of impacts on the AONB as a sensitive receptor.
Natural England	3.3.21 Vol. 3 Chapter 4 – Landscape and Visual Resources 4.18.1.2 We note that Hornsea Three will develop an indicative construction strategy, refining the location of compound areas associated with the HVDC converter/HVAC substation site, and the arrangement of the temporary areas.	I	Noted. Impacts relating to landscape and visual resources are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual resources.
Natural England	3.3.22 Vol. 3 Chapter 4 – Landscape and Visual Resources 4.18.1.3 At this stage and without further information, we consider that it is not possible to conclude within the AONB that 'During the operation and maintenance phase of the onshore elements of Hornsea Three, there would be no significant effects upon landscape or visual receptors along the onshore cable route'. However, we agree that 'The long term effects upon landscape and visual receptors would reduce over time as mitigation measures that have implemented mature'.	I	Impacts relating to landscape and visual resources are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual resources. This has included consideration of impacts on the AONB as a sensitive receptor.
Natural England	3.3.23 Vol. 3 Chapter 4 – Landscape and Visual Resources 4.18.1.4 Likewise, the decommissioning phase within the AONB.	I	Impacts relating to landscape and visual resources are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual resources. This has included consideration of impacts on the AONB as a sensitive receptor.
Natural England	3.3.24 Vol. 3 Chapter 4 – Landscape and Visual Resources 4.19.1.1 We agree that the next steps should be the further refinement of the route alignment, the development of construction phase mitigation measures, location of construction compounds etc.	I	Impacts relating to landscape and visual resources are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual resources. This has included consideration of impacts on the AONB as a sensitive receptor.
Natural England	3.3.25 Vol. 3 Chapter 4 – Landscape and Visual Resources 4.19.1.4 We note that mitigation measures will be investigated once the project has been fully defined, allowing the likely areas of landform and vegetative mitigation to be sited appropriately. The opportunity to mitigate for significant effects relies upon the implementation of appropriate measures that include strengthening landscape character and providing visual screening for the elements of the onshore infrastructure that would remain in situ for the duration of the long term operational and maintenance phase.	I	Appropriate mitigation measures for visual disturbance are outlined in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources. This includes, for example, the restoration of habitats (including hedgerows) which cannot be avoided at the end of the construction phase.  During design refinement, visual screening has been proposed for during the operational phase of the HVAC booster station and HVDC converter/HVAC substation to minimise impacts. Indicative proposals are shown within the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>43</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
East Carleton & Ketteringham Parish Council	The visual impact should be mitigated as far as possible and screening considered to soften the effect on the rural landscape in which it will be constructed. Also consider the impact on the vista from the A47. consider the impact on neighbouring properties and respect the rural environment and impact on wildlife	I	<p>Appropriate mitigation measures for visual disturbance are outlined in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources. This includes, for example, the restoration of habitats (including hedgerows) which cannot be avoided and landscape planting around the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.</p> <p>Impacts on sensitive residential and ecological receptors are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3).</p>
East Carleton & Ketteringham Parish Council	Good the representatives who explained this to parish councils were very helpful	N	Noted
Swardeston Parish Council	<p>Substation - 1 The siting of such a large structure so close to a residential area is undesirable. Is there any opportunity to challenge the decision of the National Grid to require Dong Energy to connect Hornsea Project Three to the Norwich Main substation? 2 Has Dong energy exhausted all alternatives before determining the precise site location for the substation? 3 Why is the onshore substation not being built adjacent to, and to the South of, the existing Norwich Main substation? This site has direct vehicular access off the A140 and is as removed, if not more removed, from existing residential developments as the proposed site. 4 The proposed substation is an immensely high structure. Has Dong Energy considered acquiring a portion of the Mangreen quarry site so as to be able to construct the substation at least partially below ground level? This site would have direct access off the A140 and A47 and the added benefit of almost totally screening the finished substation by a combination of building below ground and planting around the circumference. 5 Whatever the precise location of the substation site, we believe that access to the site should be directly from the A47 (or the A140-A47 slip road), at least for HGVs and "abnormal loads" and preferably for ALL traffic. The B1113 already fails to meet the needs of pedestrians and cyclists and will struggle to cope with the proposed increase in traffic. It is already gridlocked in places at certain times of day, especially at its junction with the A140. 6 The B1113 north of the A47 underpass has a recent history of flooding in heavy rain, with the majority of that flooding caused by water run-off from the field in which the proposed substation is to be sited. Is Dong energy aware of this historic issue and can users of the road be assured that sufficient drainage will be put in place in order to avoid any increased likelihood of these flooding events? 7 How does Dong Energy intend to alleviate any noise and light pollution consequent upon the construction and operation of the substation? 8 Dong Energy representatives have indicated that substantial tree planting will take place to reduce the visual impact of the substation. The proposed site already contains a number of ancient hedgerows and mature trees. Will Dong Energy be taking all necessary steps to ensure that these trees and hedges are protected, both for the sake of their existing ecology and for the immediate screening effect they will have on the finished substation? 9 Given the height of the proposed structure, we believe that 'bundling' the substation and planting along the crest will not of itself significantly reduce its visibility since most native tree varieties are relatively slow growing. Accordingly, we believe that, wherever possible, planting of semi-mature trees should commence immediately, not only around the boundaries of the site but also in other more distant areas where there is anticipated to be line of sight visibility of the substation. 10 Again, given the height of the structure, will Dong Energy be giving consideration to entering into agreements with mobile telephone network operators to enable mobile phone masts to be placed on the substation so as to improve reception in the area? 11 What assurances will Dong Energy give that Parishioners will not suffer financially from the decision to site the substation in the Parish? Clearly some Parishioners will have their homes permanently blighted such that they will become unsaleable. Many others however will find that their properties are reduced in value. For most people, their homes are an important part of their retirement planning. Any loss of value will have serious financial repercussions. How is Dong Energy planning to address this? 12 We understand that Dong Energy has previously established community funds to compensate the community as a whole for the inconvenience suffered during</p>	I	<p>Environmental Statement, volume 3, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives sets out the process of identifying a grid connection location.</p> <p>The aim of the grid connection option appraisal was to identify the most economic and efficient design option for the connection of a project. Although both National Grid and Orsted input into the appraisal process (in respect to economic and strategic factors), the eventual grid connection offer is determined by National Grid. In May 2016, Hornsea Three was formally offered a grid connection at Norwich Main Substation as a result of this appraisal process.</p> <p>Information pertaining to the site selection for the HVAC booster station and HVDC converter/HVAC substation is also provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives.</p> <p>Through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive ecological receptors. For example, the orientation of the HVAC booster station has been optimised to minimise impacts on nearby field boundaries (hedgerows and trees) as well as maximise natural screening. Additional mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project are outlined in topic specific chapters, and include the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts on local road networks; the restoration of habitats (including hedgerows) which cannot be avoided; and landscape planting around the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.</p> <p>In respect to construction impacts, the Project will ensure that sensitive construction management measures, such as noise, dust and traffic control are implemented where required. These are documented in an outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) and outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP), which accompanies the DCO application.</p> <p>In respect to your final point, Hornsea Project Three will review the interactions of the project, as the proposal is refined and consider an appropriate way to feed benefits back into the local community. However, any decision to establish a community benefit fund for Hornsea Three would be made post financial investment decision (FID).</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>43</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>the construction process and whilst the substation is in operation. We have noted the sums being made available by Dong Energy through Grantscape in connection with the Race Bank and Hornsea Project One offshore windfarms. How have these sums been calculated? 13 The Race Bank and Hornsea Project One compensation schemes appear to have been established to compensate communities over a wide area on the basis, presumably, that they are all adversely affected over the long term through sight of the wind turbines. This will not be the case with the Hornsea Project Three. Since the turbines are well out of sight of land, communities along the cable laying route will only be affected during the relatively brief construction phase. Swardeston alone, with the possible inclusion of the area around the HVAC Booster Station if it is needed, will continue to be affected following the completion of the construction phase by the visual impact and polluting aspects of the continued operation of the substation. Will any community fund either be heavily weighted in favour of this locality, or a separate fund established to compensate Swardeston and its close neighbours. 14 Will Swardeston Parish Council have a leading role in determining how any community funds are distributed?</p>		
<b>Section 42: Local Authorities (prescribed under section 43 of the Act)</b>			
Norfolk County Council	<p>Local Member Views 2.39 The Local County Councillor for Melton Constable has made the following comments: 2.40 There is generally little opposition to these proposals in absolute terms and local residents appreciate the importance of national infrastructure and securing future energy supply; 2.41 There are concerns about the lack of mitigating measures planned in respect of the onshore HVAC Booster Station; and 2.42 The Local Member strongly urges the County Council to insist that the developers provide detailed mitigating measures as part of their submission in respect of: height, visibility and noise – relating to the HVAC booster station at Little Barningham.</p>	I	<p>Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts to local residential receptors, either through site selection/route refinement (see Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives) or through the identification of suitable mitigation measures. Where there are impacts to residential receptors, these are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3).</p> <p>Appropriate mitigation measures relating to the onshore HVAC booster station are also identified in the relevant topic specific chapters. For example, visual disturbance impacts and associated mitigation are outlined in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources. This includes, for example, the restoration of habitats (including hedgerows) which cannot be avoided and landscape planting around the HVAC booster station to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>43</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Norfolk County Council	<p>Landscape</p> <p>5.11 The potential landscape impacts associated with the temporary construction compounds; HVAC Booster Station and Substation are only preliminary at this stage and the applicant will need to revisit and expand on this in their Environmental Statement (ES) accompanying the final submission proposal. The ES will also need to include specific elements of mitigation that will be required in order to alleviate any significant adverse effects where these arise. These mitigation measures will be set out within the outline Landscape Scheme and Management Plan (LSMP), which will form part of the EIA/ES. The applicant acknowledges that LSMP will need to be agreed with local planning authorities (LPAs).</p> <p>5.12 Notwithstanding this pending further work (LSMP), the PEIR accepts that on a number of visual receptors, including for example Public Rights of Way (PRoW), it is expected that the onshore infrastructure will have a major adverse significance in EIA terms.</p> <p>5.13 Landscape and visual assessment is to be conducted using the Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (GLVIA) 3rd Edition and other industry best practice guidance. It is noted that the PEIR simply contains viewpoints and wireframes. Viewpoints and visualisations through photomontage are a more useful tool in assessing the likely effects of a proposed development, and the emerging Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) should consider the production of such images, particularly for public consultation at the next stage of the application process. The PEIR indicates that photomontages will be undertaken as part of the Environmental Statement.</p> <p>Comment</p> <p>It is felt that DONG Energy should use photomontages as part of their LVIA and LSMP for assessing the potential impact of onshore infrastructure associated with the above proposal. It is also recommended that any appropriate mitigation measures are agreed with LPAs including the County Council in respect of the HVAC booster station; the proposed new sub-station and any temporary construction compounds</p>	I	<p>Impacts relating to landscape and visual resources are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual resources. Photographic panels along the cable corridor, as well as indicative visualisations have been prepared to inform the assessment of impacts and are provided in Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 4.5: Photographic Panels, Wireframes and Photomontages.</p> <p>Appropriate mitigation measures for visual disturbance are outlined in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources. This includes, for example, the restoration of habitats (including hedgerows) which cannot be avoided and landscape planting around the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.</p>
Planning, South Norfolk Council	2) What options are there for the construction of the substation to minimise its impact on the landscape?	I	Appropriate mitigation measures for visual disturbance are outlined in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources. This includes, for example, the restoration of habitats (including hedgerows) which cannot be avoided and landscape planting around the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.
Planning, South Norfolk Council	3) How do you propose to minimise the impact of the substation (visual, heritage, transport impacts for example)?	I	Mitigation measures relevant to the onshore HVDC converter/HVAC substation have been identified in each topic chapter of the Environmental Statement (see volume 3). Key measures for during the operational phase include: strategic landscaping around the perimeter of the site to screen the site and provide landscape and heritage mitigation and preparation of an operational noise management plan. A number of other measures will be implemented to minimise and manage impacts during construction, as set out in the outline COCP which forms part of the DCO application.
Planning, South Norfolk Council	<p>The Council's response to your consultation was agreed at the Development Management Committee meeting on 13 September 2017 and I enclose a copy of the committee report for your information.</p> <p>Our response to the consultation refers to three key considerations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Heritage Assets</li> <li>• Landscape</li> <li>• Noise and Pollution</li> </ul>	N	Noted, specific comments on these considerations are considered in the following points.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>43</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Planning, South Norfolk Council	<p><b>Landscape</b> Information has been provided setting out the approach to the full Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) that will be undertaken and the submitted methodology is generally in accordance with the industry guidelines (Guidelines for Landscape and Impact Assessment, Third Edition). As elements of the scheme are not yet detailed (notably including the proposed HVDC converter/HVAC substation at Mangreen) initial assessment is based on maximum parameters at this time. Photomontages of the proposed scheme would be much more useful to demonstrate the visual effects. The details of mitigation such as planting will be expected to form part of the detailed submission and, in the absence of details to the contrary, it is suggested that these are developed in response to the scenarios anticipated by the wireframe illustrations.</p> <p>Whilst we have been involved in discussions about viewpoints for the substation, it is noted that the only one directly associated with the A47 is from the Intwood Road overbridge. Whilst it is accepted that the sensitivity of drivers and passengers using the A47 will be less than, for example, pedestrians using the bridge, it is considered that additional viewpoints from the main A47 should be included in the full LVIA.</p>	I	<p>Impacts relating to landscape and visual resources are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual resources. Photographic panels along the cable corridor, as well as indicative visualisations have been prepared to inform the assessment of impacts and are provided in Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 4.5: Photographic Panels, Wireframes and Photomontages.</p> <p>In respect to the viewpoint from the A47, photographs taken from a moving car have been presented in annex 4.5 to illustrate views from the A47 as there are no nearby laybys or other publicly accessible locations adjacent to the road in the vicinity of the onshore HVDC converter/HVAC substation site. However, it is considered that Viewpoint SS7 presented in annex 4.5 taken from a bridge crossing the A47 is sufficient to inform the assessment of impacts as presented in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources.</p>
Planning, South Norfolk Council	<p><b>Artificial Light</b> It is expected that artificial lighting will be required during the construction phase. If this poorly located and/or angled it could have a negative impact on the amenity of residents. The onshore HVAC booster stations may require poorly located and/or angled it could have a negative impact on the amenity of residents. The Preliminary Environmental Information Report does not appear to address this issue.</p>	I	<p>The majority of construction work in relation to Hornsea Three will be undertaken during daylight hours as described in the Outline CoCP, during those working hours there will be no need for artificial lighting of construction areas. Activities outside of the standard working hours will be agreed with the relevant local authority EHO officer in consultation with relevant stakeholders (e.g. third party asset owner) as required. Mitigation measures, designed to avoid or reduce the effects during construction of artificial lighting, are set out within the Outline CoCP. In this regard, lighting during construction will take into account the requirements set out in British Standard (BS) EB 12464-2:2014 (BSI, 21014) and guidance from the Institute of Lighting Professionals (Institute of Lighting Professionals, 2011 'Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Obtrusive Light').</p>
Planning, South Norfolk Council	<p>In summary, it is considered that further information is required to demonstrate how the proposed development for the substation, in particular, will be designed to consider landscape and heritage impacts, noise, dust, artificial light and private drinking water supply issues raised in more detail below:</p>	I	<p>Through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts from the project, in particular the HVDC converter/HVAC substation on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive ecological receptors. Mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project are outlined in topic specific chapters, and include the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts on local road networks, ecological receptors (e.g. hedgerows) and hydrological features (e.g. main rivers).</p> <p>In respect to ecology, landscape and heritage impacts this includes, for example, the restoration of habitats (including hedgerows) which cannot be avoided and landscape planting around the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.</p>
<b>Section 42: Persons with an interest in the land (prescribed under section 44 of the Act)</b>			



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>43</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
A Hafford	I own a substantial area of land at Kelling Paddock , Holgate Hill, Kelling, which is defined as being in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. And I am alarmed at the thought of the prospect of this project disrupting this quiet and peaceful area which is home to an abundance of wildlife, livestock and a sanctuary to many horses. My land backs directly onto the North Norfolk Steam Railway Line. Why should this be disrupted?	Y	<p>Impacts relating to landscape and visual resources are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual resources. Particular consideration has been given to the AONB as a sensitive receptor, and it is noted that Hornsea Three has consulted with the Norfolk Coast Partnership to agree viewpoints to inform the assessment of impacts on the AONB.</p> <p>Other impacts to residential receptors are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters, for example impacts from noise are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 8: Noise and Vibration.</p> <p>Mr Hafford's land is not directly affected by the scheme - he was impacted by the 200metre corridor, but not by the final cable corridor.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>43</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Dr George Carman	<p>Comments on Proposed onshore Mannington HVAC booster station at Shrubs Farm</p> <p>We are concerned that the proposed onshore Shrubs Farm Booster Station will create a real and significant risk of a significant adverse impact to our family amenity through</p> <p>(i) long term visual impact from approach roads between our market town Holt and homes (very high likelihood and very high consequence)</p> <p>(ii) long term increased background noise (very high likelihood and very high consequence).</p> <p>Figure 1 shows the results of Viewshed modelling (in green) using the Google Earth Digital Terrain Model and algorithm for a 12.5 m high structure at the proposed HVAC Shrubs Farm site indicating it will be visible<sup>3</sup> (at ground level) over (i) 20 ha of land including houses at Edgefield (intersection of Ramsgate Street and Holt Road- including popular 17th Century country pub -The Pigs.</p> <p>(ii) About 200 ha of land including houses around Little Barningham village and Corpusty Road being 3 km east of the site</p> <p>(iii) 60 ha of land west of the proposed site. Whilst topography and trees provide a screen to the east and south east it is noted that trees are not a permanent feature of the landscape and in fact harvesting of some of the plantation has already commenced.</p> <p>(iv) Some 30 ha of undeveloped land 5 km southwest of the proposed site south of the Corpusty-Briston Road. Figure 2 shows the increased viewshed for the proposed 17.5 metre above ground level lighting proposed for the 2.5Ha site</p> <p>Therefore, there is considerable risk (very high likelihood and very high consequence) the North Norfolk landscapes will be “industrialised” over more than many hundreds of hectares by the 150 x 30 m buildings and the 17.5 m high lighting of the site. We accept that higher resolution DTMs and alternative algorithms may provide alternative interpretations and we respectfully request DONG to supplement their Visual Impact reports with Viewshed analyses.</p> <p>Furthermore, we are concerned the final location of the HVAC booster station may change and move closer to family property. We assess this risk to be of modest likelihood but with an extreme and unacceptable consequence.</p> <p>In Conclusion with respect to the proposed HVAC Booster stations we wish (in order of priority)</p> <p>(i) There be NO onshore HVAC booster station and that this is achieved by (a) constructing all booster stations offshore and/or (b) use of existing/emerging HVDC technology.</p> <p>(ii) Height of Booster station above ground level be reduced by excavating 3 to 5 metre and construction of an appropriate waterproof cellar.</p> <p>(iii) That the noise emission be reduced to the very highest of industry capability and exceeds current Best Industry Practice (not ALARP4 and not the minimum of the Statutory Requirement). It is not acceptable to say the project will meet the minimum regulatory requirements since TIME as shown that previous standards are no longer appropriate e.g. highway driving speeds or the use of asbestos.</p> <p>(iv) Sound mitigation be installed including cladding and berms (to a height equal to the height of the building)</p> <p>(v) We question the need for any lighting – particularly at 17.5 m. above ground level. DONG is respectfully requested to consider the use of infra-red technology for security which would obviate the need for any lighting. Any other security lighting to be kept below 10 metres and installed with motion sensors so that lights are not left on permanently.</p>	N	<p>The maximum parameters associated with the HVAC booster station is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description.</p> <p>Generally, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts to local residential receptors, either through site selection/route refinement or through the identification of suitable mitigation measures. Where there are impacts to residential receptors, these are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3), for example noise during the operation of the HVDC converter/HVAC substation is addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 8: Noise and Vibration.</p> <p>Impacts relating to landscape and visual resources are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual resources. Photographic panels along the cable corridor, as well as indicative visualisations have been prepared to inform the assessment of impacts and are provided in Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 4.5: Photographic Panels, Wireframes and Photomontages. Appropriate mitigation measures for visual disturbance are outlined in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources. This includes, for example, the restoration of habitats (including hedgerows) which cannot be avoided and landscape planting around the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.</p> <p>Due to current uncertainty (see volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives), a decision on which transmission system (HVDC or HVAC) to adopt will not be made until post consent after extensive engagement with potential systems suppliers has taken place. As a result of this, we have conducted our assessments based on a realistic worst-case scenario, which could be either HVDC or HVDC technology depending on the receptor.</p>
Dr George Carman	<p>Opinion of Overall Proposal</p> <p>Opposed. Opposed on grounds of incomplete information and potential impact of operations of fragile North Norfolk rural landscape and direct impact on family amenity</p>	N/A	<p>Noted. The Environmental Statement provides baseline information, and additional information on the potential impacts of Hornsea Three in each topic specific chapter.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>43</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Dr George Carman	Visual and noise impact of Mannington HVAC Booster station with better than best industry practice being targeted (as opposed to minimal statutory requirement)	I	Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 8: Noise and Vibration provides an assessment of the potential noise impacts from the HVAC booster station, along with associated mitigation measures where required. It is noted that a number of measures which represent best practicable means have been designed-in to the project where reasonable, for example: site hoardings and maintenance of equipment and vehicles.
Stephen and Sandra Carman	<p>Comments on Proposed onshore HVAC booster station at Shrubs Farm</p> <p>We are concerned that the proposed onshore Shrubs Farm Booster Station will create a real and significant risk of a significant adverse impact to our family amenity through</p> <p>(i) long term visual impact from approach roads between our market town Holt and homes</p> <p>(ii) long term increased background noise</p> <p>(iii) Light pollution Figure 1 shows the results of Viewshed modelling (in green) using the Google Earth Digital Terrain Model and algorithm for a 12.5 m high structure at the proposed HVAC Shrubs Farm site indicating it will be visible (at ground level) over</p> <p>(i) 20 ha of land including houses at Edgefield (intersection of Ramsgate Street and Holt Road- including popular 17th Century country pub -The Pigs.</p> <p>(ii) About 200 ha of land including houses around Little Barningham village and Corpusty Road being 3 km east of the site</p> <p>(iii) 60 ha of land west of the proposed site. Whilst topography and trees provide a screen to the east and south east it is noted that trees are not a permanent feature of the landscape and in fact harvesting of some of the plantation has already commenced.</p> <p>(iv) Some 30 ha of undeveloped land 5 km southwest of the proposed site south of the Corpusty-Briston Road. Figure 2 shows the increased viewshed for the proposed 17.5 metre above ground level lighting proposed for the 2.5Ha site</p> <p>Therefore, there is considerable risk the North Norfolk landscapes will be "industrialised" over more than many hundreds of hectares by the 150 x 30 m buildings and the 17.5 m high lighting of the site.</p> <p>Furthermore, we are concerned the final location of the HVAC booster station may change and move closer to family property</p> <p>In Conclusion with respect to the proposed HVAC Booster stations we wish (in order of priority)</p> <p>(i) There be NO onshore HVAC booster station and that this is achieved by (a) constructing all booster stations offshore and/or (b) use of DC current</p> <p>(ii) Height of Booster station above ground level be reduced by excavating 3 to 5 metre and construction of an appropriate waterproof cellar.</p> <p>(iii) That the noise emission be reduced to the very highest of industry capability and exceeds current Best Industry Practice (not ALARP4 and not the minimum of the Statutory Requirement). It is not acceptable to say the project will meet the minimum regulatory requirements since TIME as shown that previous standards are no longer appropriate e.g. highway driving speeds or the use of asbestos.</p> <p>(iv) Sound mitigation be installed including cladding and berms (to a height equal to the height of the building)</p> <p>(v) We question the need for any lighting – particularly at 17.5 m. above ground level. DONG is respectfully requested to consider the use of infra-red technology for security which would obviate the need for any lighting. Any other security lighting to be kept below 10 metres and installed with motion sensors so that lights are not left on permanently</p>	I	<p>The maximum parameters associated with the HVAC booster station is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description.</p> <p>Generally, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts to local residential receptors, either through site selection/route refinement or through the identification of suitable mitigation measures. Where there are impacts to residential receptors, these are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3), for example noise during the operation of the HVDC converter/HVAC substation is addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 8: Noise and Vibration.</p> <p>Impacts relating to landscape and visual resources are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual resources. Photographic panels along the cable corridor, as well as indicative visualisations have been prepared to inform the assessment of impacts and are provided in Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 4.5: Photographic Panels, Wireframes and Photomontages. Appropriate mitigation measures for visual disturbance are outlined in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources. This includes, for example, the restoration of habitats (including hedgerows) which cannot be avoided and landscape planting around the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.</p> <p>Due to current uncertainty (see volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives), a decision on which transmission system (HVDC or HVAC) to adopt will not be made until post consent after extensive engagement with potential systems suppliers has taken place. As a result of this, we have conducted our assessments based on a realistic worst-case scenario, which could be either HVDC or HVDC technology depending on the receptor.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>43</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co on behalf of Kelling Estate	Topography As can be seen from the topographic map shown (Left), the proposed pipeline is set to cut through terrain which steeply rises from 20m above sea level to 55m above sea level within 250m. Removing this amount of soil will not only totally change the landscape itself, but also significantly increase the potential for sediment mobilisation. This will impact the lower lying residents of Kelling as well as localised watercourses and features through increased risk of flooding and pollution. The image below gives an indication of the steep topography in parcel 5339. Taken 10th September 2017.	Y	The sections of woodland where there is a larger change in topography will be crossed via HDD.
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co on behalf of Ringland Estate/Ebony Holdings	Amenity: The proposed cable route will come within 200m of the principle home of the Owner. Whilst the works will be screened in part from the main house by an existing woodland there is still scope for audio, visual and airborne particle disturbance to the occupation of the house. Furthermore, if the woodland to the north of Sandy Lane is drilled under (as will be needed to avoid habitat destruction) the disturbance will potentially be greater and for longer: a. DONG will need to provide a brief for working methods and means of mitigating the localised disturbance. b. Working hours will need to be agreed in this sensitive part of the property.	I	Hornsea Three confirmed that details on working methods will be available in the Environmental Statement. Working hours are proposed within the DCO application, and may be subject to conditions if the DCO is awarded. This will be confirmed with the land owner in due course.
Sandra Gentle	<b>Proposal</b> - Support the idea and proposal but am concerned about the impact of the construction and pipeline onshore and the long term potential for damage to the landscape	I	Hornsea Three has, through site selection and route refinement sought to minimise impacts on environmental and social receptors. Where there are impacts associated with Hornsea Three, these are assessed within the Environmental Statement (volume 3), along with mitigation identified to minimise them.
Simon Willcox	The landfall at Weybourne and the immediate route to the South cuts across a unique landscape which despite promised to rectify the damage will never be replaced or rectified	I	Further information pertaining to the landfall location and route selection is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives. Where possible, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts to local receptors, either through site selection/route refinement or through the identification of suitable mitigation measures. In this regard, since the PEIR, a refined route at landfall has been identified (western re-route around Kelling) and the area identified for landfall works has reduced. This was informed by a number of factors including community feedback in the area of Kelling and Weybourne, avoidance of the Kelling Heath SSSI/CWS and Holiday Park as well as engineering/technical considerations. Where there are impacts to sensitive receptors from the landfall works, these are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3). The Outline Ecological Management Plan that forms part of the application for Development Consent details the project commitments to ensure restoration of habitats affected by the construction of the onshore cables.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>43</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Simon Willcox	The proposed corridor cuts through some of the most picturesque and unspoilt countryside of North Norfolk. The corridor and proposed sub-station will affect adversely this landscape forever	I	<p>Where possible, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts from the onshore cable corridor and permanent infrastructure to local receptors, either through site selection/route refinement or through the identification of suitable mitigation measures. Mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project are outlined in topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3), and include the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts on local road networks, ecological receptors (e.g. hedgerows) and hydrological features (e.g. main rivers).</p> <p>Where there are impacts to sensitive receptors, these are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3). It is also noted that prior to construction commencing a Schedule of Condition of the land will be taken and we have an obligation to return the land in the same state. In this regard, any hedgerows which cannot be avoided will be replaced at the end of the construction phase. Furthermore, restoration of hedgerows, currently in poor condition, provides an opportunity to achieve long term benefits for the biodiversity associated with this habitat type as well as gap up hedgerows providing landscape and visual mitigation. Further details on hedgerow removal, retention and replacement can be found in volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation, the Outline Ecological Management Plan and the Outline Landscape Management Plan.</p>
Simon Willcox	<b>HVAC Booster Station</b> - Its proposed site will spoil forever a greenfield site in a special part of North Norfolk. The site covers a large area and will have buildings of up to 15m (50 feet) high. This is something that cannot be hidden by 'careful landscaping' and will spoil a very picturesque part of the countryside	I	<p>Information pertaining to the site selection for the HVAC booster station is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives, whilst maximum dimensions are provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description.</p> <p>Through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive ecological receptors. For example, the orientation of the HVAC booster station has been optimised to minimise impacts on nearby field boundaries (hedgerows and trees) as well as maximise natural screening. Additional mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project are outlined in topic specific chapters, and include the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts on local road networks, ecological receptors (e.g. hedgerows) and hydrological features (e.g. main rivers); and landscape planting around the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.</p>
Simon Willcox	<b>Construction sites</b> - Your current proposed site at Edgefield will intrude on a 'greenfield' site in an AONB. The size, height and consequential associated development are completely unsuited for this unspoilt part of North Norfolk country side.	Y	Hornsea Three will not be taking forward the Edgefield site, with the onshore HVAC booster located close to Little Barningham (as shown in the plans which accompany the DCO). Information pertaining to the site selection for the HVAC booster station is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives.



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>43</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Simon Willcox	<b>Surveys &amp; Assessments</b> - The impact assessments do not fully grasp the real and emotional disturbance and destruction your proposals will bring to this part of North Norfolk. Your proposed cable corridor is immediately outside my property. It will mean the destruction of many trees, hedgerows and habitat. Your E.I.A does not take into account the inconvenience, threat and loss of enjoyment we have and treasure	I	Where possible, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts from the onshore cable corridor and permanent infrastructure to local receptors, either through site selection/route refinement or through the identification of suitable mitigation measures. Mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project are outlined in topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3), and include the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts on local road networks, ecological receptors (e.g. hedgerows) and hydrological features (e.g. main rivers).  Where there are impacts to sensitive receptors, these are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3), and considers potential impacts to local amenity. It is also noted that prior to construction commencing a Schedule of Condition of the land will be taken and we have an obligation to return the land in the same state. In this regard, any hedgerows which cannot be avoided will be replaced at the end of the construction phase. Furthermore, restoration of hedgerows, currently in poor condition, provides an opportunity to achieve long term benefits for the biodiversity associated with this habitat type as well as gap up hedgerows providing landscape and visual mitigation. Further details on hedgerow removal, retention and replacement can be found in volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation, the Outline Ecological Management Plan and the Outline Landscape Management Plan.
Simon Willcox	<b>Strongly Oppose</b> - Your proposals are unwanted and unnecessary. The potential longer - and shorter - consequences of your proposed onshore cable corridor will have catastrophic consequences on an unspoilt and treasured landscape. The consequential loss of trees, hedgerow, wildlife habitat disturbance will not outweigh the benefits of offshore wind energy	N	The short term and long term potential impacts of Hornsea Three are assessed within the Environmental Statement, volume 2 and 3. In respect to potential landscape and visual impacts, Hornsea Three has sought to avoid landscape features (including trees and hedgerows) through cable routing or the use of trenchless technologies. Where impacts cannot be avoided, appropriate mitigation measures for visual disturbance are outlined in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources. For example, any hedgerows which cannot be avoided will be replaced at the end of the construction phase. Furthermore, restoration of hedgerows, currently in poor condition, provides an opportunity to achieve long term benefits for the biodiversity associated with this habitat type as well as gap up hedgerows providing landscape and visual mitigation. Further details on hedgerow removal, retention and replacement can be found in volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation, the Outline Ecological Management Plan and the Outline Landscape Management Plan.  At the HVAC booster station and HVDC converter/HVAC substation, landscape planting is also proposed to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.
Natasha & Steve Hall	After receiving a few calls from concerned people asking if I was happy with what was said on radio Norwich I thought I had better email to check facts. It appears that everyone is happy and there are no concerns about the Hornsea wind farm project everybody has been kept informed (which we had not up to when we went to Swardeston village hall event) and found out information for ourselves. I don't think at this stage before planning that an assumption should be made that everyone is in agreement with this project- obviously they are talking to people who live miles from the site and who have no visual or noise impact. Our concerns still remain unanswered and have had no response since event 4th September	N	Ørsted clarified that no assumption had been made that local communities were fully supportive of the proposal at that stage. Ørsted explained that it had taken part in the radio interviews to encourage wider participation in the consultation. Ørsted reassured that consultee that Hornsea Three was still in the planning pre-application stage and noted that further refinements to Hornsea Three were anticipated following receipt of comments as part of the statutory consultation.
Natasha/Steven Hall	<b>PEIR surveys</b> - My property excluded from visual sound survey - major impact	I	Where there are impacts to residential receptors, these are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3).
Natasha/Steven Hall	<b>Proposal</b> - Cannot answer above as still awaiting communication with reference to compensation as we seem to be the only private residents affected - visual - noise - devaluation of our property. We feel we have been overlooked	I	Where there are impacts to residential receptors, these are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3). Hornsea Three has met with this stakeholder following PEIR to further discuss their concerns.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>43</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 47: Duty to consult local community</b>			
Nigel Rogers	<p>3. Visual Impact of the Cable Corridor on the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB): 3.1 The main industry of North Norfolk is tourism, in part due to this area being a designated AONB. It is important to ensure that the visual impact of the cable corridor does not have a detrimental effect on the local economy. A specific area of concern is the potential removal of trees and bushes that form a barrier between Kelling Heath SSSI and Kelling Heath Park. Removal of this barrier would result in uninterrupted views of the camping site across the heath. This would not only reduce its attractiveness but could permanently disturb breeding birds on the heath.</p>	Y	<p>Response noted. Environmental Statement, volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources provides an assessment of the potential impacts on the AONB as a result of Hornsea Three. In preparing the assessment, Hornsea Three has consulted with Norfolk Coastal Partnership (i.e. to agree assessment viewpoint locations). Where possible, Hornsea Three has sought to avoid landscape features (including trees and hedgerows) through cable routing or the use of trenchless technologies. Any hedgerows which cannot be avoided will be replaced at the end of the construction phase. Furthermore, restoration of hedgerows, currently in poor condition, provides an opportunity to achieve long term benefits for the biodiversity associated with this habitat type as well as gap up hedgerows providing landscape and visual mitigation. Further details on hedgerow removal, retention and replacement can be found in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation as well as the Outline Ecological Management Plan and the Outline Landscape Management Plan which form part of the DCO application.</p> <p>In respect to the Kelling Heath SSSI and Kelling Heath park boundary in particular, it is noted that through the design development process, the onshore cable corridor now avoids Kelling Heath SSSI. As such no significant effects on this area are anticipated.</p>
Robert J Cumber	<p>Hornsea 3 Offshore Wind Farm Proposed Development Consultation. I write to express concerns regarding this proposed development:</p> <p>1) The proposed size, cost and scale of the proposed wind farm My wife and I are finding it hard to understand why it is necessary for this Danish government-owned company (51%) to intrude into UK waters to build what amounts to be an entire city of giant wind turbines. DONG is one of the most expensive suppliers of energy in Denmark with a track record of developing and then disposing of energy companies e.g. it has - or intends to - dispose of all its oil and gas interests.</p> <p>Whilst this development is proposed to impact heavily on both the north Norfolk land and sea scape the local residents will gain no benefit whatsoever from the energy produced- other than paying an energy surcharge towards the cost of this and other "renewable" energy projects.</p>	N	<p>Hornsea Project Three is being developed by Ørsted (formerly DONG Energy). Headquartered in Denmark, Ørsted is the global leader in offshore wind power, with over 25 years of experience developing, constructing and operating offshore wind farms. Over the last decade, we have undergone a truly green transformation, halving our CO2 emissions and focusing our activities on renewable sources of energy. We have recently divested our oil and gas production business and by 2023, we will have replaced coal with sustainable biomass in our power stations across Northern Europe, reducing our carbon emissions by 96%. We are committed to innovation and want to revolutionise the way we provide power to people by developing market leading green energy solutions that benefit the planet and our customers alike.</p> <p>In respect to local benefit, Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 10: Socio-economics assesses the potential socio-economic benefits associated with Hornsea Three. Relevant to this, it is noted that we have established voluntary Community Benefit Funds (CBFs) for a number of our previous projects, which are currently under construction. These funds can make a valuable contribution to the local area, by supporting projects such as community building improvements and recreation facilities, conservation and wildlife projects etc. Any decision to establish a CBF for Hornsea Project Three would be made post financial investment decision (FID), when the Project has been given the green light to go ahead.</p>
Robert J Cumber	<p>3) The impact on the quiet coastal community of Weybourne As stated in the PEIR the proposed cable routes will cross through no less than three SSSI's in the Weybourne area. The disturbance and likely damage is incalculable as is the effect on the peace and tranquillity of this quiet coastal neighbourhood in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Whilst the deep water access point provided at Weybourne might appear cheap and attractive to DONG as contractor it rides roughshod over the rights of the local community. We strongly recommend that DONG look elsewhere to bring their cables on shore.</p>	Y	<p>Through the design development process, the onshore cable corridor now follows the 'alternative route under consideration' and therefore the onshore cable corridor now avoids the designated sites in close proximity to the landfall. Therefore there is no potential for significant impacts on these particular designated sites (e.g. Kelling Heath SSSI).</p> <p>Consideration of alternate landfall locations, as well as justification for the preferred choice of landfall location is set out in Environmental Statement, volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Alternatives.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>43</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Beverley Wigg	The disruption caused by both the cable route and the booster station are unacceptable in this rural landscape, which is also happens to be an important area for tourism especially self catering cottages and B&B style accommodation.	I	<p>Potential impacts associated with Hornsea Three, particularly the onshore cable corridor and the HVAC booster station are addressed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement.</p> <p>The potential for impacts to interact and impact tourism is addressed in Environmental Statement Volume 3, Chapter 10: Socio-economics, whilst impacts on recreational resources are addressed in volume 6: Land Use and Recreation. The former concludes that there would be no significant effects on tourism as a result of Hornsea Three.</p>
Beverley Wigg	Of particular concern is the booster station which is a major industrial installation in a totally rural setting. The images provided so far at the drop-ins (Reepham 8th September) are not sufficiently detailed to allow members of the public, or stakeholders to get a real sense of how it will look – and it is difficult for people to begin to understand what the noise implications are.	I	<p>Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 4.5: Photograph Panels, Wirelines and Photomontages presents indicative visualisations which show a potential appearance of the proposed HVAC booster station. In short, the equipment for the onshore substation could be up to 25 metres in height and could be housed within a single or multiple buildings, in an open yard or a combination of these. The maximum design scenario is detailed more fully in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description.</p> <p>It is noted that the assessment contained within Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual resources, which is informed by annex 4.5, considers a worst-case scenario, so in this instance the maximum dimensions of the proposed HVAC booster station. Based on the findings of the impact assessment, mitigation measure have been identified to reduce any significant landscape and visual effects to an acceptable level. Measures include strategic landscape planting .</p> <p>It is important to note that although annex 4.5 includes visualisations which show an indicative design, the final design will be subject to change. However, this final design will need to be within the confines of what has been assessed, i.e. it couldn't be any larger than the maximum dimensions presented.</p> <p>In respect to noise, a full assessment of potential impacts associated with the HVAC booster station is provided in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 8: Noise and Vibration. It concludes that with mitigation, no significant effects are anticipated.</p>
David Ramsbotham	You may recall our correspondence when I was the Norfolk County Councillor for the Melton Constable Division. I confirm that the various issues raised are still of concern to me as a resident of the area. In particular I feel that the onshore HVAC booster station should be avoided at all costs. This would create an unacceptable industrial blot on the landscape affecting the environment for local residents and tourism which is the life blood of the area.	N	<p>Potential impacts associated with Hornsea Three, particularly the onshore cable corridor and the HVAC booster station are addressed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement.</p> <p>The potential for impacts to interact and impact tourism is addressed in Environmental Statement Volume 3, Chapter 10: Socio-economics, whilst impacts on recreational resources are addressed in volume 6: Land Use and Recreation. The former concludes that there would be no significant effects on tourism as a result of Hornsea Three.</p> <p>The need for the HVAC booster station is set out in the Environment Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives.</p>
Cllr Graham Everett (District Councillor for Reepham) - Broadland District Council	3) The matter of lighting and security at compounds and storage sites has frequently been raised to myself and I believe it is essential that these locations are not overly illuminated overnight as this can certainly attract unwanted attention. I believe low lighting levels, CCTV and manned personnel provide the best form of security and it is critical in the high state of security this country is currently at to ensure only authorised personnel have access to compounds and storage sites.	I	<p>Response noted. Details of security measures during the onshore construction phase of Hornsea Three are set out in outline CoCP which establishes the principles which any principal contractor must follow, the outline CoCP forms part of the DCO application. The operational substation, will be secured in accordance with established standards, with specific measures developed during the detailed design phase. The outline CoCP also sets out the principles of lighting at the onshore infrastructure.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>43</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Friends of North Norfolk	<p>THE RESPONSE MADE BY THE FRIENDS OF NORTH NORFOLK TO THE HORNSEA PROJECT THREE OFFSHORE WIND FARM DEVELOPMENT PRELIMINARY ENVIRONMENTAL INFORMATION REPORT CONSULTATION.</p> <p>1. The Friends of North Norfolk support green energy and the use of efficient offshore wind farms to produce clean electricity. However, such wind farms and the necessary offshore/onshore infrastructure must not be allowed to result in major cumulative harm to the environment, specifically the landscapes, seascapes and ecology, all of which constitute priceless heritage assets that are designated as of the highest importance both nationally and internationally.</p>	N	Cumulative effects on seascape and visual receptors have been assessed in Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 10: Seascape and Visual Resources. Effects on ecology are considered in volumes 2 and 3 of the Environmental Statement.
Friends of North Norfolk	<p>15. HVAC Booster Stations will be visible from very important sensitive areas of AONB, Heritage Coast, SSSI, and RAMSAR sites - as evidenced by PEIR Volume 2, Chapter 10, and Figure 10.3 Zone of Theoretical Visibility of Offshore HVAC Booster Stations.</p>	I	<p>The potential visual impacts associated with the onshore and offshore HVAC booster stations are assessed in Environmental Statement, volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources. Particular consideration has been given to the designated sites including the AONB as a sensitive receptor, and it is noted that Hornsea Three has consulted with the Norfolk Coast Partnership to agree viewpoints to inform the assessment of impacts on this particular receptor.</p> <p>Appropriate mitigation measures for visual disturbance are outlined in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources. This includes, for example, the restoration of habitats (including hedgerows) which cannot be avoided and landscape planting around the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.</p>
Friends of North Norfolk	<p>16. Please note that Race Bank Offshore Wind Farm was presented as being barely visible but in reality has a significant impact upon a very sensitive and important stretch of coast, which holds AONB, and Heritage Coast Designations. The turbines can clearly be seen inland from other sensitive and important SSSI areas e.g. Kelling Heath.</p>	I	The potential for offshore infrastructure to impact onshore receptors is assessed within Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 4.7: Effects of the Offshore HVAC booster station.



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>43</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Friends of North Norfolk	<p>17. PEIR Volume 3, which deals with onshore impacts. We have great concerns that the additional cables, very large offshore and onshore Reactive Compensation Installations and works which would be required if HVAC Transmission is used would have a major adverse impact on very sensitive Receptors taken cumulatively with other major developments, either recently completed or proposed. Both the Dudgeon and Sheringham Shoal Wind Farms make landfall at Weybourne; and if HVAC Transmission is utilised it will mean more and very much greater works over a prolonged period both to the East and West affecting a key part of the Norfolk Coast AONB, Norfolk Heritage Coast and the Norfolk/ English National Trail.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Chapter 4 Landscape and Visual Resources.</li> <li>- Chapter 5 Historic Environment.</li> <li>- Chapter 6 Land Use and Recreation.</li> <li>- Chapter 8 Noise and Vibration.</li> <li>- Chapter 11 Inter Related Effects.</li> </ul>	I	<p>An assessment of impacts on the AONB is presented in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources. To inform this process, Hornsea Three has consulted with the Norfolk Coast Partnership, as well as local authorities, in regard to the identification of suitable viewpoints within the AONB.</p> <p>Where the onshore cable corridor crossed public rights of way, Hornsea Three has sought to avoid impacts through the use of HDD technology. Where this has not been possible and thus open cut, or HDD with a haul road over, is proposed, the routes will be temporarily diverted along existing tracks, for a maximum of one month per cable. Following the completion of the construction works all areas of access land, recreational resources, PRoWs and other linear routes affected by the onshore works would be re-instated to their current condition and/or along their current alignments. There would be no physical effects on these resources arising from the operation or maintenance of Hornsea Three. The measures to be taken to ensure the continued use of all linear recreational resources during the construction phase of the project have been discussed with Norfolk County Council and are set out in the Outline CoCP. This dialogue will continue during the detailed design process. The assessment of impacts on individual public rights of way (where appropriate) are set out in Environmental Statement, volume 3, chapter 6: Land Use and Recreation.</p> <p>Following the completion of the construction works all areas of access land, recreational resources, PRoWs and other linear routes affected by the onshore works would be re-instated to their current condition and/or along their current alignments. There would be no physical effects on these resources arising from the operation or maintenance of Hornsea Three. The measures to be taken to ensure the continued use of all linear recreational resources during the construction phase of the project have been discussed with Norfolk County Council and are set out in the Outline CoCP. This dialogue will continue during the detailed design process.</p> <p>The potential for cumulative effects as a result Hornsea Three in combination with other major developments is assessed in each of the topic chapters of the Environmental Statement (see volume 3).</p>
Friends of North Norfolk	<p>18. Mitigation proposals of whatever means are not acceptable for long-term adverse impacts, causing such harm to the Norfolk Coast AONB, Heritage Coast, Nationally and Internationally Designated Sites.</p>	I	<p>A full assessment of the effects of Hornsea Three on benthic ecology, including on features of designated sites, is presented in the Environmental Statement in volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology. Conclusions on the effects of Hornsea Three on the conservation objectives of the North Norfolk Coast and Saturn Reef SAC and The Wash and North Norfolk Coast SAC are presented in full within the RIAA for Hornsea Three. Discussions on the effects of Hornsea Three on the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ and the Markham's Triangle rMCZ are presented in full within Environmental Statement volume 5, annex 2.3: Marine Conservation Zone Assessment.</p> <p>Consideration of impacts on onshore designations are considered throughout volume 3 of the Environmental Statement.</p>
Friends of North Norfolk	<p>20. Panoramic sea views of the Coastal Edge, and the interaction between the landscape and sea are an essential part of its unique character made up by the dynamic coastal landforms and processes, ecological interdependences, biodiversity and cultural, architectural, economic, historic and archaeological features.</p>	I	<p>The visual impacts of Hornsea Three offshore and onshore are addressed in Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 10: Seascape and Visual Resources and volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources respectively. Impacts on coastal landforms and processes, ecology, cultural heritage and socio-economics are assessed in the relevant topic chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 2 and volume 3).</p>
Friends of North Norfolk	<p>21. The Coastal Plain from Holme-next-the-Sea to Weybourne in particular has a wilderness quality, which is rare in lowland England. Nationally, it is one of the few remaining examples of undeveloped coast with such a sense of remoteness and tranquillity.</p>	I	<p>Impacts on the local landscape are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources.</p>



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>43</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Friends of North Norfolk	7. The details provided in the PEIR and Non-technical Summary do not describe the Proposal as clearly and simply as possible. There are no proper accurate and detailed photo montages/ wireframe images, particularly for the very large offshore or onshore HVAC Compensator/ Booster Station Installations to enable a ready visualisation/ appreciation of their visual impact. No proper description of the equipment e.g. lightning protection equipment which might be up to 17.5 metres in height which is 5 metres higher than buildings/ equipment.	I	A full description of Hornsea Three is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description. Indicative visualisations, including both wireframes and photomontages, are provided in Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 4.5: Photographic Panels, Wireframes and Photomontages.
Friends of North Norfolk	8. It is noteworthy that Dong Energy changed the original consent for Hornsea Project One to add the option to use HVAC Transmission and have subsequently chosen the HVAC Transmission option albeit in a less sensitive landfall and cabling area. In the case of Race Bank, Dong Energy have changed the position of offshore substations so that where originally they were to be out of sight over the horizon they have been moved to within the turbine array area and will now be visible from many highly sensitive viewpoints within the Norfolk Coast AONB and the Norfolk Coast National Trail.	N	Whilst the original proposals for Hornsea Project One did not include HVAC transmission technology, this was added in the pre-application phase and was granted in the original consent for the project. This was therefore not a change to the original consent for Hornsea Project One as suggested by the comment. This does, however, reflect the position of Hornsea Three in including both transmission options at the point of application. Impacts on the AONB and PRoW are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapters 4: Landscape and Visual Resources and 6: Land Use and Recreation respectively.
Friends of North Norfolk	9. There are clear and significant advantages of HVDC Transmission over HVAC Transmission. HVDC is used in long distance sub-sea and underground transmission systems linked to offshore and on-land power generation operations. Indeed it has cost advantages in terms of fewer cables and lower power losses for transmission distances over 50km. Hornsea Project Three Transmission will be over 170km in total length from offshore substations to the proposed grid connection at Norwich Main Substation. Most importantly in this case HVDC would clearly have a much less harmful environmental impact since it will not require massive offshore or onshore Reactive Compensation Booster Stations sited and visible in extremely sensitive locations.	I	As noted in previous comments, there is a certain level of confidence in the UK wind industry that HVDC technology will become more mature before Hornsea Project Three will connect, but there is currently no certainty. Therefore, committing to solely HVDC now could restrict or even prevent the development of the project in the future if we do not see the necessary developments in the market. Hornsea Three may well eventually choose to opt for HVDC transmission technology; however, it is considered that to only seek a consent (planning permission) for such a technology (and excluding HVAC) at this time could make the eventual Project unbuildable and/or unprofitable.  Due to current uncertainty, a decision on which transmission system to adopt will not be made until post consent after extensive engagement with potential systems suppliers has taken place. This will be informed by a feasibility study. However, at this time, both options are retained to ensure both can be considered post-consent.
William J Horabin	The information provided is simply overwhelming but what it provides in terms of volumes it lacks in terms of real understanding of the values and importance of the cumulative/inter relational impacts of this huge infrastructure project upon the North Norfolk Coast AONB, North Norfolk Heritage Coast, many SSSI, SAC, RAMSAR and Marine Protection Areas/MCZs.	I	A full assessment of the effects of Hornsea Three on benthic ecology, including on features of designated sites, is presented in Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 2: Benthic Ecology. Conclusions on the effects of Hornsea Three on the conservation objectives of the North Norfolk Coast and Saturn Reef SAC and The Wash and North Norfolk Coast SAC are presented in full within the Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment for Hornsea Three. Discussions on the effects of Hornsea Three on the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ and the Markham's Triangle rMCZ are presented in full within Environmental Statement volume 5, annex 2.3: Marine Conservation Zone Assessment.
William J Horabin	The majority of the North Norfolk Coastline is recognised both nationally and internationally, for its exceptional landscape and ecological value with a great number of overlapping Designations as mentioned above.	I	Noted. Impacts on onshore designated sites are assessed in the relevant topic chapter of the Environmental Statement (volume 3), most notably Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation. Impacts on offshore designation sites are considered in Environmental Statement volume 2 with some taken through for assessment in the Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment.
William J Horabin	Panoramic sea views of the Coastal Edge, and the interaction between the landscape and sea are an essential part of its unique character made up by the dynamic coastal landforms and processes, ecological interdependencies, biodiversity and cultural, architectural, economic, historic and archaeological features.	I	The visual impacts of Hornsea Three offshore and onshore are addressed in Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 10: Seascape and Visual Resources and volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources respectively. Impacts on coastal landforms and processes, ecology, cultural heritage and socio-economics are assessed in the relevant topic chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 2 and volume 3).
William J Horabin	The stretch of coast between Holme-next-the-Sea and Weybourne is recognised as one of the few remaining examples of undeveloped coast with such a sense of wilderness, remoteness and tranquility - very rare in lowland England.	I	Impacts on the local landscape are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>43</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
William J Horabin	The PEIR is quite obviously a deficient desk based assessment with inadequate weight given to the significance of the Seascape, Landscape and Heritage Receptors within North Norfolk.	N	The PEIR presented only preliminary assessments and this was acknowledged throughout the consultation materials. The final Environmental Statement has updated all assessments and the effects on seascape character and visual resources from Hornsea Three have been considered within section 10.11 of Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 10: Seascape and Visual Resources, and alongside other projects, plans and activities in section 10.13 of Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 10: Seascape and Visual Resources. The assessment has been based on present day best practice guidance (Visual Representation of Wind farms: Good Practice Guidance – Version 3 (SNH, 2014)) as outlined in section 10.3 of Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 10: Seascape and Visual Resources.
William J Horabin	The cumulative and inter relational impacts of recent development and proposed development within the proposed landfall and cabling routes have failed to be correctly recognised/identified - namely Dudgeon and Sheringham Shoal Offshore Wind Farms (which make landfall at Weybourne), Race Bank Offshore Wind Farm (which despite being presented as being beyond the horizon/hardly visible from onshore is in reality clearly visible from within very sensitive and significant parts of the Norfolk Coast AONB, Heritage Coast, English National Trail SSSI's etc), Norfolk Vanguard & Boreas Offshore Wind Farms and Bodham & Selbrigg Onshore Wind Turbine Developments (which are currently under appraisal). PEIR Volumes 2 & 3 are particularly deficient in this regard.	I	The potential for impacts arising as a result of Hornsea Project Three to combine with other planned developments (including the Vattenfall projects) is assessed in each respective Environmental Statement topic chapter, under the heading 'Cumulative Effect Assessment'. Environmental Statement volume 3, Chapter 11: Inter-related effects provides an assessment of the likely effects should the same type of impact affect the same receptor group during each of the three key project phases (i.e. construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning), and therefore have the potential to combine and result in an overall effect of greater significance. It also provides an assessment of the likely effects should multiple impact types occur on the same receptor group (e.g. noise and landscape and visual impacts may affect the same residential properties); impacts may individually be considered insignificant, but when considered together, could amount to a significant cumulative effect.
William J Horabin	Insufficient detail has been provided re the description/images of the very large offshore or onshore HVAC Compensator/Booster Stations which would enable a ready visualisation/appreciation of their visual impacts upon Receptors recognised and Designated because of their exceptional value.	I	Impacts relating to landscape and visual resources are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual resources. Where appropriate, this chapter provides an assessment of impacts on designated sites.  Photographic panels along the cable corridor, as well as indicative visualisations have been prepared to inform the assessment of impacts and are provided in Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 4.5: Photographic Panels, Wireframes and Photomontages.
Anne Harrap	I would like to make a comment as part of the consultation. I am a resident of Edgefield in Norfolk and I am deeply concerned about the prospect of an onshore booster station at Little Barningham. I feel that the size of the proposed installation, both in terms of its footprint and its height, is wholly inappropriate for such a rural location, and am worried that any lighting at this installation could seriously impinge on one of the few remaining 'dark skies' in southern England. It would also change the nature of the nearby footpath and the pretty, unspoiled valley. No mitigations are suggested, and I feel that nothing could be done to make this booster station acceptable in this location. I understand that there may be alternatives to having a booster station, and suggest that every possible effort is made to use these alternative technologies.	I	Information pertaining to the site selection for the HVAC booster station is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives.  Through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive ecological receptors. For example, the orientation of the HVAC booster station has been optimised to minimise impacts on nearby field boundaries (hedgerows and trees) as well as maximise natural screening. Additional mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project are outlined in topic specific chapters, and include the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts on local road networks, ecological receptors (e.g. hedgerows) and hydrological features (e.g. main rivers).  In respect to ecology, landscape and heritage impacts this includes, for example, the restoration of habitats (including hedgerows) which cannot be avoided and landscape planting around the HVAC booster to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>43</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Anne Harrap	It would also change the nature of the nearby footpath and the pretty, unspoiled valley. No mitigations are suggested, and I feel that nothing could be done to make this booster station acceptable in this location. I understand that there may be alternatives to having a booster station, and suggest that every possible effort is made to use these alternative technologies.	I	<p>Due to current uncertainty (see volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives), a decision on which transmission system (HVDC or HVAC) to adopt will not be made until post consent after extensive engagement with potential systems suppliers has taken place. As a result of this, we have conducted our assessments based on a realistic maximum design scenario, which could be either HVDC or HVDC technology depending on the receptor. Where appropriate, mitigation is considered for the maximum design scenario throughout the Environmental Statement.</p> <p>Impacts on PRoW are assessed within Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 6: Land Use and Recreation.</p>
Simon Harrap	I would like to make a comment as part of the consultation. I am a resident of Edgefield in Norfolk and I am deeply concerned about the prospect of an onshore booster station at Little Barningahm. I feel that the size of the proposed installation, both in terms of its footprint and its height, is wholly inappropriate for such a rural location, and am worried that any lighting at this installation could seriously impinge on one of the few remaining 'dark skies' in southern England. I understand that there may be alternatives to having booster station, and suggest that every possible effort is made to use these alternative technologies.	I	<p>Information pertaining to the site selection for the HVAC booster station is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives.</p> <p>Through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive ecological receptors. For example, the orientation of the HVAC booster station has been optimised to minimise impacts on nearby field boundaries (hedgerows and trees) as well as maximise natural screening. Additional mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project are outlined in topic specific chapters, and include the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts on local road networks, ecological receptors (e.g. hedgerows) and hydrological features (e.g. main rivers).</p> <p>In respect to ecology, landscape and heritage impacts this includes, for example, the restoration of habitats (including hedgerows) which cannot be avoided and landscape planting around the HVAC booster to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.</p>
Ray & Diane Pearce	<p>Property:</p> <p>Our home (Reference 2), is in a unique position with regards to the project as it is situated within 80m of the proposed cable route and, more importantly, adjacent to the position where the Hornsea Three cables cross the Vanguard and Boreas cables. Therefore, in accordance with the PEIR Volume 6 Annex 4.6 regarding the 'Cumulative Effects Assessment', why was our property not included for assessment? The design, engineering and construction of the crossing point has not been considered and should not be underestimated as having a permanent impact on our residential property, Furnished Holiday Let (FHL) business and Bed and Breakfast (B&amp;B) business. The project has already had a 'High Impact' on our property as it has been blighted by the proximity of the plans, and, our business will suffer going forward by being disrupted with a prolonged and intrusive construction phase. The PEIR makes no reference to our situation despite other residences and businesses being individually referenced.</p>	I	<p>The potential for impacts arising as a result of Hornsea Project Three to combine with other planned developments (including the Vattenfall projects) is assessed in each respective topic chapter, under the heading 'Cumulative Effect Assessment'.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>43</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Ray & Diane Pearce	<p>Construction Yard: A 'Construction Compound' is proposed to be located adjacent to our property in accordance with the PEIR's Onshore Key Plan Map 5. This was not communicated to us until the issuance of the PEIR. Coupled with the location of the cable crossing point, the additional disruption of locating a construction compound adjacent to our property will have a severe and negative impact upon us. The cumulative effects of the location of construction compounds on private residents and members of the public is not discussed in the PEIR. The disruption we will experience if the planned construction compound is located thus will be untenable and could be for a prolonged period not detailed in the PEIR. Clearly, there will also be an environmental impact on the location of construction yards and the PEIR is deficient in discussing this impact on the population.</p> <p>The proposed construction yards, in general, will also have an impact on the appearance and character of the planned areas with implications in respect of agriculture during a prolonged construction phase which is not evident in the PEIR. A prolonged period of disruption could ensue as the construction phase for the project is not time limited.</p>	Y	<p>The main construction compound for the project will be located at Oulton Airfield, accessed off the B1149. Since the PEIR, Hornsea Three has refined the proposals for the secondary compounds, with five compounds located along the onshore cable corridor. The locations of the proposed secondary compounds are shown in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description.</p> <p>Impacts on sensitive receptors are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3). Impacts on agricultural land use in particular is assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 6: Land Use and Recreation.</p> <p>The construction programme for Hornsea Three is set out in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Projects Description and confirms a maximum duration of the onshore construction works of eight years, within this, the maximum duration for construction of the onshore cable corridor is approximately 2.5 years, this therefore means that the maximum duration over which construction could occur would be 5.5 years incorporating two phases (assuming a three-year gap between the two phases). The work associated with each phase is expected to progress along the Hornsea Three onshore cable corridor with a typical active construction works duration of three months at any particular location. Secondary construction compounds and storage areas would only remain in place while works were being undertaken in the nearby area, after which they would be restored back to the baseline conditions (as set out in the outline CoCP which accompanies the DCO application).</p>
Joanna and Anshuman Mondal	<p>We are concerned about the alternative route that is being considered, which is purple on your map. This route would be closer to our property than the original, yellow route, and would have considerable impact on our property and our neighbours. Could you please let us know why this alternative and more disruptive route is being considered?</p> <p>Also, can you please tell us how long the excavations will be in place? That is, from the commencement of the work around Church Farm Barns, to the restoration of the terrain.</p>	I	<p>Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts to local residential receptors, either through site selection/route refinement or through the identification of suitable mitigation measures. Where there are impacts to residential receptors, these are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3). Justification for the route refinement changes during the pre-application phase are set out in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives.</p>
Stephen Huntley	<p>Mitigation Methods - Mitigation of noise must be developed. Screening measures must be developed - the graphic video used at the consultation meeting gave no realistic impression of the screening or the extent of visibility from the surrounding area</p>	I	<p>Impacts in relation to operational noise generated at the HVDC converter/HVAC substation are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 8: Noise and Vibration. Where relevant, Hornsea Three has identified mitigation measures to minimise impacts.</p> <p>Appropriate mitigation measures for visual disturbance are outlined in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources. This includes, for example, the restoration of habitats (including hedgerows) which cannot be avoided and landscape planting around the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application. Photographic panels along the cable corridor, as well as indicative visualisations have been prepared to inform the assessment of impacts and are provided in Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 4.5: Photographic Panels, Wireframes and Photomontages.</p>
Stephen Huntley	<p>PEIR - I recognise the substation must go somewhere and do not wish to be a 'NIMBY', but it is vital that every effort is made to reduce the impact on the surrounding villages</p>	I	<p>Where possible and practicable the cable corridor route selected seeks to avoid passing adjacent to properties. This is to reduce impacts associated with construction disturbance and to seek to minimise conflicts such as Heavy Goods Vehicle (HGV) traffic movements. However, it is not possible to avoid passing in close proximity to all properties on the route. Where properties are located in close proximity, the Project will ensure that sensitive construction management measures, such as noise, dust and traffic control are considered. These are documented in an outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), which accompanies the DCO application.</p>



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>43</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
John Walker, (SHOOT)	<b>Local Matters Landfall</b> - This is an AONB and any construction mars it - there will be hedges/trees that will be permanently damaged	I	<p>Noted. Impacts relating to landscape and visual resources are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual resources. Particular consideration has been given to the AONB as a sensitive receptor, and it is noted that Hornsea Three has consulted with the Norfolk Coast Partnership to agree viewpoints to inform the assessment of impacts on the AONB.</p> <p>Impacts from Hornsea Three on ecological features, including hedgerows and trees (including woodlands) has been avoided where possible through commitments to use trenchless technologies such as Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD). The replacement of hedgerows at the end of the construction phase to be undertaken will ensure there is no net loss of hedgerow habitat as a result of Hornsea Project Three. Furthermore, restoration of hedgerows, currently in poor condition, provides an opportunity to achieve long term benefits for the biodiversity associated with this habitat type. Further details on hedgerow removal, retention and replacement can be found in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation as well as the Outline Ecological Management Plan and the Outline Landscape Management Plan which form part of the DCO application.</p>
Hugh Guyatt	<b>EIA</b> - Affect and effect on an AONB not thought important, except in one case of land owned by the National Trust, who possess power.	I	<p>Impacts relating to landscape and visual resources are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual resources. Particular consideration has been given to the AONB as a sensitive receptor, and it is noted that Hornsea Three has consulted with the Norfolk Coast Partnership to agree viewpoints to inform the assessment of impacts on the AONB.</p>
Hugh Guyatt	<b>Mitigation Methods</b> - The project will scar AONB for over 11 years	Y	<p>Impacts relating to landscape and visual resources are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual resources. Particular consideration has been given to the AONB as a sensitive receptor, and it is noted that Hornsea Three has consulted with the Norfolk Coast Partnership to agree viewpoints to inform the assessment of impacts on the AONB.</p> <p>Following stakeholder feedback on the PEIR, the overall duration of construction work has been reduced from 11 to eight years and the number of phases has been reduced from three to two.</p>
Pat Floyd	<b>Offshore Array</b> - Weybourne is a small and central village in an AONB. The village may be reached by the Coast Road or Station Road. This however has an overhead railway bridge if approaching from Sheringham, too low for high vehicles and the latter is totally unsuitable for large vehicles due to the width in some places and the need to cram a Victorian railway bridge built originally for horses and carts. Weybourne has recently been the landfall sight for Dudgeon Wind Farm and has carried many problems with roads etc plus affecting the tourism industry on which this village relies. Weybourne has had enough and in danger of becoming a building site	I	<p>Since the PEIR, a refined landfall location has been identified (western re-route around Kelling) and the area identified for landfall works has reduced. This was informed by a number of factors including community feedback in the area of Kelling and Weybourne, avoidance of the Kelling Heath SSSI/CWS and Holiday Park as well as engineering/technical considerations.</p> <p>Impacts related to access are assessed within Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport, with principles for the traffic management measures outlined in the outline CTMP which forms part of the DCO application.</p> <p>Impacts on the AONB are assessed within the relevant topic specific chapters, most notably Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources.</p>



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>43</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
John Norman	<b>HVAC</b> - I am aware that environmental groups are concerned about the visual impact on the local area and the light pollution spoling the dark Norfolk sky-line. The local community have already had great success in stopping the building of wind turbines at Bodham and Selbrigg, so I suggest their comments are taken very seriously.	I	We note your concerns regarding lighting close to the designated Dark Sky Discovery Sites. It is noted that lighting during the onshore construction phase will be short term and temporary, used only when required (and generally limited to certain working hours) and designed to avoid unnecessary illumination. Light spill during out of hours working will be minimised through the use of task-orientated lighting, as set out in the outline CoCP which accompanies the DCO application.  In terms of permanent onshore infrastructure, the cables within the AONB will be buried and there will be no operational lighting. The closest part of Hornsea Three to the AONB, and thus the dark sky discovery sites, that would have lighting during the operational phase is the potential HVAC booster station (as security lighting may be required during operation to ensure a safe working environment), which is located over 6 km from the AONB. The HVDC converter/HVAC substation also lies outside the AONB. Notwithstanding this, light spill from these permanent elements would be minimised through design, in particular the use of directional lighting. Based on the mitigation and management measures in place, no significant light spill is anticipated, particularly within the AONB.
Christine Walton	<b>Mitigation Measures</b> - It has to consider using more of the infrastructure there already/ from previous projects. Reduce noise/disruption and destruction of the countryside/coastline	I	Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on sensitive receptors including landscapes, designated sites and residential receptors both through design (e.g. refinement of the onshore cable corridor route to avoid sensitive sites) as well through commitments to be implemented during construction and operation. Mitigation measures are identified in each topic chapter of the Environmental Statement, as well as in the outline Code of Construction Practise which forms part of the DCO application.
Christine Walton	<b>HVAC</b> - I do not believe that as this is the 3rd project that you cannot use the infrastructure you already have or at least significantly reduce the amount of new building work necessary. 25m high building - really? Serious green screening and noise reduction needs to be sorted out being dealing with the building of it. I do not believe there has been enough consideration given to the reality of the disruption, noise and destruction of the countryside	I	Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts to local residential receptors, either through site selection/route refinement or through the identification of suitable mitigation measures. Where there are impacts to receptors, these are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3), for example visual impacts associated with the HVDC converter/HVAC substation is addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources. This chapter also identifies appropriate mitigation measures. This includes, for example, the restoration of habitats (including hedgerows) which cannot be avoided and landscape planting around the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application. Impacts relating to noise during the operational phase is assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 8: Noise and Vibration.
Christine Walton	<b>Substation</b> - There has already been considerable land destruction/disruption/noise in East Anglia due to unthought through building against local residents wishes and through the building of the Northern bypass around Norwich and through Norfolk. Consideration to routes put in place for this would also apply to other building projects. More thinking needs to take place re minimising this destruction and also honest feedback re how long it will take and how much disruption there would be. I do not think the occurrence of this project is worth losing our beautiful countryside.	I	Further information on the site selection and refinement process for the HVDC converter/HVAC substation is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Alternatives. Hornsea Three has sought to minimise disturbance through the identification of relevant mitigation measures which are outlined in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3).
Christine Walton	<b>Proposal</b> - I have answered this in previous answers. I do not believe that the benefit of a windfarm outweighs the loss which is considerable and significant as our beautiful countryside/coastline	I	Hornsea Three has, through site selection and route refinement (as detailed within Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives) sought to minimise impacts on environmental and social receptors. Where there are impacts associated with Hornsea Three, these are assessed within the Environmental Statement, along with mitigation identified to minimise them.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>43</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Gervase Walton	<b>HVAC</b> - I am concerned about 2 things. Firstly, the look of it and secondly the humming noise that it will make. I hope everything possible will be done to mitigate the noise. Also, that the substation will be landscaped so it can be hidden as much as possible and blend into the landscape, I believe placing it as close to the A47 and away from the village of Swardeston as far as possible would be preferable	I	Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts to local residential receptors, either through site selection/route refinement or through the identification of suitable mitigation measures. Where there are impacts to residential receptors, these are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3), for example noise during the operation of the HVDC converter/HVAC substation is addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 8: Noise and Vibration.  Appropriate mitigation measures for visual disturbance are outlined in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources. This includes, for example, the restoration of habitats (including hedgerows) which cannot be avoided and landscape planting around the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.
Ruth Bullard	<b>HVAC</b> - Already huge pressure on area around Swardeston and a variety of planning applications. I am concerned about noise, landscaping, additional traffic	I	Impacts relating to landscape, traffic and noise are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapters 4, 7 and 8 respectively. Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts through site selection/route refinement, or the identification of suitable mitigation measures, this is also documented in the relevant topic specific chapters as well as in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives.
Ruth Bullard	<b>Landfall Zone</b> - This is an AONB - development must preserve this	I	Impacts relating to landscape and visual resources are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual resources. Particular consideration has been given to the AONB as a sensitive receptor, and it is noted that Hornsea Three has consulted with the Norfolk Coast Partnership to agree viewpoints to inform the assessment of impacts on the AONB.
Ruth Bullard	<b>PEIR Construction Methods</b> - I am pleased that cables will be underground. The converter/substation will need landscaping. It would be good to improve the locality from an environmental perspective - more trees, more hedgerows, ponds etc.	Y	Noted.  Appropriate mitigation measures for visual disturbance are outlined in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources. This includes, for example, the restoration of habitats (including hedgerows) which cannot be avoided and landscape planting around the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.  The replacement of hedgerows at the end of the construction phase to be undertaken will ensure there is no net loss of hedgerow habitat as a result of Hornsea Project Three. Furthermore, restoration of hedgerows, currently in poor condition, provides an opportunity to achieve long term benefits for the biodiversity associated with this habitat type. Further details on hedgerow removal, retention and replacement can be found in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation as well as the Outline Ecological Management Plan and the Outline Landscape Management Plan which form part of the DCO application.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>43</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Ruth Bullard	<b>Proposal</b> - I strongly support the development of wind power. As I live in Swardeston, I would prefer that the substation was built somewhere else. It is an area under huge existing pressure for further development - all of which will change the character of the locality. If care was genuinely taken over landscaping, building design and environmental impact, then I could support the development. However, as local residents, we have been promised much before the developers prior to gaining planning consent and then none of it has been stuck to once building commences.	I	Noted.  Appropriate mitigation measures for visual disturbance are outlined in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources. This includes, for example, the restoration of habitats (including hedgerows) which cannot be avoided and landscape planting around the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.  Other potential impacts associated with Hornsea Three are assessed in the relevant topic chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3). Where appropriate, mitigation measures are identified in the topic specific chapters, these are summarised in Environmental Statement volume 4, chapter 5.1: Enhancements, Mitigation and Monitoring Commitments along with the mechanism by which they would be secured.
Elaine Parkinson	<b>Offshore Array</b> - Minimise the visual impact from the coast line. Removal of building waste and debris. Impact on local livelihoods e.g. fishing	I	A site waste management plan forms part of the DCO application and sets out Hornsea Three's approach to waste management.  Impacts on socio-economics are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 10: Socio-Economics. In the Environmental Statement, section 6.11 of volume 2, chapter 6 (Commercial Fisheries) the impact assessment considers the level of impact to specific fisheries activities and fleets
Mark Cook	<b>Cable Corridor</b> - I think the corridor around the villages Weybourne and Kelling will have a big impact on the environment and landscape. This would be very serious for tourism, there are a number of small hotels and B+B's which rely on holiday makers. Once the project has started I believe it will discourage people from visiting this area and they will be unlikely to return. This effect will also be felt in the nearby market towns of Holt and Sheringham.	I	Potential impacts from Hornsea Three on socio-economic and tourism are identified and assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 10: Socio-Economics. Taking into consideration the mitigation designed into Hornsea Three, no significant adverse effects are predicted.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>43</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Sue Lowther	<p><b>Substation</b> - Does this affect our water supply? There are ancient hedges around here (at least 400 years old) that must be preserved, plus ancient trees. It will affect the view from this house. Can the substation be sunk into the ground? The consultation said there would be considerable noise levels from substation - this is not acceptable. The consultation also said the visual impact would be considerable. It should therefore be situated as far away from residents as is possible. Therefore locate next to the national grid station.</p>	I	<p>Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives sets out the process undertaken during the pre-application phase of Hornsea Three to identify the location of the HVDC converter/HVAC substation. The proposed site for the HVDC converter / HVAC substation, just south of the A47, has been identified following extensive environmental surveys, technical and feasibility studies and ongoing consultation. Due to the size of the land area required for the onshore substation, there are very limited options available and the location indicated in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Project Description was determined to be the most suitable following our site selection process.</p> <p>Impacts from Hornsea Three on ecological features, including hedgerows and trees has been avoided where possible through commitments to use trenchless technologies such as Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD). We recognise that protection and sensitive restoration of hedgerows is important to minimise any negative impact on biodiversity or landscape resulting from loss or reduction in hedgerows and in the few instances where sections of the hedgerow needs to be temporarily removed, it will of course be handled sensitively. The replacement of hedgerows at the end of the construction phase to be undertaken will ensure there is no net loss of hedgerow habitat as a result of Hornsea Project Three. Furthermore, restoration of hedgerows, currently in poor condition, provides an opportunity to achieve long term benefits for the biodiversity associated with this habitat type. The impacts of Hornsea Three on hedgerows and trees is presented in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation.</p> <p>Consideration was given to a wide range of potential mitigation in respect to landscape and visual effects of Hornsea Three. The lowering of the HVDC converter/HVAC substation below current ground level was one option which was considered; however, given that multiple underground cables need to connect into this infrastructure, this option would have had significant implications for the depth of cable trenches and thus earthworks needed along a length of the onshore cable corridor. Based on this, Hornsea Three has implemented a range of other mitigation measures which are set out in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Effects. For example, it is recognised that the onshore HVAC booster station and onshore HVDC converter/HVAC substation would not be screened entirely by existing landform or vegetation in some views. As such, an indicative landscape strategy has been developed to assist in mitigating visual and landscape impacts. This is presented in the outline Landscape Management Plan which accompanies the DCO application.</p> <p>In respect to noise, the noise generated by the HVDC converter/HVAC substation is considered within Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 8: Noise and Vibration. Furthermore, an operational noise management plan will be prepared and agreed with the local environmental health officer.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>43</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Sue Lowther	<p><b>Proposal</b> - The beauty of Mangreen has already been damaged by the national grid station, the pylons and the gravel extraction. The proposed site will damage the beauty of the Mangreen countryside even more. The site should be situated next to the National Grid Station to minimise the damage and avoid the danger of Mangreen being surrounded by sites which are visually detrimental and also add to noise pollution</p>	I	<p>Information pertaining to the site selection for the HVDC converter/HVAC substation station is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives, whilst maximum dimensions are provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description.</p> <p>Through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive ecological receptors. Additional mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project are outlined in topic specific chapters, and include the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts on local road networks, ecological receptors (e.g. hedgerows) and hydrological features (e.g. main rivers); and landscape planting around the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.</p>
Neil Buxton	<p><b>Proposal</b> - Selecting Weybourne as the site for landfall is completely unacceptable. No work done or understanding how long term work with impact on the community. Inadequate infrastructure to allow HGVs to access the proposed construction site. No thought given to compensation for local business and residents. No economic gain for the locality e.g. long term jobs. Impact on the environment in an AONB</p>	I	<p>Impacts to socio-economics and tourism are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 10: Socio-Economics. In respect to compensation, we will compensate landowners who are directly affected by the cable through their land. Compensation is paid for the freehold depreciation of the land affected by the easement and for all reasonable and substantiated losses arising from construction of the project.</p> <p>Impacts on the environment and the AONB are assessed within the topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3).</p>
Neil Buxton	<p><b>Landfall</b> - I am extremely concerned about this. Weybourne is small quiet village in a AONB. The works proposed it will cause disruption for years and impact on business and residents. Proposed work over an 11 year period is unacceptable.</p>	Y	<p>Since the PEIR, a refined landfall location has been identified (western re-route around Kelling) and the area identified for landfall works has reduced. This was informed by a number of factors including community feedback in the area of Kelling and Weybourne, avoidance of the Kelling Heath SSSI/CWS and Holiday Park as well as engineering/technical considerations.</p> <p>Where possible and practicable the cable corridor route selected seeks to avoid passing adjacent to properties. This is to reduce impacts associated with construction disturbance and to seek to minimise conflicts such as Heavy Goods Vehicle (HGV) traffic movements. However, it is not possible to avoid passing in close proximity to all properties on the route. Where properties are located in close proximity, the Project will ensure that sensitive construction management measures, such as noise, dust and traffic control are considered. These are documented in an outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), which accompanies the DCO application.</p> <p>During the design refinement Hornsea Three has sought to minimise the duration of any disruption, and has reduced the total duration of the construction phase onshore to eight years. Impacts on socio-economics are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 10: Socio-Economics.</p>



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>43</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Louisa Peaver	<b>Landfall</b> - No, other than general concerns about the environmental impact and permanent loss of aesthetics in an AONB	I	<p>Through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive ecological receptors. For example, Weybourne Cliffs and Kelling Heath SSSI have been avoided and no direct impacts are predicted on these designated sites from Hornsea Three. Additional mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project are outlined in topic specific chapters, and include the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts on local road networks, ecological receptors (e.g. hedgerows) and hydrological features (e.g. main rivers).</p> <p>Impacts relating to landscape and visual resources are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual resources. Particular consideration has been given to the AONB as a sensitive receptor, and it is noted that Hornsea Three has consulted with the Norfolk Coast Partnership to agree viewpoints to inform the assessment of impacts on the AONB.</p>
Louisa Peaver	<b>Mitigation Methods</b> - Please consider significant noise and vibration reduction strategies for the Booster Station. Please consider significant visual improvements at the Booster Station, Insulation, digging into the ground to reduce total building height and planting of trees	I	<p>Through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts from the HVAC booster station on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive ecological receptors. This has been informed by the results of the Environmental Impact Assessment which are reported in Environmental Statement (volume 3).</p> <p>Impacts relating to noise from the permanent infrastructure, including the HVAC booster station, are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 8: Noise and Vibration. A number of mitigation measures are designed-in to the project, and where significant effects may occur, additional mitigation measures have been identified (see chapter 8).</p> <p>Additional mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project to minimise impacts of the HVAC booster station are outlined in topic specific chapters, and include landscape planting around the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.</p>
Karl Feistner	<b>EIA</b> - Impossible to judge the Environmental impact of the HVAC booster station when at consultation there was no information as to exactly how big it would be, how noisy, how screened etc.	I	<p>Information pertaining to the site selection for the HVAC booster station is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives, whilst maximum dimensions are provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description.</p> <p>Through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts from the HVAC booster station on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive receptors. For example, the orientation of the HVAC booster station has been optimised to minimise impacts on nearby field boundaries (hedgerows and trees) as well as maximise natural screening. Additional mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project are outlined in topic specific chapters, and include the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts on local road networks, ecological receptors (e.g. hedgerows) and hydrological features (e.g. main rivers); and landscape planting around the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>43</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Karl Feistner	<p><b>HVAC</b> - There would be no requirement of this booster station if HVDC was implemented as the transmission technology. HVDC has the advantage of being more efficient and would negate the need to build a large noisy industrial installation (the booster station) in the middle of unspoilt countryside. Contrary to some things that were said at the consultation, HVDC has been successfully used for other North Sea wind farms (<a href="http://new.abb.com/news/detail/1689/ABB-delivers-DolWin2-wind-connection">http://new.abb.com/news/detail/1689/ABB-delivers-DolWin2-wind-connection</a>) and should be seen as the technology of the future. I believe every effort should be made to use HVDC transmission. IF there is a compelling case for HVAC (none was suggested at the consultation) then every effort should be made to conceal the booster station from sight (high earth bunds, tree planting etc., and to make sure that it does not cause any sound or light pollution by enclosing machinery in soundproofed buildings as required.</p>	I	<p>Due to current uncertainty (see previous responses), a decision on which transmission system (HVDC or HVAC) to adopt will not be made until post consent after extensive engagement with potential systems suppliers has taken place. As a result of this, we have conducted our assessments based on a realistic worst-case scenario, which could be either HVDC or HVDC technology depending on the receptor.</p> <p>In this regard, an assessment of potential impacts of the HVDC converter/HVAC substation is provided in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement, volume 3. In respect to the three points mentioned in the response, appropriate mitigation measures for visual disturbance are outlined in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources. This includes, for example, the restoration of habitats (including hedgerows) which cannot be avoided and landscape planting around the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.</p> <p>Noise during the operation of the HVDC converter/HVAC substation is addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 8: Noise and Vibration, where mitigation is also proposed to minimise the potential for significant effects.</p> <p>Lighting during the operational phase is likely to be required at the HVDC converter/HVAC substation (as security lighting may be required during operation to ensure a safe working environment). Notwithstanding this, light spill from these permanent elements would be minimised through design, in particular the use of directional lighting. Based on the mitigation and management measures in place, no significant light spill is anticipated.</p>
Karl Feistner	<p><b>Booster Station</b> - Similar comments as above with regard to mitigating the visual and auditory impact of the substation.</p>	I	<p>An assessment of potential impacts of the HVAC booster station is provided in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement, volume 3. In respect to the two points mentioned in the response, noise during the operation of the HVAC booster station is addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 8: Noise and Vibration, where mitigation is also proposed to minimise impacts where required.</p> <p>Lighting during the operational phase is likely to be required at the HVDC converter/HVAC substation (as security lighting may be required during operation to ensure a safe working environment). Notwithstanding this, light spill from these permanent elements would be minimised through design, in particular the use of directional lighting. Based on the mitigation and management measures in place, no significant light spill is anticipated.</p> <p>Appropriate mitigation measures for visual disturbance are outlined in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources. This includes, for example, the restoration of habitats (including hedgerows) which cannot be avoided and landscape planting around the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>43</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Julia Peters	<p><b>80m Refinement</b> - Kelling Heath and 100Acre Wood - long term impact and irreversible damage. Pine Farm Bodham - nationally designated heritage site and setting - ECR needs to be 250m+ away from its boundaries Hedges and Ponds in Bodham - locate the ECR around or away from them, each time these are removed or damaged degrades the landscape and reduces the potential for wildlife/ biodiversity. I</p>	Y	<p>Since the PEIR, a refined landfall location has been identified (western re-route around Kelling) and the area identified for landfall works has reduced. This was informed by a number of factors including community feedback in the area of Kelling and Weybourne, avoidance of the Kelling Heath SSSI/ Kelling Heath Park and 100 Acre Wood CWS, and Holiday Park as well as engineering/technical considerations. Additional information relating to the onshore cable corridor routing is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description and chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives.</p> <p>Furthermore, Hornsea Three has sought to avoid sensitive ecological features such as hedgerows and ponds through cable route refinement. Where this was not possible, Hornsea Three has, in many instances, committed to the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts. The same approach has been applied to hydrological features (e.g. main rivers).</p> <p>Impacts relating to heritage assets and ecological receptors are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 5: Historic Environment and chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation respectively.</p>
Julia Peters	<p><b>Proposal</b> - Very concerned over the potential time span of the project once work commences. Altering the ECR to avoid the very fragile environments of Weybourne Beach wetland and Kelling Heath would be ideal, mostly for the wildlife and also tourism. Destruction of local hedges and ponds should be avoided by shifting the line of the ECR by 100m as required. The ECR at Pine Farm and setting is contrary to your own policy documents. Construction needs to be mindful of silt and unintentional pollution of the River Glaven headwaters Mitigation should consider both repairing the damage and also improving the landscape features on the proposed route.</p>	Y	<p>Through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive ecological receptors. For example, Weybourne Cliffs and Kelling Heath SSSI have been avoided and no direct impacts are predicted on these designated sites from Hornsea Three. Additional mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project are outlined in topic specific chapters, and include the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts on local road networks, ecological receptors (e.g. hedgerows) and hydrological features (e.g. main rivers).</p> <p>Measures to minimise the generation of silt and prevent runoff entering the watercourses are set out in the Outline Code of Construction Practice which forms part of the DCO application, and includes a commitment to prepare Pollution Prevention and Emergency Response Plans.</p> <p>Prior to construction commencing a Schedule of Condition of the land will be taken and we have an obligation to return the land in the same state. In this regard, any hedgerows which cannot be avoided will be replaced at the end of the construction phase. Furthermore, restoration of hedgerows, currently in poor condition, provides an opportunity to achieve long term benefits for the biodiversity associated with this habitat type as well as gap up hedgerows providing landscape and visual mitigation. Further details on hedgerow removal, retention and replacement can be found in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation, the Outline Ecological Management Plan and the Outline Landscape Management Plan.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>43</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
John Seymour	<p><b>HVAC</b> - Put serious consideration of the DC alternative to the top go the agenda. It has been used elsewhere and if used here would obviate the need for the booster station. If the booster station is to be built then much more needs doing to mitigate the issues of screening, light pollution, noise and vibration. Nothing in your documentation addresses these concerns adequately. The construction of a scaffold tower of the proposed height would indicate what might be seen and from where in an absolute method which no amount of visualisations can achieve.</p>	I	<p>HVDC cable circuits are typically able to transport more power than HVAC cable circuits therefore if using HVDC it is possible we may be able to use a reduced number of circuits (currently the maximum is six circuits) which could result in a narrower corridor. However, as noted, a HVDC scenario may result in the largest parameters of the HVDC converter/HVAC substation near Norwich Main being required. The EIA therefore conducts the assessments based on a realistic worst-case scenario, which could be either HVDC or HVDC technology depending on the receptor.</p> <p>Through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts from the HVAC booster station and HVDC converter/HVAC substation on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive ecological receptors. For example, the orientation of the HVAC booster station has been optimised to minimise impacts on nearby field boundaries (hedgerows and trees) as well as maximise natural screening. Additional mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project are outlined in topic specific chapters, and include the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts on local road networks, ecological receptors (e.g. hedgerows) and hydrological features (e.g. main rivers).</p> <p>Landscape and visual impacts are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual resources. Photographic panels along the cable corridor, as well as indicative visualisations have been prepared to inform the assessment of impacts and are provided in Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 4.5: Photographic Panels, Wireframes and Photomontages. Lighting during the operational phase may be required at the HVAC booster station (as security lighting may be required during operation to ensure a safe working environment). Notwithstanding this, light spill from these permanent elements would be minimised through design, in particular the use of directional lighting. Based on the mitigation and management measures in place, no significant light spill is anticipated,</p>
John Seymour	<p><b>PEIR surveys</b> - The visualisations of the proposed booster station do not provide an adequate means of assessing how they will interfere with the landscape and individual properties. The decibel ratings of day and night do not appear to be the experience of local people.</p>	I	<p>Impacts relating to landscape and visual resources are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual resources. Photographic panels along the cable corridor, as well as indicative visualisations have been prepared to inform the assessment of impacts and are provided in Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 4.5: Photographic Panels, Wireframes and Photomontages.</p> <p>Impacts relating to the operational noise of the HVAC booster station and HVDC converter/HVAC substation are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 8: Noise and Vibration. Where appropriate, mitigation measures have been identified in this chapter to minimise impacts.</p>
Karen Saunders	<p><b>Export Cable</b> - My property will be one of the closest to the booster station. I am extremely concerned about visual blight, and more importantly, noise pollution. The property is run as a furnished holiday let, the hvac will be visible from the front of the property impacting on the open, rural view. Any noise could seriously impact on my business; people go on holiday for peace and quiet. I'm also concerned about the potential impact on the value of the property if it is considered 'blighted' by this construction.</p>	I	<p>Through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts from the HVAC booster station and cable corridor on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive ecological receptors. For example, the orientation of the HVAC booster station has been optimised to minimise impacts on nearby field boundaries (hedgerows and trees) as well as maximise natural screening. Additional mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project are outlined in topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3), and include the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts on local road networks, ecological receptors (e.g. hedgerows) and hydrological features (e.g. main rivers). Impacts on tourism and socio-economics are specifically assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 10: Socio-Economics.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>43</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
R.H Peaver	<b>Onshore Cable</b> - I am concerned about any potential despoliation of the countryside.	I	Through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive ecological receptors. For example, Weybourne Cliffs and Kelling Heath SSSI have been avoided and no direct impacts are predicted on these designated sites from Hornsea Three. Additional mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project are outlined in topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3), and include the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts on local road networks, ecological receptors (e.g. hedgerows) and hydrological features (e.g. main rivers).
R.H Peaver	<b>HVAC</b> - I am resigned to this going ahead; however, I am greatly concerned that there may be light pollution (security lights going on and off) and further concreting over of the countryside.	I	In terms of permanent onshore infrastructure, the cables will be buried and there will be no operational lighting. Lighting would be provided during the operational phase at the HVDC converter/HVAC substation and HVAC booster station (as security lighting may be required during operation to ensure a safe working environment). Notwithstanding this, light spill from these permanent elements would be minimised through design, in particular the use of directional lighting. Based on the mitigation and management measures in place, no significant light spill is anticipated.
R.H Peaver	<b>Mitigation Measures</b> - My main concern, as mentioned above, is the spoiling of the beautiful countryside. This will, to some extent, occur however great the efforts to minimise it. And also I am particularly concerned about any addition to the light pollution that has increased hugely over the past 30 years.	I	In terms of permanent onshore infrastructure, the cables will be buried and there will be no operational lighting. Lighting would be provided during the operational phase at the HVDC converter/HVAC substation and HVAC booster station (as security lighting may be required during operation to ensure a safe working environment). Notwithstanding this, light spill from these permanent elements would be minimised through design, in particular the use of directional lighting. Based on the mitigation and management measures in place, no significant light spill is anticipated.  The topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3) also set out additional mitigation measures where appropriate.
Robert Speck	Yes, disguise it. Make it quiet. Do not take ambient noise readings from next to roads which is what you have done. This is one of the quietest counties in the SE. Keep it so [check end of this to make sure info not missed off]	I	Through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts from permanent infrastructure on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive ecological receptors. Mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project are outlined in topic specific chapters, and include the use of trenchless technologies to maintain natural screening and ecological receptors (e.g. hedgerows) as well as landscape planting around the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.  The results of the baseline noise surveys are presented in Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 8.1: Baseline Noise Surveys, and sets out how the project has ensured that a realistic worst case assessment has been undertaken.



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>43</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Simon Willcox	The landfall at Weybourne and the immediate route to the South cuts across a unique landscape which despite promised to rectify the damage will never be replaced or rectified	I	Further information pertaining to the landfall location and route selection is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives. Where possible, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts to local receptors, either through site selection/route refinement or through the identification of suitable mitigation measures. In this regard, since the PEIR, a refined route at landfall has been identified (western re-route around Kelling) and the area identified for landfall works has reduced. This was informed by a number of factors including community feedback in the area of Kelling and Weybourne, avoidance of the Kelling Heath SSSI/CWS and Holiday Park as well as engineering/technical considerations. Where there are impacts to sensitive receptors from the landfall works, these are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3). The Outline Ecological Management Plan that forms part of the application for Development Consent details the project commitments to ensure restoration of habitats affected by the construction of the onshore cables.
Simon Willcox	The proposed corridor cuts through some of the most picturesque and unspoilt countryside of North Norfolk. The corridor and proposed sub-station will affect adversely this landscape forever	I	Where possible, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts from the onshore cable corridor and permeant infrastructure to local receptors, either through site selection/route refinement or through the identification of suitable mitigation measures. Mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project are outlined in topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3), and include the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts on local road networks, ecological receptors (e.g. hedgerows) and hydrological features (e.g. main rivers).  Where there are impacts to sensitive receptors, these are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3). It is also noted that prior to construction commencing a Schedule of Condition of the land will be taken and we have an obligation to return the land in the same state. In this regard, any hedgerows which cannot be avoided will be replaced at the end of the construction phase. Furthermore, restoration of hedgerows, currently in poor condition, provides an opportunity to achieve long term benefits for the biodiversity associated with this habitat type as well as gap up hedgerows providing landscape and visual mitigation. Further details on hedgerow removal, retention and replacement can be found in volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation, the Outline Ecological Management Plan and the Outline Landscape Management Plan.
Simon Willcox	<b>HVAC Booster Station</b> - Its proposed site will spoil forever a greenfield site in a special part of North Norfolk. The site covers a large area and will have buildings of up to 15m (50 feet) high. This is something that cannot be hidden by 'careful landscaping' and will spoil a very picturesque part of the countryside	I	Information pertaining to the site selection for the HVAC booster station is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives, whilst maximum dimensions are provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description.  Through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive ecological receptors. For example, the orientation of the HVAC booster station has been optimised to minimise impacts on nearby field boundaries (hedgerows and trees) as well as maximise natural screening. Additional mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project are outlined in topic specific chapters, and include the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts on local road networks, ecological receptors (e.g. hedgerows) and hydrological features (e.g. main rivers); and landscape planting around the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.
Simon Willcox	<b>Construction sites</b> - Your current proposed site at Edgefield will intrude on a 'greenfield' site in an AONB. The size, height and consequential associated development are completely unsuited for this unspoilt part of North Norfolk country side.	Y	Hornsea Three will not be taking forward the Edgefield site, with the onshore HVAC booster located close to Little Barningham (as shown in the plans which accompany the DCO). Information pertaining to the site selection for the HVAC booster station is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>43</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Simon Willcox	<b>Surveys &amp; Assessments</b> - The impact assessments do not fully grasp the real and emotional disturbance and destruction your proposals will bring to this part of North Norfolk. Your proposed cable corridor is immediately outside my property. It will mean the destruction of many trees, hedgerows and habitat. Your E.I.A does not take into account the inconvenience, threat and loss of enjoyment we have and treasure	I	Where possible, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts from the onshore cable corridor and permanent infrastructure to local receptors, either through site selection/route refinement or through the identification of suitable mitigation measures. Mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project are outlined in topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3), and include the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts on local road networks, ecological receptors (e.g. hedgerows) and hydrological features (e.g. main rivers).  Where there are impacts to sensitive receptors, these are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3), and considers potential impacts to local amenity. It is also noted that prior to construction commencing a Schedule of Condition of the land will be taken and we have an obligation to return the land in the same state. In this regard, any hedgerows which cannot be avoided will be replaced at the end of the construction phase. Furthermore, restoration of hedgerows, currently in poor condition, provides an opportunity to achieve long term benefits for the biodiversity associated with this habitat type as well as gap up hedgerows providing landscape and visual mitigation. Further details on hedgerow removal, retention and replacement can be found in volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation, the Outline Ecological Management Plan and the Outline Landscape Management Plan.
Simon Willcox	<b>Strongly Oppose</b> - Your proposals are unwanted and unnecessary. The potential longer - and shorter - consequences of your proposed onshore cable corridor will have catastrophic consequences on an unspoilt and treasured landscape. The consequential loss of trees, hedgerow, wildlife habitat disturbance will not outweigh the benefits of offshore wind energy	N	The short term and long term potential impacts of Hornsea Three are assessed within the Environmental Statement, volume 2 and 3. In respect to potential landscape and visual impacts, Hornsea Three has sought to avoid landscape features (including trees and hedgerows) through cable routing or the use of trenchless technologies. Where impacts cannot be avoided, appropriate mitigation measures for visual disturbance are outlined in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources. For example, any hedgerows which cannot be avoided will be replaced at the end of the construction phase. Furthermore, restoration of hedgerows, currently in poor condition, provides an opportunity to achieve long term benefits for the biodiversity associated with this habitat type as well as gap up hedgerows providing landscape and visual mitigation. Further details on hedgerow removal, retention and replacement can be found in volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation, the Outline Ecological Management Plan and the Outline Landscape Management Plan.  At the HVAC booster station and HVDC converter/HVAC substation, landscape planting is also proposed to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.
Graham & Susan Mette	<b>Mitigation measures</b> - The compound at Weybourne MUST NOT be in the car park at the end of Beach Lane. Working hours need to be adhered to and weekends kept free from noise, light and disruption. Shingle Bank must be protected.	Y	Following design refinement, the area identified for landfall works has reduced and the beach lane car park is not under consideration as a construction compound. Further details on the proposed landfall, including access are set out in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description and volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport.
Graham & Susan Mette	<b>PEIR</b> - The area indicated immediately affects my home, along with my immediate neighbours. But my house will be exposed the most to noise, light and disruption the most of all village residents.	I	Where possible and practicable the onshore cable corridor route selected seeks to avoid passing adjacent to properties. This is to reduce impacts associated with construction disturbance and to seek to minimise conflicts such as Heavy Goods Vehicle (HGV) traffic movements. However, it is not possible to avoid passing in close proximity to all properties on the route. Where properties are located in close proximity, the Project will ensure that sensitive construction management measures, such as noise, dust and traffic control are considered. These are documented in an outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), which accompanies the DCO application.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>43</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 48: Duty to publicise</b>			
George Carman, Geodirect Resources P/L	<b>Onshore Cable Corridor</b> - Grave concerns on impact of installation operations generating disruptive traffic and long term damage to rural landscape (ancient hedgerows) and fragile country single track lanes	I	<p>Impacts relating to access are addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport. It is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this forms part of the DCO application.</p> <p>In respect to hedgerows, impacts from Hornsea Three on ecological features, including hedgerows and trees (including woodlands) has been avoided where possible through commitments to use trenchless technologies such as Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD). We recognise that protection and sensitive restoration of hedgerows and trees is important to minimise any negative impact on biodiversity or landscape.</p> <p>The replacement of hedgerows at the end of the construction phase to be undertaken will ensure there is no net loss of hedgerow habitat as a result of Hornsea Project Three. Furthermore, restoration of hedgerows, currently in poor condition, provides an opportunity to achieve long term benefits for the biodiversity associated with this habitat type. Further details on hedgerow removal, retention and replacement can be found in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation as well as the Outline Ecological Management Plan and the Outline Landscape Management Plan which form part of the DCO application.</p>
George Carman, Geodirect Resources P/L	<b>Proposal</b> - Opposed on grounds of incomplete information and potential impact of operations of fragile North Norfolk rural landscape and direct impact on family amenity (residential (depreciation in property value), commercial, pasture, equine, arable, sporting amenity, camping and further 'unforeseen' uses in the future).	I	Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including landscapes, sensitive ecological receptors and land uses. Impacts which have been identified are assessed within the relevant topic chapter of the Environmental Statement (volume 3).

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>43</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
George Carman, Geodirect Resources P/L	<p><b>HVAC</b> - We are concerned that the proposed onshore Shrubs Farm Booster Station will create a real and significant risk of a significant adverse impact to our family amenity through</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) long term visual impact from approach roads between our market town Holt and homes</li> <li>(ii) long term increased background noise</li> <li>(iii) Light pollution</li> </ul> <p>Figure 1 shows the results of Viewshed modelling (in green) using the Google Earth Digital Terrain Model and algorithm for a 12.5 m high structure at the proposed HVAC Shrubs Farm site indicating it will be visible (at ground level) over</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) 20 ha of land including houses at Edgefield (intersection of Ramsgate Street and Holt Road- including popular 17th Century country pub -The Pigs.</li> <li>(ii) About 200 ha of land including houses around Little Barningham village and Corpusty Road being 3 km east of the site</li> <li>(iii) 60 ha of land west of the proposed site. Whilst topography and trees provide a screen to the east and south east it is noted that trees are not a permanent feature of the landscape and in fact harvesting of some of the plantation has already commenced.</li> <li>(iv) Some 30 ha of undeveloped land 5 km southwest of the proposed site south of the Corpusty-Briston Road.</li> </ul> <p>Figure 2 shows the increased viewshed for the proposed 17.5 metre above ground level lighting proposed for the 2.5Ha site</p> <p>Therefore, there is considerable risk the North Norfolk landscapes will be “industrialised” over more than many hundreds of hectares by the 150 x 30 m buildings and the 17.5 m high lighting of the site.</p> <p>Furthermore, we are concerned the final location of the HVAC booster station may change and move closer to family property</p> <p>In Conclusion with respect to the proposed HVAC Booster stations we wish (in order of priority)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) There be NO onshore HVAC booster station and that this is achieved by (a) constructing all booster stations offshore and/or (b) use of DC current</li> <li>(ii) Height of Booster station above ground level be reduced by excavating 3 to 5 metre and construction of an appropriate waterproof cellar.</li> <li>(iii) That the noise emission be reduced to the very highest of industry capability and exceeds current Best Industry Practice (not ALARP4 and not the minimum of the Statutory Requirement). It is not acceptable to say the project will meet the minimum regulatory requirements since TIME as shown that previous standards are no longer appropriate e.g. highway driving speeds or the use of asbestos.</li> <li>(iv) Sound mitigation be installed including cladding and berms (to a height equal to the height of the building)</li> <li>(v) We question the need for any lighting – particularly at 17.5 m. above ground level. DONG is respectfully requested to consider the use of infra-red technology for security which would obviate the need for any lighting. Any other security lighting to be kept below 10 metres and installed with motion sensors so that lights are not left on permanently</li> </ul> <p>We are concerned that the proposed onshore Shrubs Farm Booster Station will create a real and significant risk of a significant adverse impact to our family amenity through</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) long term visual impact from approach roads between our market town Holt and homes</li> <li>(ii) long term increased background noise</li> <li>(iii) Light pollution</li> </ul> <p>Figure 1 shows the results of Viewshed modelling (in green) using the Google Earth Digital Terrain Model and algorithm for a 12.5 m high structure at the proposed HVAC Shrubs Farm site indicating it will be visible (at ground level) over</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) 20 ha of land including houses at Edgefield (intersection of Ramsgate Street and Holt Road- including popular 17th Century country pub -The Pigs.</li> <li>(ii) About 200 ha of land including houses around Little Barningham village and Corpusty Road being 3 km east of the site</li> </ul>	I	<p>The maximum parameters associated with the HVAC booster station is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description.</p> <p>Generally, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts to local residential receptors, either through site selection/route refinement or through the identification of suitable mitigation measures. Where there are impacts to residential receptors, these are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3), for example noise during the operation of the HVDC converter/HVAC substation is addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 8: Noise and Vibration.</p> <p>Impacts relating to landscape and visual resources are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual resources. Photographic panels along the cable corridor, as well as indicative visualisations have been prepared to inform the assessment of impacts and are provided in Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 4.5: Photographic Panels, Wireframes and Photomontages. Appropriate mitigation measures for visual disturbance are outlined in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources. This includes, for example, the restoration of habitats (including hedgerows) which cannot be avoided and landscape planting around the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.</p> <p>Due to current uncertainty (see volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives), a decision on which transmission system (HVDC or HVAC) to adopt will not be made until post consent after extensive engagement with potential systems suppliers has taken place. As a result of this, we have conducted our assessments based on a realistic worst-case scenario, which could be either HVDC or HVDC technology depending on the receptor.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>43</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>(iii) 60 ha of land west of the proposed site. Whilst topography and trees provide a screen to the east and south east it is noted that trees are not a permanent feature of the landscape and in fact harvesting of some of the plantation has already commenced.</p> <p>(iv) Some 30 ha of undeveloped land 5 km southwest of the proposed site south of the Corpusty-Briston Road.</p> <p>Figure 2 shows the increased viewshed for the proposed 17.5 metre above ground level lighting proposed for the 2.5Ha site</p> <p>Therefore, there is considerable risk the North Norfolk landscapes will be "industrialised" over more than many hundreds of hectares by the 150 x 30 m buildings and the 17.5 m high lighting of the site.</p> <p>Furthermore, we are concerned the final location of the HVAC booster station may change and move closer to family property</p> <p>In Conclusion with respect to the proposed HVAC Booster stations we wish (in order of priority)</p> <p>(i) There be NO onshore HVAC booster station and that this is achieved by (a) constructing all booster stations offshore and/or (b) use of DC current</p> <p>(ii) Height of Booster station above ground level be reduced by excavating 3 to 5 metre and construction of an appropriate waterproof cellar.</p> <p>(iii) That the noise emission be reduced to the very highest of industry capability and exceeds current Best Industry Practice (not ALARP4 and not the minimum of the Statutory Requirement). It is not acceptable to say the project will meet the minimum regulatory requirements since TIME as shown that previous standards are no longer appropriate e.g. highway driving speeds or the use of asbestos.</p> <p>(iv) Sound mitigation be installed including cladding and berms (to a height equal to the height of the building)</p> <p>(v) We question the need for any lighting – particularly at 17.5 m. above ground level. DONG is respectfully requested to consider the use of infra-red technology for security which would obviate the need for any lighting. Any other security lighting to be kept below 10 metres and installed with motion sensors so that lights are not left on permanently</p>		



Table 3.10: Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Further Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.B) relating to landscape and visual resources

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>44</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 42: Prescribed consultees (The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009: Schedule 1))</b>			
Estelle Hook, Norfolk Coast Partnership	I am responding to the Orsted consultation on Hornsea Project Three of November-December 2017 on behalf of the Norfolk Coast Partnership, guardians of the Norfolk Coast Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the North Norfolk Heritage Coast.	N	Noted, responses have been provided to individual comments.
Estelle Hook, Norfolk Coast Partnership	Orsted current plans show the cable coming ashore at Weybourne and heading south via 3 alternative routes, crossing the A148 in the High Kelling area. In this area, the southern boundary of the AONB skirts the north side of Holt then runs eastward along the A148 road. Thus the onshore cable will run through a strip of the AONB between Weybourne and Holt, a direct distance of approx. 7.5km. The North Norfolk Heritage Coast designation stops at Kelling Hard, just to the west of the planned cable landfall. The AONB seaward boundary in this area is at low water mark and the Heritage Coast designation stretches seaward, with no official seaward boundary, so we also have some interest in the initial length of the offshore cable route.	I	Since the PEIR, a refined landfall location has been identified (western re-route around Kelling) and the area identified for landfall works has reduced. This was informed by a number of factors including engineering/technical considerations, community feedback in the area of Kelling and Weybourne, avoidance of the Kelling Heath SSSI/CWS and Holiday Park.  Impacts relating to landscape and visual resources are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual resources. Particular consideration has been given to the AONB as a sensitive receptor, and it is noted that Hornsea Three has consulted with the Norfolk Coast Partnership to agree viewpoints to inform the assessment of impacts on the AONB.
Estelle Hook, Norfolk Coast Partnership	My comments relate to the potential effects of the development on the landscape quality of the Norfolk Coast Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and North Norfolk Heritage Coast (referred to collectively as 'the AONB'), with consideration also given to development beyond its boundaries where this may have impacts on the views from the AONB and indirect impacts on the landscape of the AONB. Other than these considerations, I have not commented on the impact of this windfarm and cable route outside of the AONB boundary. I have not assessed or commented on any impacts on the wider marine environment. I have not assessed or commented on impacts on the wildlife of the area and I suggest that Natural England is consulted, as the statutory consultee for both biodiversity and landscape issues. I have not commented on wider impacts on the built and historic environment and suggest that Historic England and the Norfolk County Council Historic Environment team are consulted. I suggest that Eastern IFCA are consulted about impacts on the MCZ.	I	Impacts relating to landscape and visual resources are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual resources. Particular consideration has been given to the AONB as a sensitive receptor, and it is noted that Hornsea Three has consulted with the Norfolk Coast Partnership to agree viewpoints to inform the assessment of impacts on the AONB.
Estelle Hook, Norfolk Coast Partnership	The current 2014-19 Norfolk Coast AONB Management Plan has a Policy (PC5) to 'Support the development of renewable energy in the area in ways and locations that contribute to the area's local economy and jobs and maintain its natural beauty.' However, the National Planning Policy Framework emphasises that the impact of a proposed development is an important consideration, including the cumulative landscape and visual impacts. It states that 'Great weight should be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, which have the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty'. As renewable energy schemes, and particularly large wind power schemes, can have a highly significant impact on the natural beauty of the landscape, we approach each project on an individual basis.	N	Noted, see previous response.

<sup>44</sup> Y = Yes change made; N = No change made; I = Incorporated into or considered when producing the assessment or landowner voluntary agreement offer; N/A = Not applicable.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>44</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Estelle Hook, Norfolk Coast Partnership	We have identified a number of sensitive landscapes and habitats and request that the impact on these is minimised through careful planning and delivery. These sites include (working south from the landfall site): Weybourne Cliffs SSSI The shingle beach and shingle ridge, where its natural movement and profile should not be disrupted The reedbed and pond to the west of the beach car park – which the Norfolk Coast Partnership is seeking funding for a community project to restore Weybourne Beck (aka Spring Beck) – which has a published Catchment Management Plan (available from Norfolk Coast Partnership or Norfolk Rivers Trust) Kelling Heath SSSI – a valuable heathland landscape The Glaven River, running to its source near Selbrigg Pond – a rare chalk river with its northern stretch running through the AONB to the sea, of high ecological value and sensitive to pollution (e.g. run off during construction).	Y	Through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive ecological receptors (including designated sites). For example, Weybourne Cliffs and Kelling Heath SSSI have been avoided and no direct impacts are predicted on these designated sites from Hornsea Three. Additional mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project are outlined in topic specific chapters (Environmental Statement volume 3), and include the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts on ecological receptors (e.g. hedgerows) and hydrological features (e.g. main rivers).
Estelle Hook, Norfolk Coast Partnership	We thank Orsted for planning to site any relay stations to the southern end of the potential area for their location, i.e. outside of the AONB, and confirm that we would object if this changed to within the AONB as we consider that it would have a significant impact on the designated landscape.	I	Noted. The location of the onshore HVAC booster station is located at Little Barningham, outside the AONB, as shown in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description
Estelle Hook, Norfolk Coast Partnership	We suggest that construction traffic should use carefully selected routes within the AONB, to minimise disruption, damage and pollution.	I	Impacts relating to access are addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport. It is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this forms part of the DCO application.
Estelle Hook, Norfolk Coast Partnership	We are particularly concerned about light pollution, both of the temporary works and of the permanent infrastructure (including the offshore relay station). We have recently had two Dark Sky Discovery Sites designated very close to this area, one at Kelling Heath Holiday Park and one at Wiveton Downs. These sites are designated because they meet specified low light levels and visibility of stars, with little light pollution. Accordingly, we request details of light levels for the temporary works and for the permanent infrastructure. We request that careful consideration is given to the design and use of lighting through-out the project to minimise any light pollution, e.g. through careful use of appropriate lighting technology, levels used and shielding.	I	We note your concerns regarding lighting close to the designated Dark Sky Discovery Sites. It is noted that lighting during the onshore construction phase will be short term and temporary, used only when required (and generally limited to certain working hours) and designed to avoid unnecessary illumination. Light spill during out of hours working will be minimised through the use of task-orientated lighting, as set out in the outline CoCP which accompanies the DCO application.  In terms of permanent onshore infrastructure, the cables within the AONB will be buried and there will be no operational lighting. The closest part of Hornsea Three to the AONB that would have lighting during the operational phase is the potential HVAC booster station (as security lighting may be required during operation to ensure a safe working environment), which is located over 6 km from the AONB. The HVDC converter/HVAC substation also lies outside the AONB. Notwithstanding this, light spill from these permanent elements would be minimised through design, in particular the use of directional lighting. Based on the mitigation and management measures in place, no significant light spill is anticipated, particularly within the AONB.
CPRE Norfolk	For the onshore we follow by map number where we have a comment to make; while not a landowner, we do have a CPRE interest in landscape and wildlife, the latter mainly informed from the experience of the River Glaven Conservation Group.	N	Noted, responses provided to individual comments.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>44</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
CPRE Norfolk	Map 2. We prefer the eastern option for the cabling corridor from the shore to the Warren Farm area. This is because it avoids Kelling Heath. In addition to being a SSSI, the Heath is a beautiful and distinctive landscape in the mosaic of the AONB. It is popular with local residents who can walk the narrow trials through gorse and heather, and at the north end offers views of the coastline and sea. It is a good site for nightjars; and for those staying beyond dusk, one of the best Dark Skies areas in the country.	Y	<p>Since the PEIR, a refined landfall location has been identified (western re-route around Kelling) and the area identified for landfall works has reduced. This was informed by a number of factors including engineering/technical considerations, community feedback in the area of Kelling and Weybourne, avoidance of the Kelling Heath SSSI/CWS and Holiday Park.</p> <p>Impacts relating to landscape and visual resources are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual resources. Particular consideration has been given to the AONB as a sensitive receptor, and it is noted that Hornsea Three has consulted with the Norfolk Coast Partnership to agree viewpoints to inform the assessment of impacts on the AONB.</p> <p>We note your comments related to the designated Dark Sky areas. It is noted that lighting during the onshore construction phase will be minimised through the use of task-orientated lighting, as set out in the outline CoCP which accompanies the DCO application. In terms of permanent onshore infrastructure, the cables within the AONB will be buried and there will be no operational lighting. Based on the mitigation and management measures in place, no significant light spill is anticipated, particularly within the AONB.</p>
Edgefield and Corpusty & Saxthorpe Parish Councils	We are concerned that you are asking us to comment on the further screening of the booster station in Little Barningham. It is impossible to comment on the screening of something when it has still not been disclosed the size of the booster station you want to screen. Is it possible to confirm the proposed size of the booster station, and perhaps erect scaffolding on the site to the height it will be, so we can see how visible it will be from each direction?	N	The dimensions of the HVAC booster station are set out in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description (and had previously been provided in the same chapter of the PEIR). Appropriate mitigation measures for visual disturbance are outlined in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources. This includes, for example, the restoration of habitats (including hedgerows) which cannot be avoided and landscape planting around the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.
<b>Section 42: Local Authorities (prescribed under section 43 of the Act)</b>			
<i>No comments were received from the local authorities relating to landscape and visual resources under Phase 2.B.</i>			
<b>Section 42: Persons with an interest in the land (prescribed under section 44 of the Act)</b>			
Ray & Diane Pearce	<p>16. As evidenced above, there is no transparency between the Vanguard and Hornsea Three projects and no details for the Public to scrutinise due to the imposition of a commercial NDA. The lack of detail regarding the cable crossing point is a failure of the Hornsea Three Project Team's duty of care and we would therefore expect a further statutory consultation process to be agreed to fill in the details prior to the EIA, or indeed DCO. We contest that the project is in a rush to meet the next CFD auction before the cost for the project becomes commercially unviable. We assert that it is cost alone which is driving the project with a consequential disregard for the detrimental impact the project will have on the Norfolk countryside and the people who currently enjoy its peaceful nature. The further consultation has done nothing to allay our concerns and has increased the uncertainty for our future.</p> <p>Attachments: - See FULL response on DECA 1. Maps of proposed cable crossing point. 2. DONG Energy Letter dated 12 October 2017. 3. Hornsea Three PEIR Figure 3.22.</p>	I	Noted, responses provided in individual comments in relation to EMF, disruption impacts and cumulative impacts with Vanguard.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>44</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 47: Duty to consult local community</b>			
Diana Jenkinson	In addition this is being proposed in an area that is known as an area of outstanding natural beauty, there is so much wildlife and nature in this area and the affects of this construction would be devastating. The pink footed geese were on this very field last winter and the winter before, a construction like this would affect local wildlife massively.	I	Impacts relating to landscape and visual resources are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual resources. Particular consideration has been given to the AONB as a sensitive receptor, and it is noted that Hornsea Three has consulted with the Norfolk Coast Partnership to agree viewpoints to inform the assessment of impacts on the AONB.  Environmental Statement, volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation considers potential impacts on ecological receptors as a result of Hornsea Three. This includes potential impacts on species such as Pink-footed Geese.
Mark Flatman on behalf of Mr & Mrs DW Flatman	<b>Alternative Cable Corridor</b> Due to express exclusion from earlier consultation exercises, I am consequently therefore unaware of the full scope of alternative routing from the sea via Norfolk Coast to Norwich that previously was considered by Orsted. Notwithstanding, it is particularly perverse to propose a landing place on the coast that immediately requires traversing through or very close to an SSSI, that provides a particularly valuable and niche habitat supporting a range of rare UK Biodiversity Priority Species. It is also noted that all three alternative corridors would need to bisect the North Norfolk AONB and heritage Coast and is one of 32 designated coasts in England. These are specifically subject to the provisions of paragraph 114 of the NPPF. In contrast, and by reference to the extent of the North Norfolk AONB shown on the map below, it is noted that there is a logical gap adjoining the coast and not subject to AONB or Heritage Coast status that extends approximately between Mundesley and Sea Palling and as indicated graphically by reference to the white arrow on the plan (see full response).	Y	Since the PEIR, a refined landfall location has been identified (western re-route around Kelling) and the area identified for landfall works has reduced. This was informed by a number of factors including engineering/technical considerations, community feedback in the area of Kelling and Weybourne, avoidance of the Kelling Heath SSSI/CWS and Holiday Park. Environmental Statement, volume 3, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives sets out the process of identifying a landfall location and the route refinement process.  Impacts relating to landscape and visual resources are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual resources. Particular consideration has been given to the AONB as a sensitive receptor, and it is noted that Hornsea Three has consulted with the Norfolk Coast Partnership to agree viewpoints to inform the assessment of impacts on the AONB.
Mark Flatman on behalf of Mr & Mrs DW Flatman	Furthermore, when this location is considered in proximity to the final destination of the Norwich Main National Grid Substation, south of Norwich, al landing point between Mundesley and Sea Palling would suggest a far more logical approach and one that would also offer a shorter and more direct onshore cable corridor routing to Norwich. This is depicted on the full response and is suggested that a detailed investigation would undoubtedly reveal and more direct onshore alternative route that would avoid statutory landscape and heritage designations. It is suggested that Orsted investigate this alternative route (see full response for marked plan).	I	Environmental Statement, volume 3, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives sets out the process of identifying a grid connection location and landfall. It describes the alternative routes considered and justification for the chosen route.
CPRE Norfolk	For the onshore we follow by map number where we have a comment to make; while not a landowner, we do have a CPRE interest in landscape and wildlife, the latter mainly informed from the experience of the River Glaven Conservation Group.	N	Noted, responses provided to individual comments.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>44</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
CPRE Norfolk	<p>Map 2. We prefer the eastern option for the cabling corridor from the shore to the Warren Farm area. This is because it avoids Kelling Heath. In addition to being a SSSI, the Heath is a beautiful and distinctive landscape in the mosaic of the AONB. It is popular with local residents who can walk the narrow trials through gorse and heather, and at the north end offers views of the coastline and sea. It is a good site for nightjars; and for those staying beyond dusk, one of the best Dark Skies areas in the country.</p>	Y	<p>Since the PEIR, a refined landfall location has been identified (western re-route around Kelling) and the area identified for landfall works has reduced. This was informed by a number of factors including engineering/technical considerations, community feedback in the area of Kelling and Weybourne, avoidance of the Kelling Heath SSSI/CWS and Holiday Park.</p> <p>Impacts relating to landscape and visual resources are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual resources. Particular consideration has been given to the AONB as a sensitive receptor, and it is noted that Hornsea Three has consulted with the Norfolk Coast Partnership to agree viewpoints to inform the assessment of impacts on the AONB.</p> <p>We note your comments related to the designated Dark Sky areas. It is noted that lighting during the onshore construction phase will be minimised through the use of task-orientated lighting, as set out in the outline CoCP which accompanies the DCO application. In terms of permanent onshore infrastructure, the cables within the AONB will be buried and there will be no operational lighting. Based on the mitigation and management measures in place, no significant light spill is anticipated, particularly within the AONB.</p>
The River Glaven Conservation Group - Henry Crawley	<p>The addition of screening to the HVAC booster site at Barningham again is welcome. I assume this implies a tree belt. We would of course prefer that HVDC is used, not only precluding need for a Booster site, but also needing a much narrower cabling excavation corridor and less damage to the vulnerable countryside and river valley.</p>	I	<p>Due to current uncertainty (see Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives), a decision on which transmission system (HVDC or HVAC) to adopt will not be made until post consent after extensive engagement with potential systems suppliers has taken place. As a result of this, we have conducted our assessments based on a realistic worst-case scenario, which could be either HVDC or HVAC technology depending on the receptor.</p> <p>Appropriate mitigation measures for visual disturbance are outlined in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources. This includes, for example, the restoration of habitats (including hedgerows) which cannot be avoided and landscape planting around the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.</p>



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>44</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Anthea Spray	<p>This project is going to ruin our beautiful countryside for years to come; our Government is expecting many new houses to be built also taking up rural landscapes. What is going to happen to our wildlife, the flora and fauna of our local area? They are already endangered and reduced greatly in numbers due to loss of habitat, pests and diseases. Now you want to scar our county, create noise and devastation across our land and through our quiet villages.</p> <p>You will destroy historic sites that archaeologists have yet to reveal and our coastline is so vulnerable to erosion that this project cannot but do more harm than good. As you see I am not in favour of any of this project. PLEASE reconsider whether it is not possible to bring power ashore where structures are already available to distribute it to properties along the coast.</p>	I	<p>Through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive ecological receptors. For example, Weybourne Cliffs and Kelling Heath SSSI have been avoided and no direct impacts are predicted on these designated sites from Hornsea Three. Additional mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project are outlined in topic specific chapters, and include the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts on local road networks, ecological receptors (e.g. hedgerows) and hydrological features (e.g. main rivers).</p> <p>In respect to historic sites, an assessment of impacts on heritage assets is provided in Environmental Statement, volume 3, chapter 5: Historic Environment and volume 2, chapter 9: Marine Archaeology. Impacts on marine processes including those associated with coastal erosion are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 1: Marine Processes.</p> <p>Environmental Statement, volume 3, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives sets out the process of identifying a grid connection location and landfall. It is noted that the aim of the grid connection option appraisal was to identify the most economic and efficient design option for the connection of a project. Although both National Grid and Orsted input into the appraisal process (in respect to economic and strategic factors), the eventual grid connection offer is determined by National Grid. In May 2016, Hornsea Three was formally offered a grid connection at Norwich Main Substation as a result of this appraisal process which has informed the subsequent landfall and route refinement.</p>
<b>Section 48: Duty to publicise</b>			
No comments were received in response to the Public Notice relating to landscape and visual resources under Phase 2.B.			

Table 3.11: Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Focused Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.C) relating to landscape and visual resources

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>45</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 42: Prescribed consultees (The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009: Schedule 1))</b>			
Oulton Parish Council	<p>Light Pollution - The Section of Lighting and Security is vague, sketchy and too technical to be useful. OPC needs to know the height, frequency and type of lighting to be used around the perimeter fence of the compound. We also need to know what other forms of lighting will be used on the compound itself and how much of the lighting will be turned off completely when working hours are over. As to type: will "yellow light" be used ( the most night-friendly), will the lighting be down-lit and will it be movement-sensitive only?</p> <p>OPC has significant concerns about the need for permanent security lighting at a Main Compound - Especially over the enormously long timespan of this project. Oulton is a dark skies area and this is greatly valued by residents. We already have experience of the airfield being used (for a much shorter period) for storage for the gas pipeline project some years ago. Security lighting on the airfield at that time was experienced as very intrusive.</p>	I	<p>It is noted that lighting during the onshore construction phase will be short term and temporary, used only when required (and generally limited to certain working hours) and designed to avoid unnecessary illumination. Light spill during out of hours working will be minimised through the use of task-orientated lighting, as set out in the outline CoCP which accompanies the DCO application. Lighting during construction will take into account the requirements set out in British Standard (BS) EB 12464-2:2014 (BSI, 21014) and guidance from the Institute of Lighting Professionals (Institute of Lighting Professionals, 2011 'Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Obtrusive Light').</p>
<b>Section 42: Local Authorities (prescribed under section 43 of the Act)</b>			
No comments were received from the local authorities relating to landscape and visual resources under Phase 2.C.			

<sup>45</sup> Y = Yes change made; N = No change made; I = Incorporated into or considered when producing the assessment or landowner voluntary agreement offer; N/A = Not applicable.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>45</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 42: Persons with an interest in the land (prescribed under section 44 of the Act)</b>			
No comments were received from persons with an interest in land relating to landscape and visual resources under Phase 2.C.			
<b>Section 47: Duty to consult local community</b>			
Clive Searson & Nicola Tanner	<p>We are the residents at [REDACTED]. We are totally horrified that your company propose to put a compound in without any correspondence with local residents, especially when it is going to have an adverse impact on our lives. It is unacceptable to have a compound that will be disruptive to our quality of life. We purchased our house in good faith and were told that no planning applications would be forthcoming due to the rejection of the AD plant in 2014. We have to deal with noise from cars and farm traffic on a daily basis, it is noticeably loud especially as when it goes over the hump in the road it intensifies the noise. The noise levels in our house are very clear, you can hear cars and farm traffic as it passes our house clearly. All of our windows on our house are viewable from the road and even though double glazed it is intrusive and does not shut out the sound. It will be unacceptable to have heavy construction traffic passing our house night and day. It will have a serious impact on our lives and well being. As I work in staff recruitment I take phone calls from 7.00am through to 9:00pm. My work day is already disrupted through passing traffic, if it were to increase it would make my job unworkable. The noise levels generated during harvest are bad enough. We are the only house that will be seriously affected by all the traffic to and from site and it is unacceptable that we should have to live with it.</p> <p>There are no footpaths along the road and only a few unofficial passing places. The road is very popular for local dog walkers and for cyclists following "The Tudor Route". The road itself is quite narrow and in places when cars and farm traffic are passing each other it can be dangerous. Adding construction traffic and low loaders to traverse this route as it is not wide enough. We accept that farm traffic is going to pass our house as it is a farming community, the noise can be disruptive now, with construction traffic too it will be unbearable. The compound itself will be offset to the right behind our house. The lights and generators will be very disturbing especially at night when sound travels. The lit compound would light a normally dark sky and will stand out like a sore thumb. The constant hum of generator's in the background are not conducive with relaxation time in our garden. There your proposal would result in material harm in the living conditions as of us as residents.</p>	I	<p>Hornsea Three recognises the sensitivity of this location and since its identification as the main construction compound, Hornsea Three has sought to identify measures to minimise any impacts on Oulton village, local residents and the local road network. In this regard, where properties are located in close proximity to the Oulton Airfield, the Project will ensure that sensitive construction management measures, such as noise, dust and traffic control are considered. These are documented in an outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), which accompanies the DCO application. Furthermore, it is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this also forms part of the DCO application.</p> <p>Impacts associated with the use of Oulton Airfield as the main construction compound are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3). Impacts relating to traffic and transport are specifically assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport. Impacts to pedestrian safety, amenity, severance and driver delay, amongst others, are also assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport.</p> <p>It is noted that lighting during the onshore construction phase will be short term and temporary, used only when required (and generally limited to certain working hours) and designed to avoid unnecessary illumination. Light spill during out of hours working will be minimised through the use of task-orientated lighting, as set out in the outline CoCP which accompanies the DCO application. Lighting during construction will take into account the requirements set out in British Standard (BS) EB 12464-2:2014 (BSI, 21014) and guidance from the Institute of Lighting Professionals (Institute of Lighting Professionals, 2011 'Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Obtrusive Light').</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>45</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Peter Glenser	<p>The Manor House - I note that that the proposed hours of operation are from 6 am to 7 pm during the week and from 6 am until 5 pm on Saturdays. I vividly remember looking at the Norfolk Churches website when we made the decision to buy this house. It contained the following description of the immediate vicinity: <i>"The area between Aylsham and Holt can seem among the most remote in Norfolk, a landscape of scattered villages unknown to the busy traffic a few miles off on the Cromer road... At a lost crossroads where four deep cut narrow roadways meet is St Peter and St Paul, not far from the great Hall. Elms and oaks are all about, their treetops restless on this late summer day. When the wind drops, you can hear a car approaching from miles off - but not many come this way."</i> The peace and quiet of this remote location was a major factor in our decision to buy the house. The quiet enjoyment of this property will be severely effected by the construction of a site nearly eight acres in size, with lights, generators, facilities for staff and heavy vehicle movements just a few hundred metres away and in the direction the house faces. It is difficult to overstate how quiet this area is and how much vehicle reversing alarms, engines and even voices will disturb this silence. Similarly the area is very dark at night – inevitably security lighting will cause light pollution in this dark skies area.</p>	I	<p>Proposed working hours are set out in the outline CoCP which forms part of the DCO application. The outline CoCP is a 'living' document that will be updated as required post submission of the DCO application, during the Examination Period following more detailed engagement with stakeholders and post examination by way of instruction of the Examining Authority and Secretary of State.</p> <p>Given the nature of the Oulton Airfield, which comprises existing hardstanding, its use as the main construction compound has less potential for significant effects than other sites which were under consideration. Notwithstanding this, Hornsea Three recognises the sensitivity of this location and since its identification as the main construction compound, Hornsea Three has sought to identify measures to minimise any impacts on Oulton village, local residents and the local road network. In this regard, where properties are located in close proximity to the Oulton Airfield, the Project will ensure that sensitive construction management measures, such as noise, dust, light and traffic control are considered. These are documented in an outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), which accompanies the DCO application. Furthermore, it is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this also forms part of the DCO application.</p> <p>Impacts associated with the use of Oulton Airfield as the main construction compound are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3).</p> <p>It respect to lighting in particular, lighting during construction will take into account the requirements set out in British Standard (BS) EB 12464-2:2014 (BSI, 21014) and guidance from the Institute of Lighting Professionals (Institute of Lighting Professionals, 2011 'Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Obtrusive Light'). Based on the mitigation and management measures in place, no significant light spill is anticipated.</p>
Mrs M L and Mr R L G Williams	<p><b>Light pollution</b> –any security lighting will have an impact on local houses. Darkness at night is a key characteristic of a rural area. <b>The area is designated as a "Dark Sky" for Norfolk</b> and should be protected.</p>	I	<p>We note your concerns regarding lighting close to the designated Dark Sky Discovery Sites. It is noted that lighting during the onshore construction phase will be short term and temporary, used only when required (and generally limited to certain working hours) and designed to avoid unnecessary illumination. Light spill during out of hours working will be minimised through the use of task-orientated lighting, as set out in the outline CoCP which accompanies the DCO application.</p>
<b>Section 48: Duty to publicise</b>			
No comments were received in response to the Public Notice relating to landscape and visual resources under Phase 2.C.			

### 3.5 Historic Environment

Table 3.12: Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.A) relating to historic environment

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>46</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 42: Prescribed consultees (The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009: Schedule 1))</b>			
East Midlands Airport	I have recently been sent the consultation pack for the proposed wind farm off of the Norfolk Coast - Ref.- HOW03_s42_25072017. You have identified East Midlands Airport as a consultee for this application and I wanted to check that this is the case please? The pack is addressed to a [REDACTED] who was previously the Safeguarding Officer here but he left the business some time ago. During his time here, [REDACTED] was also responsible for the safeguarding of Humberside Airport, something we are not responsible for now, and I just wanted to check if it was them who were actually the consultee and not East Midlands Airport?	N	Whilst the PEIR was sent to East Midlands Airport, further assessment of potential sources of impact has highlighted that given the distance from East Midlands Airport and Humberside Airport to the project, there is no pathway for impact.
Norfolk Rivers Trust	Norfolk Rivers Trust would like to register their concern on the management of land and water.	I	Noted. Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including land and water either through design, or identification of built in mitigation measures. Potential impacts on geology, hydrology and land use are identified and assessed in Environmental Statement Volume 3, chapters 1: Geology and Ground Conditions, 2: Hydrology and Flood Risk and 6: Land Use and Recreation respectively.
Norfolk Rivers Trust	7. On non agricultural land native UK seed mixes must be the standard application.	I	New planting will be carried out in accordance with the Landscape Management Plan and associated biosecurity risk assessments. The Outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application includes planting methodologies and plant species lists. These comprise native UK seed mixes.
Norfolk Rivers Trust	The Norfolk Rivers Trust are working with Land agents and Landowners on the current Vattenfall project on proposed river crossing points.	N	Noted.
High Kelling Parish Council	3) Interruption to rights of way - in particular interruption of access along the footpath from the A148 to Bodham wood, which is used by many residents. No answer has yet been given with regards alternative access during the periods of disruption.	Y	Through design refinement, Hornsea Three has committed to using trenchless technologies (e.g. HDD) beneath the footpath from the A148 to Bodham Wood in order to minimise disruption to the local community.  Furthermore, traffic management measures will be implemented over the relevant part of Warren Road, as set out in the outline construction traffic management plan which forms part of the DCO application, to maximise pedestrian safety.
High Kelling Parish Council	The parish council wish to express the following concerns regarding your plans; 1) Phasing- it appears the construction will take place in phases over quite a number of years, thus potentially causing multiple periods of disruption, which is of great concern to residents. The council would wish the total construction period to be kept to an absolute minimum.	Y	During the design refinement Hornsea Three has sought to minimise the duration of any disruption, and has reduced the total duration of the construction phase onshore to eight years. A breakdown of the maximum construction durations is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Project Description.
Little Melton Parish Council	<b>Development</b> - No buildings can ever be constructed over the cable. Some parishioners think that this is good as it prevents housing development.	N	Noted.

<sup>46</sup> Y = Yes change made; N = No change made; I = Incorporated into or considered when producing the assessment or landowner voluntary agreement offer; N/A = Not applicable.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>46</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Norfolk County Council	<p>Public Rights of Way</p> <p>5.14 The County Council have checked the Public Rights of Way and linear routes shown on Figure 6.2 and have identified two additional paths that may be affected by the cable route and that do not appear to be included in the PEIR:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Salle FP9 may intersect the search area at TH10702428; and</li> <li>• Keswick FP4 is within the search area, joining Keswick BR4 and East Carleton FP1.</li> </ul> <p>5.15 In terms of PRow, the network that will be affected comprise:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Norfolk Trails: the England Coast Path and the Marriott's Way.</li> </ul> <p>Promoted circular walks that use PRow and which will potentially be affected: "Explore More Coast" Weybourne Circular; Cromer and Sheringham Health Walk No.6 – Weybourne to Sheringham via Norfolk Coast Path; and Aylsham Health Walk No.10 – Reepham via Salle Church;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tas Valley Way; and</li> <li>• The remaining PRow network.</li> </ul>	I	<p>Several PRow and areas of land with informal public access will potentially be affected by the construction of the onshore elements of the Hornsea Three. Where a PRow crosses the onshore cable corridor the contractor is to either: seek to maintain a pedestrian access route. This route will be maintained by fencing and the use of a gating, ensure that the users of the access route have a safe route to cross the onshore cable corridor; or · Provide a localised diversion.</p> <p>Signage will be erected to direct pedestrians when the construction traffic requires access over the designated pedestrian route, or of diversions if so implemented. Where an alternative route is reasonably available, with the agreement of the relevant PRow Officer, a short term permissive diversion will be formed around the active construction area. Advanced warning notices will be provided to users identifying the diversion route. Following completion of construction activities, all public access within the working area will be reinstated with a standard commensurate to that existing prior to the commencement of construction works.</p> <p>Further information on impacts to PRow and land use is provided in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 6: Land Use and Recreation.</p>
Norfolk County Council	<p>PRow - Comments</p> <p>5.16 Although routes of regional and national importance are noted above, the wider un-promoted PRow network serve a number of settlements within or near to the current search areas. Un-promoted PRow should not be considered of lesser importance; settlements such as Reepham will see disruption to its PRow network not only from this development but cumulatively through the Vattenfall Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project, which it is understood could co-inside with this project. The closure and diversion of routes near to populated areas such as this need to be considered in the wider context of both the type of use they receive and the potential implications of other projects.</p>	I	<p>Several PRow and areas of land with informal public access will potentially be affected by the construction of the onshore elements of the Hornsea Three. Where a PRow crosses the onshore cable corridor the contractor is to either: seek to maintain a pedestrian access route. This route will be maintained by fencing and the use of a gating, ensure that the users of the access route have a safe route to cross the onshore cable corridor; or · Provide a localised diversion. It is noted that a number of PRow will be crossed using HDD to avoid direct impacts e.g. Marriott's Way.</p> <p>Signage will be erected to direct pedestrians when the construction traffic requires access over the designated pedestrian route, or of diversions if so implemented. Where an alternative route is reasonably available, with the agreement of the relevant PRow Officer, a short term permissive diversion will be formed around the active construction area. Advanced warning notices will be provided to users identifying the diversion route. Following completion of construction activities, all public access within the working area will be reinstated with a standard commensurate to that existing prior to the commencement of construction works.</p> <p>Further information on impacts to PRow and land use is provided in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 6: Land Use and Recreation.</p>



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>46</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Norfolk County Council	<p>PRoW - Comments (cont.)</p> <p>5.17 In terms of mitigation, the County Council would therefore expect that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For all PRoW affected, Temporary Traffic Regulation orders should be put in place to cover the periods of closure, with reopening as soon as possible i.e. the very minimum periods of closure. Signed and maintained alternative routes for the closures should be provided where appropriate. These alternative routes should consider cumulative effects and where possible be of equal value to the communities they affect.</li> <li>Alternative routes on the Marriott's Way and England Coast path should be as of high a standard as practicable, should be off-road where possible, and should be identified well in advance of closures so that the information can be advertised.</li> <li>Where phasing of works is necessary, the County Council would anticipate that reinstatement of PRoW is carried out between construction phases. This will be particularly necessary for the England Coast Path, the Marriott's Way, and other frequently used PRoW around settlements. Both the aforementioned Norfolk Trails have ecological value and designations and there may be opportunities for some holistic mitigation for both access and ecology during the potential 11 year maximum duration of construction phase.</li> <li>Consideration will need to be given to the public car park on the Marriott's Way at TG12801760 during construction.</li> </ul>	I	<p>Several PRoW and areas of land with informal public access will potentially be affected by the construction of the onshore elements of the Hornsea Three. Where a PRoW crosses the onshore cable corridor the contractor is to either: seek to maintain a pedestrian access route. This route will be maintained by fencing and the use of a gating, ensure that the users of the access route have a safe route to cross the onshore cable corridor; or · Provide a localised diversion. It is noted that a number of PRoW will be crossed using HDD to avoid direct impacts e.g. Marriot's Way.</p> <p>Signage will be erected to direct pedestrians when the construction traffic requires access over the designated pedestrian route, or of diversions if so implemented. Where an alternative route is reasonably available, with the agreement of the relevant PRoW Officer, a short term permissive diversion will be formed around the active construction area. Advanced warning notices will be provided to users identifying the diversion route. Following completion of construction activities, all public access within the working area will be reinstated with a standard commensurate to that existing prior to the commencement of construction works.</p> <p>Further information on impacts to PRoW and land use is provided in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 6: Land Use and Recreation.</p>
Norfolk County Council	<p>PRoW - Comments (cont.)</p> <p>5.17 Post-construction, the County Council would seek</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Opportunities for enhancements, such as surfacing and connectivity enhancements to the network where appropriate.</li> <li>That any trees or other vegetation that was removed during construction is replaced within a reasonable timeframe and that measures are put in place to ensure such reinstatement is delivered.</li> </ul> <p>Norfolk County Council Environment Team would be happy to work with DONG to find effective solutions to issues relating to the PRoW network</p>	I	<p>Several PRoW and areas of land with informal public access will potentially be affected by the construction of the onshore elements of the Hornsea Three. Where a PRoW crosses the onshore cable corridor the contractor is to either: seek to maintain a pedestrian access route. This route will be maintained by fencing and the use of a gating, ensure that the users of the access route have a safe route to cross the onshore cable corridor; or · Provide a localised diversion. It is noted that a number of PRoW will be crossed using HDD to avoid direct impacts e.g. Marriot's Way.</p> <p>Signage will be erected to direct pedestrians when the construction traffic requires access over the designated pedestrian route, or of diversions if so implemented. Where an alternative route is reasonably available, with the agreement of the relevant PRoW Officer, a short term permissive diversion will be formed around the active construction area. Advanced warning notices will be provided to users identifying the diversion route. Following completion of construction activities, all public access within the working area will be reinstated with a standard commensurate to that existing prior to the commencement of construction works.</p> <p>Further information on impacts to PRoW and land use is provided in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 6: Land Use and Recreation. It is furthermore noted that a Public Rights of Way Management Plan will be developed in consultation with Norfolk County Council.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>46</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Norfolk County Council	7.5.1.7 Major adverse effect on PROW's. This has been an issue particularly near the coast at Weybourne with the Dudgeon project. There is a need to maintain the coast path – temp bridges have been used previously.	I	<p>Several PROW and areas of land with informal public access will potentially be affected by the construction of the onshore elements of the Hornsea Three. Where a PROW crosses the onshore cable corridor the contractor is to either: seek to maintain a pedestrian access route. This route will be maintained by fencing and the use of a gating, ensure that the users of the access route have a safe route to cross the onshore cable corridor; or · Provide a localised diversion.</p> <p>Signage will be erected to direct pedestrians when the construction traffic requires access over the designated pedestrian route, or of diversions if so implemented. Where an alternative route is reasonably available, with the agreement of the relevant PROW Officer, a short term permissive diversion will be formed around the active construction area. Advanced warning notices will be provided to users identifying the diversion route. Following completion of construction activities, all public access within the working area will be reinstated with a standard commensurate to that existing prior to the commencement of construction works.</p> <p>Further information on impacts to PROW and land use is provided in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 6: Land Use and Recreation.</p>
Norfolk County Council	7.7.1.8 As 7.5.1.7 - Impact on PROW's particularly at the coast.	I	<p>Several PROW and areas of land with informal public access will potentially be affected by the construction of the onshore elements of the Hornsea Three. Where a PROW crosses the onshore cable corridor the contractor is to either: seek to maintain a pedestrian access route. This route will be maintained by fencing and the use of a gating, ensure that the users of the access route have a safe route to cross the onshore cable corridor; or · Provide a localised diversion.</p> <p>Signage will be erected to direct pedestrians when the construction traffic requires access over the designated pedestrian route, or of diversions if so implemented. Where an alternative route is reasonably available, with the agreement of the relevant PROW Officer, a short term permissive diversion will be formed around the active construction area. Advanced warning notices will be provided to users identifying the diversion route. Following completion of construction activities, all public access within the working area will be reinstated with a standard commensurate to that existing prior to the commencement of construction works.</p> <p>Further information on impacts to PROW and land use is provided in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 6: Land Use and Recreation.</p>
Ministry of Defence	In relation to the onshore element of the development scheme, the plans provided indicate that the extent of the PIER assessment area and proposed re-route for cable installation on the north Norfolk coast are in proximity to a MOD transmitter site at RAF Weybourne. This technical facility is encompassed with a statutory safeguarding consultation zone in which the MOD must be consulted upon all forms of development or land use change. The safeguarding criteria applicable to the type of transmitter operated at this site would impose constraints of the installation of metallic cabling above or below ground or creation of earth works in proximity to the transmitter. In addition constraints would be applicable on the siting and design of new structures within the designated safeguarding zone. The extent and relevance of this statutory safeguarding zone should be taken into account in the evaluation of the cable and infrastructure development scheme being prepared. The information provided at this stage indicates that cable and associated infrastructure development within the northern part of the re-route corridor and western most part of PIER boundary identified may not be compatible with MOD statutory safeguarding requirements.	I	Response noted, Hornsea Three will consult with the MoD as part of the detailed design development post submission.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>46</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Holt County Division	This area is designated within the boundaries of the AONB and many residents and visitors are concerned about the impacts not only to the environment (commented below); but also upon their ability to access rights of way and footpaths during the construction. Therefore, inhibiting their ability to enjoy the natural surroundings of their homes. High Kelling Parish Council have also referenced this concern in their submission. Weybourne residents are obviously anxious about access to the beach and coastal path.	I	<p>An assessment of impacts on the AONB is presented in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources. To inform this process, Hornsea Three has consulted with the Norfolk Coast Partnership, as well as local authorities, in regard to the identification of suitable viewpoints within the AONB.</p> <p>Where the onshore cable corridor crossed public rights of way, Hornsea Three has sought to avoid impacts through the use of HDD technology. Where this has not been possible and thus open cut, or HDD with a haul road over, is proposed, the routes will be temporarily diverted along existing tracks, for a maximum of one month per cable. In respect to beach access, a Beach Access Management Plan will be developed in consultation with, and agreed with Norfolk County Council. This Plan would include management measures to be put in place on the beach at either side of the construction working areas to guide walkers along the diverted coastal path, and would also set out the measures to be followed for the reinstatement of the coastal path following the completion of construction works. Information on these temporary changes to the route of the coastal path would be posted in the beach side car park to the north of Weybourne, together with general information of the construction activities</p> <p>Following the completion of the construction works all areas of access land, recreational resources, PRowS and other linear routes affected by the onshore works would be re-instated to their current condition and/or along their current alignments. There would be no physical effects on these resources arising from the operation or maintenance of Hornsea Three. The measures to be taken to ensure the continued use of all linear recreational resources during the construction phase of the project have been discussed with Norfolk County Council and are set out in the Outline CoCP. This dialogue will continue during the detailed design process.</p> <p>The assessment of impacts on individual public rights of way (where appropriate) are set out in Environmental Statement, volume 3, chapter 6: Land Use and Recreation.</p>
Holt County Division	Impact on local communities Residents of Weybourne are concerned that this stretch of coastline appears to be becoming the landfall of choice for new offshore windfarm developments. How many other parishes along the east coast have had as many developments come through their boundaries?	N	<p>The process for identifying the most suitable landfall location is set out in the Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives.</p> <p>It is however noted that, since the PEIR, a refined landfall location has been identified (western re-route around Kelling) and the area identified for landfall works has reduced. This was informed by a number of factors including community feedback in the area of Kelling and Weybourne, avoidance of the Kelling Heath SSSI/CWS and Holiday Park as well as engineering/technical considerations.</p>
Holt County Division	The size of the project and current government processes, dictate construction is likely to take place in phases over several years, thus potentially causing multiple periods of disruption, which is of great concern to residents. It is essential householders receive binding commitments that the total construction period will be kept to an absolute minimum. (I believe this also endorses the views of High Kelling Parish Council).	I	<p>During the design refinement Hornsea Three has sought to minimise the duration of any disruption, and has reduced the total duration of the construction phase onshore to eight years. A breakdown of the maximum construction durations is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Project Description.</p>
Marine Management Organisation	Farming: The farm land is used to grow a full arable rotation including cereals, legumes, oilseeds and high value root crops, such as parsnips, potatoes and carrots. Disturbance to soil structure will compromise productive capacity and versatility of crop	I	Noted.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>46</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
River Glaven Conservation Group (RGCG) and CPRE Norfolk	<p><b>OVERVIEW ON KEY ISSUES</b></p> <p>The RGCG and CPRE Norfolk made separate submissions to the Phase 1B consultation, and also verbal input prior to that at the 'roadshow' events. The RGCG did so from the remit of enhancing and protecting the Glaven and its catchment, and CPRE from a wider remit with landscape being the main issue. However we have felt for some time that wildlife and landscape go hand-in-hand. This is particularly so in the context of a river valley and the catchment area, which have the key role in a wider ecological network, and so now make a joint submission. The reason is well expressed by Brendan Joyce, Chief Executive of the Norfolk Wildlife Trust when he said in the preface to the CPRE Norfolk policy document A Vision for Norfolk (July 2017):</p> <p>The county is famous for its wildlife and habitats and extremely rich in its biodiversity, but so much of it is rare and endangered and confined to isolated, fragmented nature reserves. It is not enough to protect what is there from growing threats. Its future survival depends on us taking a more landscape approach to its conservation and this means creating more space for wildlife and repairing broken ecological networks.</p> <p>It is only in recent years that we have realised the potential of the restoration of farmland ponds in repairing a key part of this network, particularly those on a watershed between the two river systems and this work was initiated on the Glaven-Bure catchment 'boundary'. Such an area, particularly if sited on a watershed, can be the weakest link in ecological network. Our experience shows us that rivers and aquatic habitats can, with the appropriate restoration techniques, regain their wildlife in a relatively short space of time. We attach as evidence on this point the RGCG Strategy 2016-20 to illustrate this; also what we now see as the greatest threats, arable run-off and invasive species. A recent RGCG Newsletter Autumn 2016 contains an article on the ponds work, and Spring 2017 on the Dong project at it was at that time.</p> <p>However our most important evidence is a paper written by RGCG members on the Upper Glaven Ecological Network (August 2017) (ATTACHED IN EMAIL) and is the result of many years of experience. However this remains an ongoing exercise, and we expect to contribute further on this and other topics throughout the whole Project Three timescale.</p>	I	<p>Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive ecological receptors.</p> <p>Potential impacts which remain on ecological receptors are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation. This assessment considers the interactions between the project and ecological receptors, and is informed by the relationship between hydrogeology, hydrology and water-dependant habitats which are described in the Hydrological Characterisation Note which forms Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 2.4. This approach was discussed and agreed with the onshore ecology expert working group which comprised Natural England, the Wildlife Trust, Environment Agency and the RSPB amongst others.</p> <p>Potential impacts on landscape and visual resources are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources.</p> <p>The interaction between landscape and ecological receptors is acknowledged and addressed through cross-referencing between the outline landscape management plan and the outline ecological management plan (both of which form part of the DCO application). For example, restoration of hedgerows, currently in poor condition, provides an opportunity to achieve long term benefits for the biodiversity associated with this habitat type as well as gap up hedgerows providing landscape and visual mitigation.</p>
River Glaven Conservation Group (RGCG) and CPRE Norfolk	<p><b>COMMENTS ON ECOLOGY AND NATURE CONSERVATION:</b></p> <p>3.2.15: We note that the PEIR assessment is based on the wider 200 m wide onshore cable corridor search area which includes the proposed locations for the onshore HVAV booster station and onshore HVDC converter/HVAC substation. The final 80 m wide cable corridor construction area (60 m wide permanent cable corridor) will continue to be refined before being confirmed in the final DCO. It is anticipated that a number of potential impacts identified through this assignment will be mitigated or removed, through the refinement of the onshore cable corridor, particularly where the onshore cable corridor search area currently crosses designated sites. We comment: This 'wriggle room' might be particularly useful for avoiding impact on the restored (and those yet to be restored) farmland ponds in the upper Glaven, proving to be important as a key link in the ecological network.</p> <p>3.3.1.4, Table 3.1, Field surveys undertaken and associated survey area: We note in this list in particular the comments on hedgerows, white-clawed crayfish, great crested newt, bats, otters and water voles. All present in the upper Glaven, see attached Ecological Network document.</p> <p>3.9.1.3 and Table 3.11; and 3.9.2.2 and Table 3.12: We note the impact assessment criteria and definition of terms relating to the sensitivity of the receptor, and the magnitude of the impact. We comment: we agree with the hierarchy order of importance and sensitivity of an international designation (very high), national designation (high), county or regional level (medium), district level (low) and local level (negligible). We comment: BUT this is part of the compartmentalisation issue as all on a wider basis might be part of an ecological corridor, have in that sense a greater importance than when done in isolation. In the refinement and mitigation stage of the cabling route this needs to be taken into account.</p> <p>3.10.1.3 and Table 3.14: We welcome the design measures adopted in selecting a cabling route. In particular as a Valued Ecological Receptor (VER) features such as ponds and Local Wildlife Sites</p>	Y	<p>Impacts on protected species as well as associated habitats are included within Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation. This assessment considers the interactions between the project and ecological receptors, and is informed by the relationship between hydrogeology, hydrology and water-dependant habitats which are described in the Hydrological Characterisation Note which forms Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 2.4. This approach was discussed and agreed with the onshore ecology expert working group which comprised Natural England, the Wildlife Trust, Environment Agency and the RSPB amongst others.</p> <p>Hornsea Three has committed to use HDD at all EA main rivers and a majority of tributaries. A full list of crossing, and the methodologies proposed are provided in Environmental Statement volume 4, annex 3.5: Crossing Schedule (onshore).</p> <p>It is noted that since the PEIR, refined route at landfall has been identified (western re-route around Kelling) and the area identified for landfall works has reduced. This was informed by a number of factors including community feedback in the area of Kelling and Weybourne, avoidance of the Kelling Heath SSSI/CWS and Holiday Park as well as engineering/technical considerations.</p> <p>Appropriate mitigation measures for visual disturbance are outlined in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources. This includes, for example, the restoration of habitats (including hedgerows) which cannot be avoided and landscape planting around the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation to minimise impacts. Details</p>



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>46</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>(LWSs); these have been avoided where possible; likewise standard trees. Also as a pre-construction measure the surveys of ponds; where a trenchless installation across a water course will be undertaken where water voles, Desmoulin's whorl snail, white-clawed crayfish and/or otters have been recorded. On construction methods that the landfall cable installation may be by trenchless method beneath Weybourne Cliffs SSSI, we assume by HDD.</p> <p>Table 3.14 continued to page 38: There are two lists where measures to minimise the potential for pollution incidents, and options for trenchless installation. The first lists places where they are identified, seven in all and include the rivers Wensum, Tud and Bure, and associated water bodies. The second list of four locations are being considered and may be identified following the completion of species survey, and include Kelling Heath SSSI and River Glaven head waters and tributaries. We urge that these should be 'promoted'. The first because heather is difficult if not impossible to regenerate following an open cut and backfill; it forms part of an area where much effort has been taken to restore heathland also at nearby at Salthouse, Wiveton Downs and Holt Lowes. There is an impact on Landscape as well as species, and in addition to being much walked they are part of the North Norfolk tourism 'offer'. On the Glaven headwaters, and at the risk of repeating a mantra, we would argue for the central role in the ecological corridor, and that the numbers of protected species would out-compete the other three rivers, albeit not well recognised, 3.11.1.3/3.11.1.4: Weybourne Cliffs are mentioned again, and notes that they are designated SSSI for its geological features, and about 1.8 ha of the land falls within the Ecology and nature conservation area. We comment: this is helpful reminder of in depth on one topic but segregation of others, including landscape and tourism interests. On a specific point, the sand martin colony does need checking ahead of construction. After many years of being located under the Coastguard Cottage, some 3-4 years ago they moved to about 1 km to the east.</p> <p>3.11.1.5: Kelling Heath returns with a statement that 5.2 ha of heathland habitat falls inside the onshore cable corridor, which is 5.2% of the SSSI. Then we have: Although restoration would be put in place, restoration of heathland is not guaranteed and can take many years to succeed. In addition the maximum design scenario would involve three separate trenching operations over an 11 year period, and it is considered that heathland restoration would not succeed except potentially in the very long term given the repeat disturbance that would result in this scenario. We comment, and make some general points here: Much effort has been put in to extend precious habitat, such as heathland, and we should not be reversing his by knocking lumps off in some places. Further the EIA 'system' rightly takes a view as a safety net that the impact of a maximum dimension should be considered as a scenario. However an 11 year vacuum in many situations would be ruinous, not least by some pernicious weeds (as defined by Defra) such as thistles; but also invasive plant species such as Himalayan Balsam, which on the Glaven the RGCG spend much time seeking to eradicate. There is also a major issue on many and various individual sites of sediment run-off. Should you wish to visit and area already badly affected by Himalayan Balsam, then visit the Wensum or Bure; the same applies there for arable run-off, and near extinction of the white-clawed crayfish. The EU Habitat Regulations state that a development for a river such as the SAC Wensum should not make matters worse than the already are. The same principle should apply to our other Chalk Rivers. The Water Directive Framework seeks to improve the ecology status of all our rivers, those affected by the development are described as moderate condition, except the Bure classified as poor.</p> <p>There are other paragraphs that we have 'marked up', but to comment would become repetitive and unnecessary as regards ecology and nature conservation; and some have appeared in the N-TS section. For this and the Landscape Chapter we will respond again at the next consultation step, and in addition likely to submit further information on the Glaven for species and habitats in the context of the ecological network.</p>		<p>of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.</p>
Swannington with Alderford and Little Witchingham Parish Council	<p>Cables and pipes: although Dong should be able to easily identify public utility services, being a rural area there is a likelihood that there are privately-owned pipes near the construction area. How will Dong identify these so as to prevent rupturing these?</p>	N	<p>Hornsea Three review public records to identify existing utilities which may be affect by the project. In respect to those not on the public record, a more detailed utility search would be undertaken during the detailed phase to identify any local supplies.</p>



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>46</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Kelling Parish Council (Barbara Young)	<p><b>PEIR</b> - Arable fields have not yet recovered from the last cables buried a few years ago. The thought of spreading the work over 3 phases, and scarring the fields again and again, is horrifying.</p>	Y	<p>During the design refinement Hornsea Three has sought to minimise the duration of any disruption, and has reduced the total number of phases from three to two, and reduced the duration of the construction phase onshore from eleven to eight years. Within this, the maximum duration for construction of the onshore cable corridor is approximately 2.5 years, this therefore means that the maximum duration over which construction could occur would be 5.5 years incorporating two phases (assuming a three-year gap between the two phases). The work associated with each phase is expected to progress along the Hornsea Three onshore cable corridor with a typical active construction works duration of three months at any particular location.</p> <p>Prior to construction commencing a Schedule of Condition of the land will be taken and following the completion of the construction works all land directly impacted by the onshore works would be re-instated to their current condition .</p>
Kelling Parish Council (Barbara Young)	<p><b>Further Comments</b> - Green energy is important in protecting our planet. We should, likewise, try to protect areas of outstanding natural beauty. Our rural economy relies heavily on tourism and farming - these industries need respect and protection</p>	I	<p>An assessment of impacts on the AONB is presented in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources. To inform this process, Hornsea Three has consulted with the Norfolk Coast Partnership, as well as local authorities, in regard to the identification of suitable viewpoints within the AONB.</p> <p>The potential for impacts to interact and impact tourism is addressed in Environmental Statement Volume 3, Chapter 10: Socio-economics and concludes that there would be no significant effects on tourism as a result of Hornsea Three.</p> <p>In respect to agricultural use, during the construction phase, there would be a permanent loss of land predominantly associated with the onshore HVAC booster station and onshore HVDC converter/HVAC substation, together with the temporary loss of the "best and most versatile" agricultural land along the Hornsea Three onshore cable corridor. Following the completion of the construction phase or phases and the restoration of temporarily affected land to its former agricultural use, as far as possible. An assessment of the effects of this on both agricultural land classification as well as farming operations are presented in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 6: Land Use and Recreation.</p>
<b>Section 42: Local Authorities (prescribed under section 43 of the Act)</b>			
Norfolk County Council	<p>Historic Environment 5.20 The historic environment assessment so far is based only on the known archaeological assets and the potential exists for previously unidentified heritage assets with archaeological interest (yet unestablished significance) to be present along the unevaluated sections of the onshore cable route. Norfolk County Council have previously advised the applicant that further archaeological survey work (including geophysical survey and trial trenching) will be required post-consent along the whole of the onshore cable route which will in turn inform the mitigation measures to be adopted (i.e. to avoid archaeological remains). Consequently, the assessment of the overall impact of the proposals on undesignated heritage assets with archaeological interest can only be provisional at this stage.</p> <p>Comments DONG Energy and their heritage consultant (RPS) should continue to review the setting of the designated heritage assets affected by the booster station and substation and produce supporting visualisations for the EIA in consultation with Historic England and Norfolk County Council. The PEIR and EIA need to explicitly acknowledge that further archaeological survey work is required on the whole of the onshore cable route before mitigation measures for undesignated heritage assets can be agreed. A clear strategy and programme for this work needs to be agreed with Norfolk County Council and Historic England and be fully set out in the EIA.</p>	I	<p>Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 5.1: Desk Based Assessment provides a map regression search* on the basis of the onshore elements of Hornsea Three as well as compounds, storage areas and access roads. Visualisations have been prepared where potential significant effects were identified and are included in Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 5.7: Historic Environment Visualisations. Measures adopted as part of Hornsea Three are delineated in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 5: Historic Environment, Table 5.13 and Table 5.14.</p> <p>*A map regression search is a search of historic maps to look for any previously unrecorded remains (i.e. buildings identifiable on an early maps).</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>46</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Planning, South Norfolk Council	3) How do you propose to minimise the impact of the substation (visual, heritage, transport impacts for example)?	I	Mitigation measures relevant to the onshore HVDC converter/HVAC substation have been identified in each topic chapter of the Environmental Statement (see volume 3). Key measures for during the operational phase include: strategic landscaping around the perimeter of the site to screen the site and provide landscape and heritage mitigation and preparation of an operational noise management plan. A number of other measures will be implemented to minimise and manage impacts during construction, as set out in the outline COCP which forms part of the DCO application.
Planning, South Norfolk Council	The Council's response to your consultation was agreed at the Development Management Committee meeting on 13 September 2017 and I enclose a copy of the committee report for your information. Our response to the consultation refers to three key considerations: • Heritage Assets • Landscape • Noise and Pollution	N	Noted, specific comments on these considerations are considered in the following points.
Planning, South Norfolk Council	Any HIA should also to cover undesignated heritage assets, in particular Cavell House, which is in close proximity to the site to the southwest.	I	Potential impacts on Cavell House is assessed within Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 5: Historic Environment.
Planning, South Norfolk Council	In summary, it is considered that further information is required to demonstrate how the proposed development for the substation, in particular, will be designed to consider landscape and heritage impacts, noise, dust, artificial light and private drinking water supply issues raised in more detail below:	I	Through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts from the project, in particular the HVDC converter/HVAC substation on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive ecological receptors. Mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project are outlined in topic specific chapters, and include the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts on local road networks, ecological receptors (e.g. hedgerows) and hydrological features (e.g. main rivers).  In respect to ecology, landscape and heritage impacts this includes, for example, the restoration of habitats (including hedgerows) which cannot be avoided and landscape planting around the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>46</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Planning, South Norfolk Council	<p>Heritage Assets</p> <p>It is considered that it PEIR underplays the potential impact on Keswick Hall, due to only being a Grade II Listed Building, however it is a former country house of some status, by a national architect, with a designed landscape to it southeast and importantly directly faces the site with the landscape in between. Larger structures in the backdrop could have a significant adverse impact on these views and the relationship between the house and its designed garden.</p> <p>At the application stage the application requires a separate Heritage Impact Statement that looks into more detail with regard to the impact on the setting of these heritage assets and importantly fully analyses how the landscape setting contributes to the overall significance of those assets, which is not identified in detail in the PEIR.</p> <p>The assessment with the PEIR places significance as the listing status. This does not relate to how setting might contribute to a building, as for example the landscape parkland to the southeast of Keswick Hall makes a significant contribution to it setting. Mangreen Hall still architectural terms faces north and although its parkland has degraded and been replaced with agricultural fields, any development to the north of the Hall (as indicated with the orange land) could result in less than substantial but still significance harm to the setting of the heritage asset through removing its rural setting and affecting the important northern aspect of the hall. There are views from the hall looking north and vice versa, looking back from the fields to the hall. Gowthorpe is an earlier moated manor with more of an agricultural setting potentially large structures in the distance could affect its rural isolation in views particularly as there are footpaths around the site and if they are considered structures/buildings that are alien in a rural context and detract from views to and from the heritage assets.</p>	I	<p>A Heritage Impact Statement is provided within Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 5.1: Desk Based Assessment. This examines the setting baseline in some detail.</p> <p>The assessment of the impact, if any, of Hornsea Three on the settings of heritage assets, including Keswick Hall, Mangreen Hall and Gowthorpe has been undertaken in accordance with the steps outlined at paragraph 19 of 'The Setting of Heritage Assets' Historic England GPA 3 2017. Further assessment of the effect of Hornsea Three on Keswick Hall including a visualisation, is provided within this chapter, particularly at Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 5: Historic Environment, paragraph 5.11.1.92 et seq. and in volume 6, annex 5.7: Historic Environment Visualisations.</p>
Planning, South Norfolk Council	<p>Comments regarding some of heritage assets in more detail:</p> <p>Mangreen Hall and Associated buildings</p> <p>To the north of Mangreen Lane historic maps show historic avenue planting which a designed landscape associated with the house. The house has its principal elevation facing North and was purposely designed to be viewed arriving along this avenue from the north. Although this planting has been removed, and there are new buildings to the north of the house as well as screening, there is always the possibility that the historic setting could be reinstated.</p> <p>There are also indications of the DMV and field workings around the Hall and these need to be taken into account: <a href="http://www.heritage.norfolk.gov.uk/record-details?MNF58680">http://www.heritage.norfolk.gov.uk/record-details?MNF58680</a>. These will all have an impact on the location of buildings and potential screening by landscaping (including bunding/tree planting etc.) Mangreen is not included in the archaeology section, although as para 139 states "Non-designated heritage assets of archaeological interest that are demonstrably of equivalent significance to scheduled monuments, should be considered subject to the policies for designated heritage assets.</p> <p>With PEIR the potential (para 5.10.2.60) that the magnitude of impact of Hornsea Three on the designated assets can be considered to be minor as it will have some impact on setting. A large building has the potential to still result in significant harm to the setting of the Hall, and to some extent, particularly if development takes place in close proximity to the north of the hall. It is agreed that the effect of Hornsea Three on the designated assets is assessed as being moderate adverse, which is significant in EIA terms and at an application stage harm could be harmful.</p> <p>There is some potential to affect the setting of Wattle Cottage (Grade II). Although this is a modest cottage with low eaves and dormers, with a more localised setting than Mangreen Hall, the proximity of the works means it is likely to be highly visible and has the potential to impact on the rural setting of cottage. Although not high grade of listing, the degree of impact will be moderate adverse.</p>	I	<p>The historic avenue associated with Mangreen Hall is described in section 1.7 of Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 5.1: Desk Based Assessment. The possibility of the new buildings to the north of the house and screening being removed and the avenue being reinstated is noted, but seems unlikely, given the extent of work required and the effect on listed buildings and their settings. Impacts have been assessed against the current baseline as per the methodology set out Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 5: Environmental Impact Assessment Methodology.</p> <p>Consultation with Norfolk County Council Archaeology has not identified an issue with the deserted medieval village at Mangreen Hall but the effect of Hornsea Three on this asset is considered in the paragraphs 5.11.1.61 to 5.11.1.69 of Environmental Statement, volume 3, chapter 5: Historic Environment. An assessment of the impact of Hornsea Three on Wattle Cottage is provided in paragraphs 5.11.1.61 to 5.11.1.69 of the same chapter.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>46</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Planning, South Norfolk Council	<p><b>Keswick Hall</b> With regard to Keswick Hall, the landscaped park to the south east of the hall is an important aspect contributing to its setting in terms of views to and from the hall. Although the building was designed by a well-known national architect, William Wilkins, subsequent alterations and extensions to turn the hall into a teacher training college has led to a Grade II listing. Although the hall has seen significant extensions, the principal historic part of the building i.e. the central 3 storey pedimented classical façade, faces SE towards its historic parkland.</p> <p>Although the bypass already has a significant impact in terms of noise, its low level means that vehicles are only very partially glimpsed and not really noticed in the view. On the other hand, although trees may provide some screening, a large and tall structure to the south east of the parkland has the potential to be seen in views from the Hall through the parkland. Although further assessment needs to be made, it is suggested that there is more potential for greater impact than has been identified.</p>	I	A further baseline description is provided in the in section 1.7 of Environmental Statement, volume 6, annex 5.1: Desk Based Assessment. An assessment of the impact of Hornsea Three on Keswick Hall is provided in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 5: Historic Environment, section 5.11. In addition a visualisation from a viewpoint at Keswick Hall is included in Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 5.7: Historic Environment Visualisations to assess the likely effect of Hornsea Three on the designated asset.
Planning, South Norfolk Council	<p><b>Gowthorpe Manor House</b> This is a complex of various buildings including Grade II* Manor House itself. The buildings are some distance to the south and the building generally face away from the site. The roof tops are visible from Mangreen Lane. Depending on height of the development the isolated setting of the building cluster may be harmed. The isolated nature of this rural cluster is a of significance, however there are fields between development and the house. Unlike Keswick or Mangreen, there is no indication of a designed landscape around the house and therefore its setting is characterised both in the modern day and historically by agricultural fields. If structures are visible it may result in a degree of harm and the building cluster needs to be included in a Heritage Impact Statement once it is clearer what structures are actually planned.</p>	I	<p>Further baseline is provided in section 1.7 of Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 5.1: Desk Based Assessment, whilst an assessment of the impact of Hornsea Three on Gowthorpe Manor House is provided in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 5: Historic Environment, section 5.11.</p> <p>A visualisation from a viewpoint at Gowthorpe Manor House is included in Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 5.7: Historic Environment Visualisations to assess the likely effect of Hornsea Three on the designated asset.</p>
Planning, South Norfolk Council	<p><b>Dunston Hall</b> With regard to Dunston Hall, the existing station is well screen to the west of the Norwich Road, and the hall and parkland is to East, with extensive tree banding. Historically the House and its landscape parkland were always to the east of the Norwich Road.</p>	I	Noted.
Planning, South Norfolk Council	<p><b>Caistor Old Hall and St Edmunds</b> With regard to Caistor Old Hall and St Edmunds the degree of harm is considered to be moderate/adverse. However, with the distance, separation provided by the parkland of Dunston Hall and landscaping provided around the sand and gravel pit, and land levels, it is likely that there will not be any significant impact, if any, on those heritage assets. These should be included in HIA assessment, together with archaeology of Caistor Roman Fort, if only to discount that the Heritage Assets that will be impacted upon.</p>	I	<p>The likely effect of Hornsea Three on Caistor Hall is considered in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 5: Historic Environment.</p> <p>A HIA is provided in Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 5.1: Desk Based Assessment. St Edmunds Church and Dunston Manor are considered in Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 5.4: Screening Assessment – Onshore HVDC Converter/HVAC Substation.</p> <p>A visualisation from a viewpoint at Venta Icenorum is included in Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 5.7: Historic Environment Visualisations to assess the likely effect of Hornsea Three on the designated assets there.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>46</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 42: Persons with an interest in the land (prescribed under section 44 of the Act)</b>			
Christopher Bond, Bidwells, on behalf of Nicholas Evans-Lombe	<p>Nicholas Evans-Lombe — Land at Little Melton</p> <p>Little Melton has been identified in the emerging Greater Norwich Development Partnership options for growth for levels of growth in all options.</p> <p>The original route for this length of the cables passes through land submitted to the Greater Norwich Local Plan — Call for Sites Consultation Response in July 2016, being land to the west of Little Melton considered as a sustainable location for future growth, with no insurmountable constraints to development and based on an appropriate density and allowing for open space requirements, in total the site can provide the delivery of up to 350 dwellings. Please see attached Bidwells plan marked 'B' showing the land in question.</p> <p>The suggested route also passes close to (south) of the Church of St Mary All Saints on Mill Lane, this being a Grade II listed church, and works in close proximity to this structure would cause unnecessary disruption and possible damage.</p> <p>The suggested route passes close to (north) of [REDACTED] and adjoining properties and works in close proximity to these structures would cause unnecessary disruption and possible damage.</p>	N/A	Client details and allocation of land in Little Melton for development plan and in call for sites noted.
Jane Kenny, Savills, on behalf of Salle & Heydon Estate	<p>Salle and Heydon Estate</p> <p>Both Estates are appreciative of the alternative route being proposed. However it is not possible to provide constructive comments on the alternative route shown purple on page 5 of 10 of the On Shore Statutory Consultation Plan as there is no detail contained within the PEIR as these routes have not yet been surveyed and no consultation been undertaken with the landowners. Our clients wish for it to be noted that these Estates have been in the families for many generations and not only have very many environmental assets but historical significance which must be protected for future generations. There is also concern that the appropriate information has been obtained from the land identified to form part of the scheme as no access to undertake surveys has been allowed for some time. The proposed scheme will cause considerable disruption to the Christmas Tree business.</p>	Y	<p>Comments noted. Access has not been possible due to this being refused. Earlier request from the estates for an alternative route is being considered in order to attempt to reduce impact to the estates.</p> <p>The proposals should have no impact on the Christmas Tree business, however should this occur then appropriate compensation will be payable on receipt of a claim with sufficient supporting evidence.</p> <p>Note: Dalcour Maclaren attended a site meeting on 10 August 2017 - feedback to DONG/Orsted and the comments were taken into account in the cable routing design meetings.</p>
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co on behalf of Kelling Estate	<p>Archaeology</p> <p>All of the following sites are in the path of the proposed line of works and although not scheduled, each one holds valuable historical information. The impact of the proposed works on these lesser known historical features will need to be investigated.</p> <p>Monument (38355) Site of World War Two Pillbox and Slit Trenches on the edge of Muckleburgh Hill. This is in the centre of the proposed path of works.</p> <p>Monument (27206) Possible World War Two earthworks and post medieval boundary.</p> <p>Monument (29527) Post Medieval Lime Kiln in Devil's Plantation. This is in the centre of The proposed path of works.</p> <p>monument (29587) Kelling Hall, enclosure and trackway. Field 4371 is aesthetically part of the Kelling Hall Estate designation.</p> <p>Monument (27168) Site of possible Bronze Age ring ditch and other features.</p> <p>SEE FIGURE IN KELLING ENVIRONMENTAL REPORT</p>	Y	Areas of historical value are noted and have all been avoided by the refined cable route, except for part of 27168. Monument 29527 is proposed to be crossed via HDD, therefore not having a surface impact on potential archaeology.
Tom Corfield (on behalf of Lady M A Prince-Smith Morton Hall Estate)	<p>viii) General</p> <p>The Morton Hall Estate is an historic estate with a rich history. The Hall and grounds were used in the war for training purposes and unexploded ordinance has been found as recently as 18 months ago.</p> <p>Great care therefore needs to be taken in this location and a full sweep of the intended route should be carried out.</p> <p>On a similar note, care needs to be given to Archaeology, how will this be dealt with?</p>	I	Information on Unexploded Ordinance (UXO) is appreciated and has already been noted from earlier correspondence. Nonintrusive archaeology surveys have already been undertaken on certain sections of the route corridor following consultation with Norfolk County Council's Historic Environmental Records (HER) department, but it is likely that further archaeology surveys will be undertaken prior to construction, again in line with the Council's HER department.



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>46</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
D.N Gray	<b>PEIR</b> - The enclosed field map (TG1218-0889) includes sites of: Bat area (surveyed), small ancient bell picked up, very old earthworks inside big covert.	I	Environmental Statement volume 6, annexes 3.1 - 3.14 report on the full suite of ecological baseline surveys undertaken to inform the assessment of impacts on ecology and nature conservation as reported in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation. Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 3.8: Bat surveys provide a description of the current baseline in relation to bats.  An assessment of impacts on heritage assets is provided in Environmental Statement, volume 3, chapter 5: Historic Environment. Baseline information is also presented within this chapter and its accompanying annexes, in particular Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 5.1: Desk Based Assessment.
Kate Willcox	This is unclear as to whether this area of Heydon will be affected, which is a Conservation Area. This area of Heydon is a Conservation Zone and as such supports a range of wildlife and insect life which will be affected by this work.	I	Impacts associated with Heydon, including Heydon Conservation Area and the registered park and gardens at Heydon Hall are addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 5: Historic Environment.  Impacts on ecological receptors are addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation.
<b>Section 47: Duty to Consult Local Community</b>			
Ann Abbott	13. I am in favour of the course running west of the village at Kelling Hard providing it skirts residents homes, the museum, and Kelling Hotel, as it will not impede the Beck stream in Weybourne village which is a rare chalk stream (b) the village should not be disrupted so much (c) it should not affect the tourists coming to the beach or walkers along the coastal path, visitors to the Museum, Hotels B and Bs - although I don't know about the fishermen.	Y	Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport confirms that traffic does not need to travel through Kelling. Construction traffic associated with the proposed works will travel along A149 through to Weybourne and utilise the haul road constructed as part of the cable installation works which will extend between A149 and Holgate Hill (and ensure that construction vehicle associated with the project can travel off the public highway network).  Impacts relating to hydrology, recreational users and tourism are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapters 2: Hydrology and Flood risk; chapter 6: Land Use and Recreation and chapter 10: socio-economics respectively.
Beverley Wigg	The disruption caused by both the cable route and the booster station are unacceptable in this rural landscape, which is also happens to be an important area for tourism especially self catering cottages and B&B style accommodation.	I	Potential impacts associated with Hornsea Three, particularly the onshore cable corridor and the HVAC booster station are addressed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement.  The potential for impacts to interact and impact tourism is addressed in Environmental Statement Volume 3, Chapter 10: Socio-economics, whilst impacts on recreational resources are addressed in volume 6: Land Use and Recreation. The former concludes that there would be no significant effects on tourism as a result of Hornsea Three.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>46</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Susan Allen	<p>Following my attendance at the Reepham Drop In, the main points I would like to feed back to you regarding the Hornsea Three Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The disruption caused by both the cable route and the booster station are unacceptable in this rural landscape, in an area which is very important for tourism – including self catering cottages and B&amp;B style accommodation – farming and community leisure.</li> </ul>	I	<p>Potential impacts associated with Hornsea Three, particularly the onshore cable corridor and the HVAC booster station are addressed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement.</p> <p>The potential for impacts to interact and impact tourism is addressed in Environmental Statement Volume 3, Chapter 10: Socio-economics, whilst impacts on recreational resources are addressed in volume 6: Land Use and Recreation. The former concludes that there would be no significant effects on tourism as a result of Hornsea Three.</p> <p>In respect to agricultural use, during the construction phase, there would be a permanent loss of land predominantly associated with the onshore HVAC booster station and onshore HVDC converter/HVAC substation, together with the temporary loss of the “best and most versatile” agricultural land along the Hornsea Three onshore cable corridor. Following the completion of the construction phase or phases and the restoration of temporarily affected land to its former agricultural use, as far as possible. An assessment of the effects of this on both agricultural land classification as well as farming operations are presented in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 6: Land Use and Recreation.</p>
David Ramsbotham	<p>You may recall our correspondence when I was the Norfolk County Councillor for the Melton Constable Division. I confirm that the various issues raised are still of concern to me as a resident of the area. In particular I feel that the onshore HVAC booster station should be avoided at all costs. This would create an unacceptable industrial blot on the landscape affecting the environment for local residents and tourism which is the life blood of the area.</p>	N	<p>Potential impacts associated with Hornsea Three, particularly the onshore cable corridor and the HVAC booster station are addressed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement.</p> <p>The potential for impacts to interact and impact tourism is addressed in Environmental Statement Volume 3, Chapter 10: Socio-economics, whilst impacts on recreational resources are addressed in volume 6: Land Use and Recreation. The former concludes that there would be no significant effects on tourism as a result of Hornsea Three.</p> <p>The need for the HVAC booster station is set out in the Environment Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>46</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Friends of North Norfolk	<p>17. PEIR Volume 3, which deals with onshore impacts. We have great concerns that the additional cables, very large offshore and onshore Reactive Compensation Installations and works which would be required if HVAC Transmission is used would have a major adverse impact on very sensitive Receptors taken cumulatively with other major developments, either recently completed or proposed. Both the Dudgeon and Sheringham Shoal Wind Farms make landfall at Weybourne; and if HVAC Transmission is utilised it will mean more and very much greater works over a prolonged period both to the East and West affecting a key part of the Norfolk Coast AONB, Norfolk Heritage Coast and the Norfolk/ English National Trail.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Chapter 4 Landscape and Visual Resources.</li> <li>- Chapter 5 Historic Environment.</li> <li>- Chapter 6 Land Use and Recreation.</li> <li>- Chapter 8 Noise and Vibration.</li> <li>- Chapter 11 Inter Related Effects.</li> </ul>	I	<p>An assessment of impacts on the AONB is presented in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources. To inform this process, Hornsea Three has consulted with the Norfolk Coast Partnership, as well as local authorities, in regard to the identification of suitable viewpoints within the AONB.</p> <p>Where the onshore cable corridor crossed public rights of way, Hornsea Three has sought to avoid impacts through the use of HDD technology. Where this has not been possible and thus open cut, or HDD with a haul road over, is proposed, the routes will be temporarily diverted along existing tracks, for a maximum of one month per cable. Following the completion of the construction works all areas of access land, recreational resources, PRoWs and other linear routes affected by the onshore works would be re-instated to their current condition and/or along their current alignments. There would be no physical effects on these resources arising from the operation or maintenance of Hornsea Three. The measures to be taken to ensure the continued use of all linear recreational resources during the construction phase of the project have been discussed with Norfolk County Council and are set out in the Outline CoCP. This dialogue will continue during the detailed design process. The assessment of impacts on individual public rights of way (where appropriate) are set out in Environmental Statement, volume 3, chapter 6: Land Use and Recreation.</p> <p>Following the completion of the construction works all areas of access land, recreational resources, PRoWs and other linear routes affected by the onshore works would be re-instated to their current condition and/or along their current alignments. There would be no physical effects on these resources arising from the operation or maintenance of Hornsea Three. The measures to be taken to ensure the continued use of all linear recreational resources during the construction phase of the project have been discussed with Norfolk County Council and are set out in the Outline CoCP. This dialogue will continue during the detailed design process.</p> <p>The potential for cumulative effects as a result Hornsea Three in combination with other major developments is assessed in each of the topic chapters of the Environmental Statement (see volume 3).</p>
Anthony Thomas	I have control over land in Weston Longville. I understand you are considering a "construction compound". I am wondering if the supply of land might be something we could help you with. Perhaps you will give this matter some thought?	Y	This alternative was considered by the project, but the Main Construction Compound proposed near Weston Longville has not been taken forward to the application. The Main Construction Compound for the project will be located at Oulton Airfield, accessed off the B1149.
Robert and Jane Scarfe	We object to these cables passing very close to our homes and those of our neighbours on the Great Melton Road. In our view Little Melton has absolutely nothing to gain and potentially everything to lose. We attended a meeting hosted by Dong for affected parish councils where we asked questions. The six spaced trenches on the Parochial Charity field seem likely to take up the entire width of the field between the Crusaders Rugby Club and Great Melton Road.	N	Noted and yes, the cables do take up the majority of the field between Great Melton Road and the rugby club. The difficulty of routing through this area is described further below.
Robert and Jane Scarfe	Parochial charity land beside Great Melton Road And we would ask the Parochial Charity to consider whether they have the right, given their duty to do good for Little Melton parishioners, to subject village residents to potential health risk and audiological nuisance. It would also constrain future use of the land, which may breach their duty and obligations as Trustees. We would also like to know what Dong are proposing to pay for wayleave and what they would do with the money. In this instance we consider the Trustees of the charity owe full transparency to the village in general and the residents of Great Melton Road in particular.	N	The Parochial Charity will be approached for a voluntary landowner agreement between Orsted and themselves on standard terms, which are confidential. However, the project will also seek compulsory acquisition powers to use the land in the event that an agreement cannot be reached.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>46</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Rt Hon Norman Lamb MP	Most people I speak to support the idea of offshore wind energy but are concerned about the industrial sites that will be created if the company uses an AC current along the cable.	I	Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts to local residential receptors, either through site selection/route refinement or through the identification of suitable mitigation measures. Where there are impacts to residential receptors, these are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3), for example noise during the operation of the HVDC converter/HVAC substation is addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 8: Noise and Vibration.
Rt Hon Norman Lamb MP	They also have misgivings, which I share, about the plans for a phased delivery of the project that could last for nearly a decade. Were that to happen it would have a major adverse effect on residents' lives, livelihoods- especially fishing and tourism- and environment and a lasting impact on transport infrastructure, wider tourism, flora and fauna.	Y	During the design refinement Hornsea Three has sought to minimise the duration of any disruption, and has reduced the total number of phases from three to two, and reduced the duration of the construction phase onshore from eleven to eight years.  Potential impacts from Hornsea Three on socio-economic and tourism are identified and assessed in Environmental Statement Volume 3, Chapter 10: Socio-Economics. Taking into consideration the mitigation designed into Hornsea Three, no significant adverse effects are predicted.  Impacts from Hornsea Three on transport and ecological receptors are assessed in Environment Statement volume 3, chapters 7: Traffic and Transport and chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation. Inter-related effects on local residents, as a result of impact interactions, are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 11: Inter-related Effects.
Anna Brookman, Strutt & Parker LLP (general comments)	How will soil storage and reinstatement be carried out, and will there be active weed control Our clients have worked hard to ensure that their soils are in the best condition possible in order to allow them to farm productively. It is there for essential that op and subsoil are stored separately and reinstated in the correct manner. A detail specification should be provided detailing how the soil will be moved, stored and replaced.	I	Soil storage and reinstatement are covered within the Environmental Statement, and will be refined once a construction contractor has been appointed by Ørsted.
Anna Brookman, Strutt & Parker LLP (general comments)	Our clients are long term land owners and cropping and grazing rotations are planned many years in advance. A project of this scale can be incorporated within this management schedule provided that the information required from the developers is provided as early as viably possible with as much details as is available. This will ensure that their businesses can continue to function well and would strengthen the relationship between the developers and occupiers, creating a better working relationship.	N/A	Indicative timescales of the earliest work could commence have been provided. Following an award of a DCO and CfD subsidies, more accurate timescales will be available and provided to landowners and agents accordingly.
Anna Brookman, Strutt & Parker LLP (general comments)	Details of the link box locations and their distance from the junction bays The maximum size specification of each of these has been provided in the PEIR documents, however, there is no reference to their locality to each other. These are permanent fixtures and although there is stated intention of installing them in field boundaries, there is the possibility that cable lengths will not accommodate this. More information on this would be greatly appreciated by the land occupying community to enable us to best plan how to work with the permanent infrastructure left on the surface.	I	Hornsea Three confirmed the location of the joint bays and link boxes will only be able to be confirmed once a DCO has been granted, cable design confirmed and order, and a construction contractor appointed. Link boxes will be located on field boundaries, where possible, and in line with landowner discussions in order to minimise the impact to ongoing agricultural operations.
Anna Brookman, Strutt & Parker LLP (general comments)	How will the project installation be phased A provisional indication on how many stages the project will be installed in, how long it is intended for trenches to remain open and how the commissioning work will be undertaken would enable us to better advise our clients on land management during the works.	Y	Hornsea Three confirmed the project could now be constructed in a maximum of two phases as opposed to three. Trenches themselves are likely to only remain open for a number of days whilst the cables, or ducting, is installed and then backfilled. The joint bays will be open for longer periods of time to allow jointing and commissioning work to be completed.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>46</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Anna Brookman, Strutt & Parker LLP (general comments)	How will the corridor be fenced, when will this be constructed, what access will be required to the corridor and how will occupiers cross the corridor No information regarding this is easily identifiable within the PEIR document, but this will be the first part of the construction project to directly affect the land owners and occupiers. Information relating to how early in the construction phase the fencing will be installed and how long it will remain in place would be gratefully received by the occupiers. This will assist in the ongoing land management plans, and enable our clients to alter cropping and grazing rotations to accommodate the project rather than be disrupted by it. It would be beneficial for there to be access points across the cable corridor which can be used whilst an area is not under construction. This will enable the impact of the development to be minimised.	I	Fencing requirements and specification will be determined once construction methods and contractor appointment are further developed. (NOTE: some sections of working corridor may not be fenced for access, egress or for other engineering reasons). Crossing points may be possible along the working corridor by request where these are feasible and suitable.
Anna Brookman, Strutt & Parker LLP (general comments)	When and how will the aspects of the PEIR document which are currently marked as "lack of data" and "not fully evaluated" be updated These terms are used extensively throughout the documents and leave a number of gaps in the information. Proceeding without having collected sufficient data and fully evaluated the aspects which require it will surely lead to issues further down the project timeline which could have been avoided.	N/A	These sections will be updated and included within the DCO application.
Anna Brookman, Strutt & Parker LLP (general comments)	The specific concerns of the clients we are representing are as follows: Will the cables will be ducted or not A number of our clients are concerned about the possibility that unducted cables may cause localised ground warming which would affect soil health and plant growth. Because of this, clarity on whether or not the cables which will be installed by the developer are going to be ducted would be appreciated.	I	The possibility of ducting should have minimal impact on any possible localised heat released from the cables. Confirmation on whether the cables will be ducted or not will be confirmed following granting of the DCO.
National Farmers Union (NFU)	The National Farmers Union represents over 47,000 farmers and growers across England and Wales. NFU members will be affected in Norfolk from the proposed onshore cables which will connect the offshore wind farm to either an high voltage direct current (HVDC) converter station or a high voltage alternating current (HVAC) substation. This will then connect in to the National Grid substation. Our members have a number of concerns and issues with the proposals of the onshore cables which are highlighted below:	N/A	Hornsea Three noted the comments, but no further action was required
National Farmers Union (NFU)	Conclusion Due to the lack of information and consultation the NFU requests that further specific one to one meetings are held for landowners, farmers and their agents to provide the information required. The NFU would also like to have a meeting direct with Dong Energy and their agents to discuss all of the issues/concerns highlighted above.	Y	Hornsea Three confirmed that individual landowner discussions will continue throughout the process and the NFU will be invited to general meetings/updates throughout the process as well.
National Farmers Union (NFU)	AC v DC Cables: It is our understanding that the cables will come inland at Weybourne on the north Norfolk Coast and the cable corridor will run to the National Grid substation at Norwich Main (just south of Norwich). It has been highlighted that the cables could be either HVDC, HVAC or a combination of both. This will involve building a booster station and converter substation. The NFU would like to receive further information as to why the cables cannot be HVDC as it is understood that less land will be required to lay the cables, the easement width required will be less and so have less impact on agricultural businesses and no link boxes are required with HVDC. This further reduces the disturbance and impact on agricultural operations. It is being said that the only reason for not laying HVDC cables is the cost. The NFU would like for this to be qualified. It is not acceptable for a greater easement with restrictions to be taken for HVAC cables due to the cost of the cables and laying the cables	N	Hornsea Three confirmed it is investigating both options, an AC and/or DC cable solution, and is showing the worst case scenario width of cable easement accordingly - a decision has not yet been made on technology. The construction corridor will be up to 80m in width.



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>46</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
National Farmers Union (NFU)	<p>Booster Station</p> <p>The NFU would like further clarification as to why the proposed Booster station is not being built on a brown field site? Whilst the cost of this may be greater for Dong Energy, there would be significantly less impact on farmers and their agricultural businesses.</p>	N	The HVAC Booster Station must be located along the route of the cables, which are routed through rural areas in order to avoid impacting built up and urban areas. Brownfield sites were investigated but were ruled out an early stage for this reason.
National Farmers Union (NFU)	<p>Construction</p> <p>The project involves laying 6 large cable ducts over a width of 60 metres along some of the most productive Grade 1, 2 and 3a land classification farmland in Norfolk. The ducts will be buried so most farming operations can take place on top of them, but as set out below, farmers are extremely concerned about the depth that cables will be buried. Further clarification and detail is requested on the depth of the cables?</p> <p>There is concern over how the cables will be laid, the actual construction technique used. Details are requested on open cut and directional drilling? Will the cables be ducted and if not why not?</p>	I	Hornsea Three confirmed that some of the construction decisions mentioned will not be made until a later date, however the Environmental Statement will set out the worst-case project proposals for each technique, so that landowners will be fully informed.
National Farmers Union (NFU)	<p>Jointing bays</p> <p>It is understood from other projects that 'Jointing Bays' should be all underground and will not interfere with agricultural operations. Confirmation of this would be gratefully received.</p>	N/A	Hornsea Three confirmed that jointing bays will all be located underground.
National Farmers Union (NFU)	<p>Link boxes.</p> <p>It is understood that link boxes will be needed if the cables are HVAC cables and they are normally placed at least every 600 to 800 metres on a cable run. Clarification is needed on how many link boxes will be needed at the end of every run? Link boxes do stand proud above ground level and so greatly interfere with agricultural operations and are a hazard to farm machinery. It is requested that link boxes where possible are located in field boundaries or field corners to reduce the interference on farming operations. However, we suspect that they will be placed where the cable runs out, i.e. literally every 600 to 800 metres along the route. This will inevitably mean that most of the link boxes will be in fields and subject to damage and extra costs for farmers in avoiding them and not cropping areas of land around the obstruction. It is extremely important to have further design information on link boxes and the siting of them. This includes will any link boxes be located in a cluster and how will they be marked/identified/fenced.</p>	I	The location of the joint bays and link boxes will only be able to be confirmed once a DCO has been granted, cable design has been confirmed, and a construction contractor appointed. Link boxes will be located on field boundaries, where possible, and in line with landowner discussions in order to minimise the impact to ongoing agricultural operations.
National Farmers Union (NFU)	<p>Time to Construct</p> <p>The underground infrastructure of these cables and the construction required to lay these cables will be some of the largest infrastructure some farmers will experience through their land and others are now only to aware from farmers who have been affected by other schemes of how big these developments are and the interference caused. Projects of this size normally take around four and a half years to complete but it is stated that this development may take eleven years to fully construct. A construction timetable needs to be clarified as it is not acceptable for a farm to lose a large strip of land from agricultural production for eleven years. It is likely that some farm businesses will not be able to sustain losing land for that length of time</p>	Y	Hornsea Three could now be constructed in a maximum of two phases as opposed to three. Trenches themselves are likely to only remain open for a number of days whilst the cables, or ducting, is installed with these then being backfilled. The joint bays will be open for longer periods of time to allow jointing and commissioning work to be completed.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>46</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
National Farmers Union (NFU)	<p>Land (Field) Drainage and Soils</p> <p>The major potential lasting damage is to land drainage systems and soils structure. One of the main reasons for the productive land the cable duct route is going through is that the farms are very well drained by a network of clay or plastic land drains laid in parallel every 20 metres or so across the field at depths of up to 1.8 metres draining into a field edge ditch or dyke. These drainage systems prevent water pooling in fields and increase the productive capacity of the agriculture in the area. Good land drainage increases farm productivity by keeping waterlogging to a minimum, increasing soil strength by reducing water content, gives higher soil temperatures and leads to more efficient use of applied fertilisers. According to the Agricultural Notebook the yield advantage for most crops when comparing drained and undrained treatments is typically 10 to 25 per cent.</p> <p>Assuming land drains are laid every 20 metres in farmland (they are laid more closely in some cases) and assuming the whole route is farmland, which it is not, but it mainly is, the cable ducts/trenches will cut thousands of land drains in six places for each land drain.</p> <p>Major pipeline constructors will cut a trench and the land drains then place the pipeline in the trench and re-connect the land drains above the pipe. It is a drainage rule of thumb that with a major pipeline one in every six land drains does not work after the soil is replaced around the pipe. This will not just affect the 60 metre working width but could potentially affect the whole field where the cable duct goes through and therefore every arable field along the route.</p>	I	An independent land drainage consultant will be appointed in order to consider and design pre and post drainage solutions where required.
National Farmers Union (NFU)	<p>Clarification is needed as to whether Dong Energy will lay the cable duct below or above field drainage systems. In some cases this implies laying the cable duct at a depth of 2 metres or more.</p> <p>The NFU would like to agree standard terms of how field drainage will be treated in principle on every farm and for this wording to be taken forward and included in the Development Consent Order. The wording normally covers before, during and after construction. It will be important in places for field drainage to take place outside of the order limits and this will need to be agreed along with a local drainage consultant being taken on by Dong Energy.</p>	I	An independent land drainage consultant will be appointed in order to consider and design pre and post drainage solutions where required.
Hugh Guyatt	<p><b>Temporary Construction</b> - Beach Road car park at Weybourne cannot be used. This would hit local people and the holiday businesses on which which depend for our income.</p>	Y	The beach road car park is not under consideration as a construction compound. Furthermore it is noted that, since the PEIR, a refined landfall location has been identified (western re-route around Kelling) and the area identified for landfall works has reduced. This was informed by a number of factors including community feedback in the area of Kelling and Weybourne, avoidance of the Kelling Heath SSSI/CWS and Holiday Park as well as engineering/technical considerations.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>46</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Pat Floyd	<b>Local Matters Landfall</b> - The coastal path is an important tourist attraction. The car park does sometimes flood but steps are being taken to avoid that. However, if the car park is to be used for excavation equipment and heavy lorries nobody including local fisherman will be able to use it in any way.	I	<p>The Peddar's Way and North Norfolk Coast Path which joins the England Coast Path to the east of Weybourne will be maintained along its existing alignment should HDD be used in the Hornsea Three landfall area. If open trenching is used the route will be temporarily diverted along existing tracks to the immediate south, for a maximum of three months, on up to two occasions. This dedicated route would be robustly fenced and gated in accordance with the Outline CoCP and PRoW Management Plan and the specific measures set out in a Coastal and Beach Access Management Plan to be developed in consultation with, and agreed with Norfolk County Council.</p> <p>Following the completion of the construction works all areas of access land, recreational resources, PRoWs and other linear routes affected by the onshore works would be re-instated to their current condition and/or along their current alignments. There would be no physical effects on these resources arising from the operation or maintenance of Hornsea Three. The measures to be taken to ensure the continued use of all linear recreational resources during the construction phase of the project have been discussed with Norfolk County Council and are set out in the Outline CoCP. This dialogue will continue during the detailed design process.</p> <p>Impacts on the PRoW are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 6: Land Use and Recreation, whilst the corresponding impact on tourism is assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 10: Socio-Economics.</p> <p>In respect to the beach road car park, this is not under consideration as a construction compound and as such would not be directly impacted by Hornsea Three.</p>
Peter Halls	<b>Onshore Cable Corridor</b> - I notice that you are using maps over 30 years old. There is now a caravan site at Station Road Attlebridge not marked.	I	Hornsea Three has sought to use recent maps, where they are available at the required scale. In respect to the caravan site at Station Road Attlebridge, this is shown on the plans which accompany the DCO application and the onshore cable corridor route passes to the west of the site.
Roger Hughes	<b>Temporary Construction</b> - It must be restored to its original land use and condition.	I	Prior to construction commencing a Schedule of Condition of the land will be taken and following the completion of the construction works all land directly impacted by the onshore works would be re-instated to their current condition. Details on impacts to existing land use, and commitments relating to their restoration, are set out Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 6: Land Use and Recreation.
Ray Bennett	<b>HVAC</b> - As the North Norfolk coast is an AONB which will if be possible to bury the stations and return the landscape back to here if was with a small access point?	I	<p>Impacts relating to landscape and visual resources are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual resources. Particular consideration has been given to the AONB as a sensitive receptor, and it is noted that Hornsea Three has consulted with the Norfolk Coast Partnership to agree viewpoints to inform the assessment of impacts on the AONB.</p> <p>Consideration was given to a wide range of potential mitigation in respect to landscape and visual effects of Hornsea Three. The lowering of the HVDC converter/HVAC substation below current ground level was one option which was considered; however, given that multiple underground cables need to connect into this infrastructure, this option would have had significant implications for the depth of cable trenches and thus earthworks needed along a length of the onshore cable corridor. Based on this, Hornsea Three has implemented a range of other mitigation measures which are set out in Environmental Statement Volume 3, Chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Effects. For example, it is recognised that the onshore HVAC booster station and onshore HVDC converter/HVAC substation would not be screened entirely by existing landform or vegetation in some views. As such, an indicative landscape strategy has been developed to assist in mitigating visual and landscape impacts. This is presented in the outline Landscape Management Plan which accompanies the DCO application.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>46</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Ray Bennett	<b>Temporary Construction</b> - None - as long as they are returned to how it was before	I	Prior to construction commencing a Schedule of Condition of the land will be taken and following the completion of the construction works all land directly impacted by the onshore works would be re-instated to their current condition. Details on impacts to existing land use, and commitments relating to their restoration, are set out Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 6: Land Use and Recreation.
George Francis - Swardeston Village Hall	<b>Mitigation Measures</b> - Strong measure for screening, please	Y	Appropriate mitigation measures for visual disturbance are outlined in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources. This includes, for example, the restoration of habitats (including hedgerows) which cannot be avoided and landscape planting around the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application. In addition, areas for potential screening have been included around both the HVAC booster station and HVDC converter/HVAC substation.
Elaine Parkinson	<b>HVAC</b> - Very concerned about potential noise from the transformers once they are commissioned and active. All possible noise/vibration reduction should be employed from the outset (i.e. not considered too difficult once the substation has been built). Every system for noise mitigation must be employed. Public footpaths and farm access (for walkers) must be reinstated and think about creating new ones. Donation to Swardeston and Swainsthorpe community development buildings would be nice	I	<p>Impacts relating to noise from the construction and operation of Hornsea Three, including at the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation sites, are reported in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 8: Noise and Vibration. As part of a suite of mitigation measures (see chapter 8: Noise and Vibration), an operational noise management plan will be prepared and agreed with the local environmental health officer.</p> <p>Following the completion of the construction works all areas of access land, recreational resources, PRoWs and other linear routes affected by the onshore works would be re-instated to their current condition and/or along their current alignments. There would be no physical effects on these resources arising from the operation or maintenance of Hornsea Three. The measures to be taken to ensure the continued use of all linear recreational resources during the construction phase of the project have been discussed with Norfolk County Council and are set out in the Outline CoCP which forms part of the DCO application. This dialogue will continue during the detailed design process.</p> <p>We have established voluntary Community Benefit Funds (CBFs) for a number of our projects, which are currently under construction. These funds can make a valuable contribution to the local area, by supporting projects such as community building improvements and recreation facilities, conservation and wildlife projects etc. Hornsea Project Three will review the interactions of the project, as the proposal is refined and consider an appropriate way to feed benefits back into the local community. However, any decision to establish a community benefit fund for Hornsea Three would be made post financial investment decision (FID).</p>
Sue Lowther	<b>Local Matters Landfall Zone</b> - Peddlars Way and the Norfolk coastal path are very important and should be protected at all costs	I	<p>The Peddar's Way and North Norfolk Coast Path which joins the England Coast Path to the east of Weybourne will be maintained along its existing alignment should HDD be used in the Hornsea Three landfall area. If open trenching is used the route will be temporarily diverted along existing tracks to the immediate south, for a maximum of three months, on up to two occasions. This dedicated route would be robustly fenced and gated in accordance with the Outline CoCP and PRoW Management Plan and the specific measures set out in a Coastal and Beach Access Management Plan to be developed in consultation with, and agreed with Norfolk County Council.</p> <p>Following the completion of the construction works all areas of access land, recreational resources, PRoWs and other linear routes affected by the onshore works would be re-instated to their current condition and/or along their current alignments. There would be no physical effects on these resources arising from the operation or maintenance of Hornsea Three. The measures to be taken to ensure the continued use of all linear recreational resources during the construction phase of the project have been discussed with Norfolk County Council and are set out in the Outline CoCP. This dialogue will continue during the detailed design process.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>46</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Louisa Peaver	<b>PEIR Surveys</b> - PEIR volume 3 chapter 6 land use and recreation does not consider the indefinite impact of the Booster Station. It only discusses the cable corridor. The booster station's visual/noise presence will permanently reduce recreational use of the nearby PROWs. The height of the flood light lamp-posts does not seem to have been considered in the visual assessments	I	<p>Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 6: Land Use and Recreation provides an assessment of potential impacts from Hornsea Three during construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning. It considers impacts from all onshore infrastructure, including the onshore cable corridor, the HVAC booster station, the HVDC converter/HVAC substation, compounds, storage areas and access roads.</p> <p>Any effects on the amenity of visitor resources, including PRoW arising from changes to the visual and acoustic environment are addressed in Environmental Statement, volume 3 chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources and chapter 8: Noise and Vibration respectively.</p> <p>At the HVAC booster station site lighting will only operate when required and will be directional to avoid unnecessary illumination. Given the rochdale envelope approach to assessment within the EIA, the landscape and visual effects assessment considers the maximum design parameters, which the height of any lamp-posts would sit within. This approach is discussed in more detail in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 5: EIA Methodology and Assessment as well as volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources.</p>
Maureen Durrant	<b>Local Matters Landfall Zone</b> - As I walk the heath most days how are we to gain access to public footpaths this does not seem to be taken into consideration have indicated this on my enclosed map	I	<p>Impacts to PRoW at the landfall have been reduced through the design refinement process which has resulted in a smaller area experiencing direct impacts from Hornsea Three. However, where the onshore cable corridor does cross public rights of way, Hornsea Three has sought to avoid impacts through the use of HDD technology. Where this has not been possible and thus open cut, or HDD with a haul road over, is proposed, the routes will be temporarily diverted along existing tracks, for a maximum of one month per cable.</p> <p>Following the completion of the construction works all areas of access land, recreational resources, PRoWs and other linear routes affected by the onshore works would be re-instated to their current condition and/or along their current alignments. There would be no physical effects on these resources arising from the operation or maintenance of Hornsea Three. The measures to be taken to ensure the continued use of all linear recreational resources during the construction phase of the project have been discussed with Norfolk County Council and are set out in the Outline CoCP. This dialogue will continue during the detailed design process.</p> <p>The assessment of impacts on individual public rights of way (where appropriate) are set out in Environmental Statement, volume 3, chapter 6: Land Use and Recreation.</p>
Maureen Durrant	<b>80m Refinement</b> - This should definitely be considered, I understand there will be a tunnel underneath the path along the back of Pineheath properties. Could this not be considered underneath the public footpath?	I	<p>Where the onshore cable corridor crossed public rights of way, Hornsea Three has sought to avoid impacts through the use of HDD technology. Where this has not been possible and thus open cut, or HDD with a haul road over, is proposed, the routes will be temporarily diverted along existing tracks, for a maximum of one month per cable.</p> <p>Following the completion of the construction works all areas of access land, recreational resources, PRoWs and other linear routes affected by the onshore works would be re-instated to their current condition and/or along their current alignments. There would be no physical effects on these resources arising from the operation or maintenance of Hornsea Three. The measures to be taken to ensure the continued use of all linear recreational resources during the construction phase of the project have been discussed with Norfolk County Council and are set out in the Outline CoCP. This dialogue will continue during the detailed design process.</p> <p>The assessment of impacts on individual public rights of way (where appropriate) are set out in Environmental Statement, volume 3, chapter 6: Land Use and Recreation.</p>
Maureen Durrant	<b>EIA</b> - Not enough information regarding access to public footpaths	I	<p>Further information on public rights of way which may be impacted by Hornsea Three is set out in Environmental Statement, volume 3, chapter 6: Land Use and Recreation.</p>



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>46</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Sarah Griggs-Smith	<p><b>Temporary Construction</b> - Tree planting around substation work for noise/fencing. Timescale for this. Access on local lanes. Footpath access. Substation behind the existing trees and hedges which are very old</p>	I	<p>The landscapes within the study areas of the onshore HVAC booster station and onshore HVDC converter/HVAC substation are characterised by fields and local roads enclosed by dense hedgerows, hedgerow trees, tree blocks and woodlands. This provides layers of vegetation that would help to screen and filter views of Hornsea Three, and integrate the onshore HVAC booster station and onshore HVDC converter/HVAC substation into the landscape. As such, Hornsea Three has sought to avoid directly impacting existing features (including trees and hedgerows) through cable routing or the use of trenchless technologies. Any hedgerows which cannot be avoided will be replaced at the end of the construction phase. Furthermore, restoration of hedgerows, currently in poor condition, provides an opportunity to achieve long term benefits for the biodiversity associated with this habitat type as well as gap up hedgerows providing landscape and visual mitigation. Further details on hedgerow removal, retention and replacement can be found in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation as well as the Outline Ecological Management Plan and the Outline Landscape Management Plan which form part of the DCO application.</p> <p>To supplement this existing landscape screening, proposals for mitigation planting have been identified to provide further screening. Landscape proposals are detailed in the Outline LMP which forms part of the DCO application.</p> <p>Hornsea Three has committed to using trenchless technologies to cross all roads, to minimise impacts on the local road network. Similarly, where the onshore cable corridor crossed public rights of way, Hornsea Three has sought to avoid impacts through the use of HDD technology. Where this has not been possible and thus open cut, or HDD with a haul road over, is proposed, the routes will be temporarily diverted along existing tracks, for a maximum of one month per cable. Following the completion of the construction works all PRoWs and other linear routes affected by the onshore works would be re-instated to their current condition and/or along their current alignments. The assessment of impacts on individual public rights of way (where appropriate) are set out in Environmental Statement, volume 3, chapter 6: Land Use and Recreation.</p>
Karl Feistner	<p><b>Onshore Cable</b> - The corridor should utilise agricultural land that can be readily reinstated. It should not affect broadleaf woodland, heath or other fragile habitats that would take many years to recover. Depending upon the time of year of construction, consideration should be given to such things as toad migrations to breeding ponds etc.</p>	I	<p>Hornsea Three has sought to avoid sensitive ecological receptors (including designated sites and sensitive habitats) through cable routing or the use of trenchless technologies (e.g. HDD). Where impacts cannot be avoided, mitigation has been proposed, as set out in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3; Ecology and Nature Conservation.</p>
<b>Section 48:Duty to Publicise</b>			
Simon Walpole	<p>Further to your advertisement in the Norwich Evening News would you please send me a copy of the documents on a USB card. I am a member of the Norfolk Ramblers Rights of Way Sub-Committee and am particularly interested in being able to scope the potential impact of your proposals on public rights of way. This would cover impacts both during the construction/installation phase and in the longer term.</p>	N	<p>Ørsted issued a USB containing the full PEIR and supporting consultation materials to the consultee and the consultee confirmed receipt.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>46</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Douglas Walters (Norfolk Geographical Association)	<b>Local Matters Landfall zone</b> - Just that it doesn't interfere with recreational use - like the Norfolk Coastal path and is built to be flood resistant	Y	Potential impacts from Hornsea Three on recreational receptors, including coastal paths and PRoW are identified and assessed in Environmental Statement chapter 6: Land Use and Recreation. Where the onshore cable corridor crosses public rights of way, Hornsea Three has sought to avoid impacts through the use of HDD technology. However, where open cut, or HDD with a haul road over, is proposed, the routes will be temporarily diverted along existing tracks, for a maximum of one month per cable. In particular, at the landfall, a diversion has been allowed for within the Order Limits.  In respect to flooding, appropriate mitigation measures have been design-in to Hornsea Three to minimise impacts on drainage and flooding. Details are provided in volume 3, chapter 2: Hydrology and Flood Risk (see Table 2.17). The Flood Risk Assessment which has been undertaken for the Project concludes that Hornsea Three meets the requirements of NPS EN-1 and the NPPF.
Richard Perry	<b>80m Refinement</b> - Heavy traffic re HVAC Booster Station location. This effects bridleways which are used every day of the year especially Shrub Farm entrance road to the proposed station. Horses and traffic of a heavy nature do not mix. Also bridleway from Pimlico Cottage towards Plumstead area.	I	Principles for construction traffic management, including interaction with other road or recreational users (e.g. bridleways and pedestrians) are set out in the outline construction traffic management plan (CTMP) which forms part of the DCO application. The CTMP will be developed in consultation with the local authorities during the detailed design stage, in order to identify site specific measures, with separation of users prioritised wherever possible.
Richard Perry	<b>HVAC</b> - Heavy traffic to booster station at New Covert, Old Covert, route from Shrub Farm. This is a bridleway not a road. We use this path every day all year round with our horses. Horses and heavy traffic do not mix. The path is narrow with no get off points if horses and traffic meet. This would be a health and safety issue.	I	Principles for construction traffic management, including interaction with other road or recreational users (e.g. bridleways and pedestrians) are set out in the outline construction traffic management plan (CTMP) which forms part of the DCO application. The CTMP will be developed in consultation with the local authorities during the detailed design stage, in order to identify site specific measures, with separation of users prioritised wherever possible.
Richard Perry	<b>Mitigation Methods</b> - Bridleways: not supporting access for horses if the plans go ahead. Narrow roads needed to access bridleways. No heavy traffic please on road. Edgefield to Little Barningham via Norwich - Holt Road. No access for heavy traffic to this road past Fuel Farm, this is the horse location	I	Principles for construction traffic management, including interaction with other road or recreational users (e.g. bridleways and pedestrians) are set out in the outline construction traffic management plan (CTMP) which forms part of the DCO application. The CTMP will be developed in consultation with the local authorities during the detailed design stage, in order to identify site specific measures, with separation of users prioritised wherever possible.
Richard Perry	<b>Proposal</b> - The disturbance to wildlife and bridleways in the area of Edgefield. Heavy traffic access to rural areas of Norfolk causing disruption to our every day riding of our horses	I	Principles for construction traffic management, including interaction with other road or recreational users (e.g. bridleways and pedestrians) are set out in the outline construction traffic management plan (CTMP) which forms part of the DCO application. The CTMP will be developed in consultation with the local authorities during the detailed design stage, in order to identify site specific measures, with separation of users prioritised wherever possible.  Impacts on ecological receptors are addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation.

Table 3.13: Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Further Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.B) relating to historic environment

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>47</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 42: Prescribed consultees (The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009: Schedule 1))</b>			
Estelle Hook, Norfolk Coast Partnership	My comments relate to the potential effects of the development on the landscape quality of the Norfolk Coast Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and North Norfolk Heritage Coast (referred to collectively as 'the AONB'), with consideration also given to development beyond its boundaries where this may have impacts on the views from the AONB and indirect impacts on the landscape of the AONB. Other than these considerations, I have not commented on the impact of this windfarm and cable route outside of the AONB boundary. I have not assessed or commented on any impacts on the wider marine environment. I have not assessed or commented on impacts on the wildlife of the area and I suggest that Natural England is consulted, as the statutory consultee for both biodiversity and landscape issues. I have not commented on wider impacts on the built and historic environment and suggest that Historic England and the Norfolk County Council Historic Environment team are consulted. I suggest that Eastern IFCA are consulted about impacts on the MCZ.	I	Impacts relating to landscape and visual resources are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual resources. Particular consideration has been given to the AONB as a sensitive receptor, and it is noted that Hornsea Three has consulted with the Norfolk Coast Partnership to agree viewpoints to inform the assessment of impacts on the AONB.
Estelle Hook, Norfolk Coast Partnership	The area is well known for its historic environment, including human remains, burial mounds/tumuli (on Kelling Heath and Fox Hill), listed buildings and scheduled monuments and it is important to deal with these sites sensitively, to minimise any impacts.	I	An assessment of impacts on heritage assets is provided in Environmental Statement, volume 3, chapter 5: Historic Environment.
Historic England	We have reviewed the additional information provided. This consists of a series of maps depicting inclusion to the onshore and offshore cable corridors, and an offshore Supporting Information Document. This information is to be seen alongside our previous responses [0203]. Please note the comments set out in that letter will apply to the amended cable corridors as set out in the amended s42 consultation. Additional comments below.	N	Hornsea Three acknowledges that previous Historic England comments apply to the amended Hornsea Three offshore cable corridors. An assessment of impacts on heritage assets is provided in Environmental Statement, volume 3, chapter 5: Historic Environment.
Historic England	<b>Onshore</b> We note that the new onshore mapping information is not accompanied by any corresponding report or addendum therefore it is difficult to assess these additions in relation to the historic environment. We would however expect the same consideration to be given to these new areas in the ES as has been afforded to the main cable corridor in respect of the assessment and analysis of impacts. In particular, if these new areas are found to be unsustainable in planning policy terms because of the likely impact upon the significance of designated or non-designated heritage assets then they will not be taken forward. We do however, accept that changes may be necessary during the planning to provide the most effective and most sustainable route and therefore this is a necessary process. The comments that we made in relation to the original Hornsea 3 PEIR should be considered as appropriate for these alternative routes. We would welcome confirmed from applicant that a full assessment would be undertaken for the ES.	I	An assessment of impacts on heritage assets is provided in Environmental Statement, volume 3, chapter 5: Historic Environment.
<b>Section 42: Local Authorities (prescribed under section 43 of the Act)</b>			
No comments were received from the local authorities relating to historic environment under Phase 2.B.			

<sup>47</sup> Y = Yes change made; N = No change made; I = Incorporated into or considered when producing the assessment or landowner voluntary agreement offer; N/A = Not applicable.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>47</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 42: Persons with an interest in the land (prescribed under section 44 of the Act)</b>			
Jane Kenny, Savills, on behalf of Easton & Otley College, Easton	<p>POTENTIAL ONSHORE CABLE CORRIDOR RE-ROUTES</p> <p>There are a number of requested route changes which have not been considered.</p> <p>In particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Easton &amp; Otley College, Easton – the current proposed route has been raised at informal consultations and within the PEIR response, however it appears in the second consultation not to have been re-routed and as it currently stands will interfere with the College's future expansion plans.</li> </ul>	Y	<p>A refined route located to west of cable corridor has been adopted, following a request from the College in order to reduce potential impact to area at Broom Farm.</p> <p>Further detail was requested on the proposed expansion plans in order for these to be taken into consideration if the proposed route does not meet the requirements.</p>
Ray & Diane Pearce	<p>16. As evidenced above, there is no transparency between the Vanguard and Hornsea Three projects and no details for the Public to scrutinise due to the imposition of a commercial NDA. The lack of detail regarding the cable crossing point is a failure of the Hornsea Three Project Team's duty of care and we would therefore expect a further statutory consultation process to be agreed to fill in the details prior to the EIA, or indeed DCO. We contest that the project is in a rush to meet the next CFD auction before the cost for the project becomes commercially unviable. We assert that it is cost alone which is driving the project with a consequential disregard for the detrimental impact the project will have on the Norfolk countryside and the people who currently enjoy its peaceful nature. The further consultation has done nothing to allay our concerns and has increased the uncertainty for our future.</p> <p>Attachments: - See FULL response on DECA</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Maps of proposed cable crossing point.</li> <li>DONG Energy Letter dated 12 October 2017.</li> <li>Hornsea Three PEIR Figure 3.22.</li> </ol>	I	<p>Noted, responses provided in individual comments in relation to EMF, disruption impacts and cumulative impacts with Vanguard.</p>
<b>Section 47: Duty to consult local community</b>			
Mark Flatman on behalf of Mr & Mrs DW Flatman	<p>Furthermore, when this location is considered in proximity to the final destination of the Norwich Main National Grid Substation, south of Norwich, a landing point between Mundesley and Sea Palling would suggest a far more logical approach and one that would also offer a shorter and more direct onshore cable corridor routing to Norwich. This is depicted on the full response and is suggested that a detailed investigation would undoubtedly reveal and more direct onshore alternative route that would avoid statutory landscape and heritage designations. It is suggested that Orsted investigate this alternative route (see full response for marked plan).</p>	I	<p>Environmental Statement, volume 3, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives sets out the process of identifying a grid connection location and landfall. It describes the alternative routes considered and justification for the chosen route.</p>
Mr. A.J. Beckerleg	<p>I write as an independent archaeological Consultee in regard to the Cable Corridor route and its archaeological effects as it crosses the Salle Parish &amp; Estate landscape. I have been engaged in academic study of this landscape for the past 7 years, and as a direct result of research have made documented Consultation Briefings to you with 2 recommendation requests for route adjustment in order to protect underlying ancient settlement evidence. The documents and maps for these were sent to you via your Norfolk Land Agent: Dalcour Maclaren (contact Joshua Clarke-Davis).</p>	I	<p>An assessment of impacts on heritage assets is provided in Environmental Statement, volume 3, chapter 5: Historic Environment.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>47?</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Mr. A.J. Beckerleg	I note from your most recent Further Consultation Pamphlet (Nov – Dec 17) the New areas identified (Online Map 4). However, there is no indication (yet) of the 2nd adjusted route I strongly recommended in the detailed briefing that was sent to you via the Land Agent in Sept '17. This effectively suggested a slight, but nevertheless significant, corridor movement westward, off archaeological sensitive land and redirection along a very "safe" route with no settlement evidence. Has this briefing document and the map ever reached you, and been taken into account? I am not sure it has, otherwise it would surely have been shown as a New area identified.	I	An assessment of impacts on heritage assets is provided in Environmental Statement, volume 3, chapter 5: Historic Environment.
Mr. A.J. Beckerleg	I have today sent a further copy of this relevant material for consideration, and perhaps if necessary, as part of this new phase of consultation. (The archaeological reasoning behind the cable corridor re-routing adjustments are set out un my 1st Briefing documents – which you should have). [See ID 0213 from Previous Log]	I	An assessment of impacts on heritage assets is provided in Environmental Statement, volume 3, chapter 5: Historic Environment.
<b>Section 48: Duty to publicise</b>			
No comments were received in response to the Public Notice relating to historic environment under Phase 2.B.			

Table 3.14: Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Focused Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.C) relating to historic environment

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>48?</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 42: Prescribed consultees (The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009: Schedule 1))</b>			
No comments were received from the prescribed consultees relating to historic environment under Phase 2.C.			
<b>Section 42: Local Authorities (prescribed under section 43 of the Act)</b>			
Norfolk County Council - Historic Environment	In addition to the general comments set out below please be aware of the following Historic environment comments: Baconsthorpe/Hempstead (Map 2) - No known additional archaeological implications.	N	Response noted.
Norfolk County Council - Historic Environment	Reepham (Map 3) – The proximity of the route to Moor Farm (GII listed) doesn't really change but the adjacent storage area could result in a temporary impact on its setting. Some cropmarks of field boundaries or enclosures are visible on Google Earth but these can be investigated post-determination.	I	Response noted, this has fed into the assessment of impacts on heritage assets reported in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 5: Historic Environment
Norfolk County Council - Historic Environment	Ringland/Weston (Map 4) – Parish boundary location otherwise, no known additional archaeological implications.	N	Response noted.
Norfolk County Council - Historic Environment	Hethersett (Map 5) – No known additional archaeological implications.	N	Response noted.
Norfolk County Council - Historic Environment	Swardeston (Map 6) - No known additional archaeological implications.	N	Response noted.
<b>Section 42: Persons with an interest in the land (prescribed under section 44 of the Act)</b>			
No comments were received from persons with an interest in land relating to historic environment under Phase 2.B.			

<sup>48</sup> Y = Yes change made; N = No change made; I = Incorporated into or considered when producing the assessment or landowner voluntary agreement offer; N/A = Not applicable.



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>48</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 47: Duty to consult local community</b>			
Mrs M L and Mr R L G Williams	<b>Conservation Area</b> This area is part of the Broadland Conservation Area; Blickling- designated in June 1991, with increase of Oulton properties in 2007 and thus alterations to hedges, trees and fencing is not permitted.	I	The impacts on Blickling Conservation Area are addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 5: Historic Environment.
Mrs M L and Mr R L G Williams	<b>Other Issues</b> No mobile phone signal or rural phone boxes for calling emergency services. no broadband-services. The development would also disturb the natural habitat of the area and impinge on the adjacent woodland and neighbours. The C1354 road is the key route to Blickling Hall. Nothing to improve the well-being of the local residents	I	Impacts of Hornsea Three, including the construction compounds, on ecology are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation. The construction access routing is set out in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport.  Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on local residents through the identification of mitigation measures to manage noise, dust and traffic (amongst others). These measures are set out in the outline CoCP and outline CTMP which form part of the DCO application.
<b>Section 48: Duty to publicise</b>			
No comments were received in response to the Public Notice relating to historic environment under Phase 2.B.			

### 3.6 Traffic and Transport

Table 3.15: Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.A) relating to traffic and transport

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>49</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 42: Prescribed consultees (The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009: Schedule 1))</b>			
Weston Longville Parish Council	One of our Parish Councillors, Ruth Goodall, has received the latest communication concerning the consultation for the Hornsea 3 wind farm (dated 25/7/17). On map 7, for the parishes of Morton on the Hill and Weston Longville, the route is marked but also marked is a construction compound. Please can you provide details of what this will consist of, how it will operate, and the numbers of vehicle movement and types of vehicles that will use it. The location on the map is within an existing 7.5t weight restriction order which encapsulates the main village of Weston Longville and the surrounding narrow lanes and we would like to evaluate the impact associated with this when responding to the consultation.	I	The Main construction compound proposed near Weston Longville has not been taken forward to the application. The main construction compound for the project will be located at Oulton Airfield, accessed off the B1149, as detailed in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description
Highways England	Thanked and clarified that they are the representative for Yorkshire North East. I have looked at the documents associated with the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) submitted for consultation in July 2017. The wind farm seeks to provide up to a maximum of 342 turbines offshore and shall include both offshore and onshore substations and electric cabling. Whilst the development itself shall be situated in Norfolk and therefore the daily operation of the site is going to mainly impact the road network within that region, I want to just clarify the impact that the construction phase could have on Area 12, namely the SRN routing from the Port of Hull, south to the development proposal.	N	The Environment Statement only undertakes an assessment of the traffic generated and associated routing for the onshore elements. The delivery of all offshore elements is dependent on port selection and contractual appointments and as these items are not known at this time, they are not included in the application.
Highways England	Having looked at your plans we can see that the route for the cable laying, crosses one of our schemes for dualling the A47 between North Tuddenham and Easton. We would be interested in meeting with you to discuss possible solutions to ensure our schemes do not conflict. We will be looking to send a representative to the community consultation event on the 12th September at Weston Longville if you would like to meet at that date and time? My contact details are below if you wish to discuss further?	I	Response noted. As a statutory consultee, Ørsted engaged with Highways England during the design refinement process, particularly in respect to future schemes. Where future Highways England schemes were sufficiently progressed within the planning system, these have been considered in the cumulative assessment (reported in each of the technical chapters of the Environmental Statement).  Ørsted met with representatives from Highways England at the Weston Longville public consultation event in September to discuss the potential intersection with A47 widening. A subsequent meeting was held at Ørsted's offices on Friday 24 November 2017 and discussions between the parties will be continued on an ongoing basis whilst the two projects mature.
Weston Longville Parish Council	I attended the meeting at Hall for All on 10th August as the representative for Weston Longville Parish Council. It was a useful and informative meeting, however I do wish to underline our objection to the siting of the construction compound at Weston given the existing problems created by high volumes of traffic which will be exacerbated when the NDR opens. We would strongly recommend that the suggestion of using the empty Atlas Works site on the A1067 is followed up. Please feel free to get in touch if you would like more information	Y	The Main construction compound proposed near Weston Longville has not been taken forward to the application. The main construction compound for the project will be located at Oulton Airfield, accessed off the B1149.
Plumstead Parish Council	The working width of the scheme passes close to the occupants of Heath Farm and Range Farm – nuisance and disturbance should be kept to a minimum.	I	Where sensitive receptors are in close proximity to onshore works, the Project will ensure that sensitive construction management measures, such as noise, dust and traffic control are considered. These are documented in an outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), which accompanies the DCO application. Impacts on residential receptors are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement.

<sup>49</sup> Y = Yes change made; N = No change made; I = Incorporated into or considered when producing the assessment or landowner voluntary agreement offer; N/A = Not applicable.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>49</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Plumstead Parish Council	The Parish Council have not seen any traffic management plans – are lorries to pass through the village? If so, which roads and Monday to Friday only?	I	Impacts relating to access are addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport. It is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this forms part of the DCO application.
Plumstead Parish Council	Will the road to Plumstead Green from Edgefield be blocked during construction?	I	Hornsea Three has committed to HDD all public roads to minimise impacts to the local road network. Impacts associated with additional traffic on the road network as a result of Hornsea Three is assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport, with mitigation measures identified in the outline CTMP where relevant.
Oulton Parish Council	The access should be from the B1149 to the compound avoiding going through Oulton Street. Vehicles accessing from B1149 to the potential compound should note that it is a narrow road with informal passing places and that the road is in constant use by agricultural vehicles, residents exiting Oulton Street and other road users especially those visiting Itteringham or Blickling.	I	Impacts relating to access, including to the main construction compound, are addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport. It is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this forms part of the DCO application.
High Kelling Parish Council	The parish council wish to express the following concerns regarding your plans; 1) Phasing- it appears the construction will take place in phases over quite a number of years, thus potentially causing multiple periods of disruption, which is of great concern to residents. The council would wish the total construction period to be kept to an absolute minimum.	Y	During the design refinement Hornsea Three has sought to minimise the duration of any disruption, and has reduced the total duration of the construction phase onshore to eight years. A breakdown of the maximum construction durations is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Project Description.
Swardeston Parish Council	3. Why is the onshore substation not being built adjacent to, and to the South of, the existing Norwich Main substation? This has direct vehicular access off the A140 and is as removed, if not more removed, from existing residential developments as the proposed site.	I	Information pertaining to the site selection for the HVDC converter/HVAC substation is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives. The site selection process was informed by a number of factors including community feedback, technical constraints and environmental constraints.
Swardeston Parish Council	4. The proposed substation is an immensely high structure. Has Dong Energy considered acquiring a portion of the Mangreen quarry site so as to be able to construct the substation at least partially below ground level? This site would have direct access off the A140 and A47 and the added benefit of almost totally screening the finished substation by a combination of building below ground and planting around the circumference.	I	The positioning of complex infrastructure in a quarry or similar, encompasses a range of technical constraints not least the footprint area which is required, accessibility and health and safety considerations. Furthermore, the quarry remains operational, with plans to extend (as assessed in the cumulative assessments in the relevant topic chapters of the Environmental Statement volume 3) and therefore was discounted as an site alternative for the HVDC converter/HVAC substation. Further information relating to the site selection process for the HVDC converter/HVAC substation is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives.
Swardeston Parish Council	5. Whatever the precise location of the substation site, we believe that that access to the site should be directly from the A47 (or the A140 - A47 slip road), at least for HGVs and "abnormal loads" and preferably for ALL traffic. The B1113 already fails to meet the needs of pedestrians and cyclists and will struggle to cope with the proposed increase in traffic. It is already gridlocked in places at certain times of day, especially at its junction with the A140.	I	Impacts relating to access are addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport. It is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this forms part of the DCO application.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>49</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Bracon Ash & Hethel Parish Council	Bracon Ash & Hethel Parish Council considered the initial surveys and PEIR at its meeting on 11th September 2017. Whilst the villages will not be impacted directly by the cable corridor or the proposed substation at Swardeston there are significant concerns about the impact on the B1113. This is a main road which is extremely busy and it is likely that during the construction phase heavy traffic would need to access the site. To mitigate against major disruption to the residents of many towns and villages and the existing commercial use of this main arterial route into Norwich; any access to the site should be directly from the A47 during the construction phase.	I	<p>Access routes will be required from the nearby road network at various places along the onshore cable route and at the HVAC substation to access the construction works as well as the various compounds along the route that may be set-up in advance of the cable laying. Vehicle movements will vary depending on their purpose but will include heavy goods vehicles as well as abnormal indivisible loads.</p> <p>However, during construction, temporary haul roads will be installed within the cable corridor to facilitate the movement of construction vehicles to the site and to allow trench excavation to take place. These haul roads will also help minimise interactions with the local road networks.</p> <p>Measures will be implemented to minimise dust, mud and debris associated with the movement of construction vehicles between the compounds and the route, the details of which will be provided in an outline Code of Construction Practice which forms part of the DCO application. Furthermore, prior to the commencement of traffic generating works, a Construction Traffic Management Plan(s) will be agreed with the relevant Local Highway Authority in consultation with the Highways Agency.</p> <p>Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport provides detailed assessment of potential traffic impacts on the local road network including the B1113 and concludes that Hornsea Three would have no significant effects.</p>
Prepared by AECOM on behalf of Highways England	6. One question which does not appear to have been addressed at this stage, is that of the sources of construction materials, for example quarries, railheads and/or a base port, and the movement of material between these locations and the construction sites. In addition, very little is said in the PEIR about traffic generated by the workforce.	I	<p>The project has not identified suppliers for construction materials at this stage, and as such an assessment of where supplies may be sourced from has not been undertaken. Notwithstanding this, the transport of construction materials to the onshore cable corridor, or sites of permeant infrastructure has been taken into consideration in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport.</p> <p>Impacts relating to access, including traffic generated by the workforce, is addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport.</p>
Prepared by AECOM on behalf of Highways England	<p>A47 Junction with B1535 west of Honingham</p> <p>21. This is a ghost-island type priority T-junction, which forms a staggered junction with Berrys Lane opposite. It is located on a relatively straight section of the A47 subject to the national speed limit. From an examination of Google street view imagery, it appears to broadly comply with DMRB design standard TD42. The B1535 will serve as the primary access to construction compound C1 and construction site access A53 (PEIR paras 7.6.4.54 and 7.6.6.2 and Figure 7.1, sheets 6 &amp; 7). As such it is anticipated to carry a significant amount of light and heavy vehicle traffic.</p> <p>22. It is likely that this junction will be superseded by the junction arrangements required to serve the A47 North Tuddenham to Easton RIS scheme. The inter-relationship between the Wind Farm scheme and the RIS scheme should be investigated and acknowledged in the TA.</p> <p>23. In the event that the Wind Farm construction precedes the opening of the RIS scheme, AECOM recommend that, in the TA, this junction should be assessed in the following ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· An assessment of the current junction layout against the requirements of DMRB design standard TD42;</li> <li>· An assessment of the collision record of this junction; and</li> <li>· If the traffic flow increases are sufficient to warrant it, a PICADY model to determine any capacity problems associated with this junction.</li> </ul>	I	<p>Access to this part of the cable corridor will be taken via the A1067 Norwich Road and Marl Hill Road. There may be occasional access required via the B1535, however, due to the constrained geometries of the access roads that would be used to reach the onshore cable corridor from the B1535, larger vehicles would have difficulty in such access, hence access would be via the A1067 Norwich Road and Marl Hill Road. Access routes are set out on Figure 1.2 in Environmental Statement volume 6 annex 7.8: Traffic and Transport Figures.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>49</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Prepared by AECOM on behalf of Highways England	<p>A47 Junction with Taverham Road east of Honingham</p> <p>24. This is a simple priority T-junction, which forms a staggered junction with Blind Lane opposite. As such it does not provide right turning lanes for vehicles waiting to turn right into the minor arms of the junction. From an examination of Google street view imagery, Taverham Road appears to be of limited width, with corner radii that may not be suitable for use by large numbers of HGVs. The junction is on the outside of a large radius bend and visibility for A47 westbound through traffic appears to be sub-standard. Taverham Road will serve as the primary access to construction site access A54 (PEIR para 7.6.4.54 and Figure 7.1, sheets 6 &amp; 7).</p> <p>25. It is likely that this junction will be superseded by the junction arrangements required to serve the A47 North Tuddenham to Easton RIS scheme. The inter-relationship between the Wind Farm scheme and the RIS scheme should be investigated and acknowledged in the TA.</p> <p>26. In the event that the Wind Farm construction precedes the opening of the RIS scheme, AECOM recommend that, in the TA, this junction should be assessed in the following ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· An assessment of the current junction layout against the requirements of DMRB design standard TD42;</li> <li>· An assessment of the collision record of this junction;</li> <li>· If the traffic flow increases are sufficient to warrant it, a PICADY model to determine any capacity problems associated with this junction;</li> <li>· Consideration should be given to geometric improvements to facilitate the use of this junction by larger numbers of HGVs;</li> <li>· Alternatively, consideration should be given to banning the right turns into and out of Taverham Road for construction vehicles, making use of the roundabouts at the east end of Honingham bypass and at Easton to facilitate the resulting U-turn movements.</li> </ul>	I	Taverham Road will not be used for access and therefore HGV movements will not access through this junction. Access routes are set out on Figure 1.2 in Environmental Statement volume 6 annex 7.8: Traffic and Transport Figures.
Prepared by AECOM on behalf of Highways England	<p>A47 to the west of Easton</p> <p>27. The cable corridor will pass under the A47 approximately 360m to the west of the existing Easton roundabout. This will require temporary site accesses to facilitate the TT crossing proposed, in addition to the general cable corridor work to the north and south of the Trunk Road. The PEIR (paras 7.6.4.56 &amp; 57 and Figure 7.1, sheet 7) proposes that two direct accesses from the A47 would be created at this point (reference A56), by making use of an existing layby on the south side of the carriageway and an existing agricultural field access on the north side. AECOM do not regard this as a satisfactory proposal and advise Highways England to resist it.</p> <p>28. To the south, the PEIR identifies an alternative possibility, making use of a redundant section of the A47 extending west from Dereham Road in the vicinity of St Peter's Church, Easton. To the north, access would appear possible from the northern arm of Church Lane, to the north of its junction with the A47, crossing agricultural land to reach the cable corridor. In both cases, the result would be that construction traffic accesses the A47 using the existing Easton Roundabout. AECOM recommend that further consideration be given to these alternatives. If either or both of them are pursued, the implications on the capacity of the A47 Easton roundabout should be assessed using an ARCADY model.</p> <p>29. The cable corridor will cross the line of the new A47 North Tuddenham to Easton RIS scheme, which AECOM understand will run to the north of the current A47 in this vicinity, and will include the creation of a new junction which will supersede the current Easton roundabout. The interrelationship between the Wind Farm scheme and the RIS scheme should be investigated and acknowledged in the TA.</p>	I	Direct access is not proposed from the A47 Access will be taken from Church Lane (northern side) and Dereham Road (southern side). In consultation with HE, it was noted that that if the construction traffic flows through a junction on their network exceeded 30 vehicle movements during the network peak hours, then an assessment of the impact upon highway capacity of that junction would be undertaken. For the movement of construction staff, it was agreed that if the construction staff peak hour subsequently exceed the network peak hour, then an assessment of the impact upon highway capacity of that junction would be undertaken. These calculations are set out in Environmental Statement volume 6 annex 7.1: Transport Assessment. Hornsea Three has engaged with Highways England and at the point of cross over between the onshore cable works and the proposed alignment of the dualled A47 (just west of Easton roundabout) the onshore cable can be installed by way of a HDD if required. The management of these interactions will be discussed and agreed with Highways England once the A47 dualling scheme is further developed.



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>49</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Prepared by AECOM on behalf of Highways England	<p>A47 Easton Roundabout</p> <p>30. Site accesses A57 – A59 will have their primary access via Dereham Road, Easton and will access the SRN at the A47 Easton Roundabout (PEIR paras 7.6.4.57 – 58 and Figure 7.1, sheet 7). To the north, Church Lane is indicated as a second possible access to site access A55 (Figure 7.1, sheet 7). Traffic accessing site access A56 will also pass through this junction, whether it is taken directly from the A47 to the west of Easton or via the local road network.</p> <p>31. It is likely that this junction will be superseded by the junction arrangements required to serve the A47 North Tuddenham to Easton RIS scheme. The inter-relationship between the Wind Farm scheme and the RIS scheme should be investigated and acknowledged in the TA.</p> <p>32. In the event that the Wind Farm construction precedes the opening of the RIS scheme, AECOM recommend that, in the TA, this junction should be assessed in the following ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· An assessment of the collision record of this junction;</li> <li>· If the traffic flow increases are sufficient to warrant it, an ARCADY model to determine any capacity problems associated with this junction.</li> </ul>	I	<p>Direct access is not proposed from the A47 Access will be taken from Church Lane (northern side) and Dereham Road (southern side). In consultation with HE, it was noted that if the construction traffic flows through a junction on their network exceeded 30 vehicle movements during the network peak hours, then an assessment of the impact upon highway capacity of that junction would be undertaken. For the movement of construction staff, it was agreed that if the construction staff peak hour subsequently exceed the network peak hour, then an assessment of the impact upon highway capacity of that junction would be undertaken. These calculations are set out in Environmental Statement volume 6 annex 7.1: Transport Assessment. An analysis of road safety is also set out in Environmental Statement volume 6 annex 7.1: Transport Assessment. Hornsea Three has engaged with Highways England and at the point of cross over between the onshore cable works and the proposed alignment of the dualled A47 (just west of Easton roundabout) the onshore cable can be installed by way of a HDD if required. The management of these interactions will be discussed and agreed with Highways England at a later date once the A47 dualling scheme is further developed.</p>
Prepared by AECOM on behalf of Highways England	<p>A47/ A1074 Longwater and A47/ B1108 Colney junctions</p> <p>33. The PEIR indicates that a number of HGV access routes will pass through, join and/or leave the A47 Trunk Road at the A1074 Longwater and B1108 Colney junctions (see PEIR Figure 7.1, sheet 7). AECOM recommend that, in the TA, if the traffic flow increases are sufficient to warrant it, the impact of the proposals on the capacity of these junctions should be assessed using an ARCADY model.</p>	I	<p>It was agreed with HE that if the construction traffic flows through a junction on their network exceeded 30 vehicle movements during the network peak hours, then an assessment of the impact upon highway capacity of that junction would be undertaken. For the movement of construction staff, it was agreed that if the construction staff peak hour subsequently exceed the network peak hour, then an assessment of the impact upon highway capacity of that junction would be undertaken. These calculations are set out in Environmental Statement volume 6 annex 7.1: Transport Assessment.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>49</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
<p>Prepared by AECOM on behalf of Highways England</p>	<p>A11 to the south-east of Hethersett</p> <p>34. The cable corridor would pass under the A11 approximately 1.3km south-west of the A11/A47 Thickthorn junction and approximately 500m to the north-east of its junction with Station Lane, Hethersett (see PEIR Figure 7.1, sheet 8). This will require temporary site accesses to facilitate the TT crossing proposed, in addition to the general cable corridor work to the north and south of the Trunk Road.</p> <p>35. This section of the A11 is a heavily trafficked high speed dual carriageway. There is one intermediate junction at Station Lane, comprising a pair of left-in, left-out priority T-junctions with no vehicular connection across the A11 itself. From an examination of Google street view imagery, the access to Station Lane (south) appears to be of a relatively high standard with merge and diverge tapers connecting into the minor arm of the junction through large radius corners. The access to Station Lane (north) is of a lower standard, with low radius corners and no tapers. Although no vehicular access is permitted across the A11 at this point, there is a staggered at-grade pedestrian/ cycle crossing across both carriageways.</p> <p>36. The PEIR (paras 7.6.4.72-74) indicates that access to route section 28, to the north of the A11 could be achieved via Station Lane. This is not acknowledged as an access route on the plans in Figures 7.1 or 7.2, sheet 8. Figure 7.1, sheet 8 indicates two potential access points, A69a and A69b; however no indication is given as to how vehicles will reach them. In addition, no indication is given as to whether HGVs would be directed to access these points via Station Lane's junction with the A11 or its junction with the B1172. These issues should be clarified. Given the relatively low standard of provision at the A11/ Station Lane (north) junction, AECOM recommend that access to this area for HGVs be achieved solely from the B1172 end of Station Lane.</p> <p>37. To access the strip of land between the A11 and the railway (route section 29), the PEIR proposes a new direct access on the A11 itself (access A70: PEIR para 7.6.4.74 and Figure 7.1, sheet 8). AECOM do not regard this as a satisfactory proposal and advise Highways England to resist it.</p> <p>38. The PEIR (para 7.6.4.74) identifies an alternative way of gaining access to the area, namely by means of Station Lane (south) and the minor road that currently serves the small number of residential dwellings located between the A11 and the railway line. AECOM recommend that further consideration be given to this alternative. Station Lane (south) also provides one of two potential accesses to route section 30, construction access point A71.</p> <p>39. Whatever combination of access points is selected, AECOM recommend that, in the TA, the A11/ Station Lane junctions should be assessed in the following ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· An assessment of the collision record of these junctions; and</li> <li>· If the traffic flow increases are sufficient to warrant it, an assessment of their capacity using a PICADY model.</li> </ul> <p>40. Although the area of the two schemes is unlikely to overlap, the proposal to upgrade the A47/A11 Thickthorn junction through the RIS scheme could affect the provision of access in this area. For example, the provision of free-flow slip roads between the A47 (east) and A11 (south-west) arms of the junction could preclude the creation of a site access on the A11 at location A70 because of the need to maintain an appropriate weaving distance between the two, in accordance with DMRB design standard TD22. AECOM recommend that the inter-relationship between the Wind Farm scheme and the RIS scheme in this area should be investigated and acknowledged in the TA.</p>	<p>I</p>	<p>There are no proposals for direct access from the A11. Access to Station Road (northern side of the A11) could be achieved either from the B1172 or from the A11. Neither has been discounted, as shown on Figure 1.2 in Environmental Statement volume 6 annex 7.8: Traffic and Transport Figures. Station Road (southern side of the A11) would be used to access the onshore cable corridor between the A11 and the railway line. It was agreed with HE that if the construction traffic flows through a junction on their network exceeded 30 vehicle movements during the network peak hours, then an assessment of the impact upon highway capacity of that junction would be undertaken. For the movement of construction staff, it was agreed that if the construction staff peak hour subsequently exceed the network peak hour, then an assessment of the impact upon highway capacity of that junction would be undertaken. These calculations are set out in Environmental Statement volume 6 annex 7.1: Transport Assessment. An analysis of road safety is also set out in Environmental Statement volume 6 annex 7.1: Transport Assessment. Hornsea Three has engaged with Highways England and at the point of cross over between the onshore cable works and the proposed alignment of the dualled A47 (just west of Easton roundabout) the onshore cable can be installed by way of a HDD if required. The management of these interactions will be discussed and agreed with Highways England at a later date once the A47 dualling scheme is further developed.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>49</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Prepared by AECOM on behalf of Highways England	<p>A11/ A47 Thickthorn Junction</p> <p>41. It is likely that the current form of this junction will be superseded by the junction arrangements proposed as part of the A11/A47 Thickthorn junction RIS scheme. AECOM recommend that the inter-relationship between the Wind Farm scheme and the RIS scheme should be investigated and acknowledged in the TA.</p> <p>42. The PEIR (Figure 7.2, sheet 8) indicates that a number of HGV access routes will pass through, join and/or leave the A11 and A47 Trunk Roads at this junction. In the event that the Wind Farm construction precedes the opening of the RIS scheme, AECOM recommend that, in the TA, the impact of the proposals on the capacity of this junction should be assessed using an appropriate model.</p>	I	It was agreed with HE that if the construction traffic flows through a junction on their network exceeded 30 vehicle movements during the network peak hours, then an assessment of the impact upon highway capacity of that junction would be undertaken. For the movement of construction staff, it was agreed that if the construction staff peak hour subsequently exceed the network peak hour, then an assessment of the impact upon highway capacity of that junction would be undertaken. These calculations are set out in Environmental Statement volume 6 annex 7.1: Transport Assessment. An analysis of road safety is also set out in Environmental Statement volume 6 annex 7.1: Transport Assessment.
Prepared by AECOM on behalf of Highways England	<p>A47 to the west of the Harford Junction</p> <p>43. The PEIR reveals (Figure 7.1, sheet 9) that a major electricity sub-station is proposed immediately to the south of the A47 and east of the bridge carrying the A47 over the B1113. The PEIR states that access for the construction of this sub-station is to be gained from the B1113 (construction access A75 – PEIR para 7.6.4.81). No suggestion is made that access could be gained directly from the A47. Highways England should be aware of the possibility, however remote, that local residents and amenity groups may seek to promote an alternative access direct from the A47, in order to minimise the impact of construction traffic on the B1113 and other local roads. Should this happen, AECOM would advise Highways England to resist it, since AECOM would not regard such an access as a satisfactory proposal.</p>	I	Direct access from the A47 is not proposed as shown on Figure 1.2 in Environmental Statement volume 6 annex 7.8: Traffic and Transport Figures.
Prepared by AECOM on behalf of Highways England	<p>A47/ A140 Harford Junction</p> <p>44. The PEIR (Figure 7.1, sheet 9) indicates that a number of HGV access routes will pass through, join and/or leave the A47 Trunk Road at this junction. AECOM recommend that, in the TA, the impact of the proposals on the capacity of this junction should be assessed using an appropriate model.</p>	I	It was agreed with HE that if the construction traffic flows through a junction on their network exceeded 30 vehicle movements during the network peak hours, then an assessment of the impact upon highway capacity of that junction would be undertaken. For the movement of construction staff, it was agreed that if the construction staff peak hour subsequently exceed the network peak hour, then an assessment of the impact upon highway capacity of that junction would be undertaken. These calculations are set out in Environmental Statement volume 6 annex 7.1: Transport Assessment. An analysis of road safety is also set out in Environmental Statement volume 6 annex 7.1: Transport Assessment.
Prepared by AECOM on behalf of Highways England	<p>A47/ A146 Trowse and A47/ A1074 Postwick Junctions</p> <p>45. These junctions are contained within the study area set out in the PEIR. They are not included within the area shown on Figures 7.1 or 7.2 sheet 9 but the roads they serve are listed in the schedule of links in PEIR Annex 7.3 as links ID 136, 137, 139, 140 and 141.</p> <p>46. The Trowse junction is relatively remote from the cable corridor and AECOM are unclear as to whether very much of the traffic generated by the Wind Farm construction would use it. This could be the case if, for example, a railhead were established in the vicinity, or if Lowestoft were selected as a base port, thus feeding construction traffic out on to the A47 via this junction.</p> <p>47. The Postwick junction is also relatively remote from the cable corridor. However, the Norwich Northern Distributor Road (NNDR), when it is completed, will provide a high capacity route into the northern part of the study area and traffic using the NNDR for this purpose will join or leave the A47 at the Postwick junction.</p> <p>48. AECOM recommend that, in the TA, the additional traffic flows anticipated through the Trowse and Postwick junctions should be quantified in order to determine whether or not a run of a junction capacity model is required.</p>	I	It was agreed with HE that if the construction traffic flows through a junction on their network exceeded 30 vehicle movements during the network peak hours, then an assessment of the impact upon highway capacity of that junction would be undertaken. For the movement of construction staff, it was agreed that if the construction staff peak hour subsequently exceed the network peak hour, then an assessment of the impact upon highway capacity of that junction would be undertaken. These calculations are set out in Environmental Statement volume 6 annex 7.1: Transport Assessment. An analysis of road safety is also set out in Environmental Statement volume 6 annex 7.1: Transport Assessment.
Prepared by AECOM on behalf of Highways England	<p>9. The PEIR sets out the planning policies the document has been prepared in accordance with. These include Planning Policy NPS (National Policy Statement) for Energy EN-01 (which specifies that a TA will be required) and National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) chapter 32.</p> <p>10. No specific reference is made to DfT Circular 02/2013 in the PEIR (although it is listed as a reference in the skeleton TA). AECOM recommend that this document and its requirements are explicitly acknowledged in any future work carried out in support of the Wind Farm.</p>	I	Specific reference has been made to DfT Circular 02/2013 and the assessment undertaken in accordance with its requirements as set out in Environmental Statement volume 6 annex 7.1: Transport Assessment.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>49</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Prepared by AECOM on behalf of Highways England	14. Highway links where the increase in total flow or HGV flows are predicted to be less than 10% will be screened out of the assessment. AECOM acknowledge that this is the 'industry standard' approach for the sort of impacts considered in an EIA. However, it should be noted that Circular 02/2013 can require detailed scrutiny of traffic capacity and road safety impacts at significantly lower thresholds.	I	This approach has only been applied to this Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport. The Transport Assessment (Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 7.1: Transport Assessment) adopts an approach aligned to Circular 02/2013.
Prepared by AECOM on behalf of Highways England	15. The PEIR contains a schedule at section 7.10, of HGV movements likely to be generated by each section of the cable corridor. Details of the assumptions underlying these calculations are contained in Annex 7.4, with potential HGV routes detailed in Annex 7.6. However, the calculations themselves are not presented for scrutiny.	I	The underlying data and assumptions are set out in Environmental Statement volume 6 annex 7.6: Construction Vehicle Trip Generation Assumptions with commentary and explanations within Environmental Statement volume 6 annex 7.1: Transport Assessment. The calculations are made using these assumptions and are undertaken within Microsoft Excel, therefore unable to be presented since the formulae are not visible.
Prepared by AECOM on behalf of Highways England	16. It should be noted that the way the HGV movements are presented does not always allow the potential usage of individual access points on the SRN to be quantified. AECOM recommend that an estimate be made of the numbers likely to arise from each construction compound and site access. This is particularly important for construction compound C1, which is to be accessed via the A47/B1535 junction at Honingham and in section 7.10, its traffic generation is aggregated with ten individual construction access points, the majority of which would be served from the north, via the A1067. So it is not possible to determine the extent to which traffic flows at the A47/B1535 junction would increase. This should be clarified in the TA.	I	Compound option C1 is no longer proposed as part of Hornsea Three, this is as a result of the project refinement process. The main construction compound is located at Oulton Airfield. Further details are set out in Environmental Statement, volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives.
Prepared by AECOM on behalf of Highways England	17. AECOM note that no similar exercise appears to have been undertaken in respect of either motor vehicle trips generated by the workforce; or by HGVs on the wider network, moving materials between quarries, railheads and/or ports and the cable corridor. Many of these routes will utilise substantial lengths of the SRN and may be significant at locations close to the source of the materials, for example at the first point of access to the SRN from the selected base port. These additional sources of traffic should be assessed in the TA.	I	Details of origins and destinations and the methodology for these calculations are set out within Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 7.1: Transport Assessment.
Prepared by AECOM on behalf of Highways England	18. No acknowledgement appears to be made in the PEIR of the potential inter-relationship between the construction of the cable corridor and the two RIS schemes (A47 North Tuddenham to Easton and A47/A11 Thickthorn Junction) currently being promoted by Highways England within the study area. AECOM could not find any information as to the potential timescale over which the construction of the Wind Farm's onshore infrastructure will take place and therefore which of the following may apply: · Construction of the Wind Farm onshore infrastructure proceeds ahead of the RIS schemes and therefore the impacts and access arrangements need to reflect the current road network as it exists today; · Construction of the Wind Farm onshore infrastructure takes place after the RIS schemes open to traffic and therefore the impacts and access arrangements need to reflect the road network as it will exist with the RIS schemes in place; · The two construction periods overlap, in which case a much more complex situation will arise, which will need to be carefully managed.	I	Noted, Hornsea Three has consulted, and will continue to consult Highways England to identify interactions between projects. Where highway improvement schemes are sufficiently progressed, potential cumulative effects have been identified and assessed within the relevant topic chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3).
Prepared by AECOM on behalf of Highways England	19. The anticipated construction phasing should be clarified before work on the TA commences because it will be critical to ensuring that the correct scenarios are assessed.	I	Information relating to the construction phasing and indicative schedule is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description. A Transport Assessment has subsequently been undertaken and is provided in Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 7.1: Transport Assessment.
Prepared by AECOM on behalf of Highways England	Location specific impacts 20. The following locations are likely to be of specific interest to Highways England and the potential location-specific impacts should be fully assessed in the forthcoming TA. Reference is made to construction site access locations A53 – A76 and construction compound C1. These are	I	Compound option C1 is no longer proposed as part of Hornsea Three, this is as a result of the project refinement process.  More generally, it was agreed with HE that if the construction traffic flows through a junction on their network exceeded 30 vehicle movements during the network peak hours, then an assessment of the impact upon highway capacity of that junction would be undertaken. For the



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>49</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
	described in paragraphs 7.6.4.54 – 82, 7.6.6.2 and 7.6.7.54 – 7.6.7.78 of the PEIR and their locations are illustrated on Figures 7.1 & 7.2, sheets 6, 7, 8 and 9 of PEIR Annex 7.2.		movement of construction staff, it was agreed that if the construction staff peak hour subsequently exceed the network peak hour, then an assessment of the impact upon highway capacity of that junction would be undertaken. These calculations are set out in Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 7.1: Transport Assessment. An analysis of road safety is also set out in Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 7.1: Transport Assessment.
Royal Mail/BNP Paribas Real Estate UK	<p>Royal Mail is responsible for providing efficient mail sorting and delivery nationally. As the Universal Service Provider under the Postal Services Act 2011, Royal Mail has a statutory duty to deliver mail to every residential and business address in the country as well as collecting mail from all Post Offices and post boxes six days a week.</p> <p>Royal Mail's postal sorting and delivery operations rely heavily on road communications. Royal Mail's ability to provide efficient mail collection, sorting and delivery to the public is sensitive to changes in the capacity of the highway network.</p> <p>Royal Mail is a major road user nationally. Disruption to the highway network and traffic delays can have direct consequences on Royal Mail's operations, its ability to meet the Universal Service Obligation and comply with the regulatory regime for postal services thereby presenting a significant risk to Royal Mail's business.</p> <p>As listed and located on the plan below, Royal Mail has operational properties that are situated to the proposed onshore infrastructure.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sheringham DO Station Road, Sheringham NR26 8AA</li> <li>• Holt DO Cromer Road, Holt NR25 6AA</li> <li>• Wymondham DO Middleton Street, Wymondham NR18 OAA</li> <li>• Reepham Vehicle Parking School Road, Reepham NR10 41P</li> <li>• Dereham Delivery Office Quebec Street, Dereham NR19 2AA</li> <li>• Norwich Delivery Office Roundtree Way, Norwich NR7 8ZZ</li> </ul>	I	Hornsea Three has committed to HDD all public roads and as such road closures at these locations is not proposed. Further information on access is provided in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport, as well as the outline CTMP which forms part of the DCO application.
Royal Mail/BNP Paribas Real Estate UK	5. Royal Mail requests that it is fully pre-consulted by Dong Energy on any proposed road closures / diversions/ alternative access arrangements, hours of working and the content of the CTMP. The ES should acknowledge the need for this consultation with Royal Mail and other relevant local businesses / occupiers.	I	Hornsea Three has committed to HDD all public roads and as such road closures at these locations is not proposed. Impacts relating to access are addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport. It is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this forms part of the DCO application.
Royal Mail/BNP Paribas Real Estate UK	Royal Mail is able to supply information on its road usage / trips if required. Should Dong Energy have any queries in relation to the above then in the first instance please contact Holly Trotman ( ) of Royal Mail's Legal Services Team or Daniel Parry- Jones ( ) of BNP Paribas Real Estate.	N	Noted.
Royal Mail/BNP Paribas Real Estate UK	None of the above properties are within the 1km Utility Search Buffer or Substation Search Area, but it is likely that there will be Royal Mail post boxes within these areas, confirmation if this will follow separately.	N	Noted.
Royal Mail/BNP Paribas Real Estate UK	In exercising its statutory duties Royal Mail vehicles use on a daily basis all of the main roads that may potentially be affected by additional traffic arising from the construction of the onshore infrastructure associated with Hornsea Project Three Offshore Wind Farm. Royal Mail therefore wishes to ensure the protection of its future ability to provide an efficient mail sorting and delivery service to the public in accordance with its statutory obligations, which may potentially be adversely affected by the construction of the proposed onshore infrastructure.	I	Hornsea Three has committed to HDD all public roads and as such road closures at these locations is not proposed. Impacts relating to access are addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport. It is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this forms part of the DCO application.
Royal Mail/BNP Paribas Real Estate UK	Based on the PEIR it appears that there is potential for operational disruption to Royal Mail road based operations during the proposed construction of the onshore infrastructure. It is noted that an impact assessment has not been undertaken as part of the PEIR, its purpose	I	Hornsea Three has committed to HDD all public roads and as such road closures at these locations is not proposed. Impacts relating to access are addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport. It is noted that a Construction Traffic



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>49</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
	being to consult on the access route and location options and that responses to the PEIR will be considered to identify the preferred routes for the construction of the onshore cable.		Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this forms part of the DCO application.
Royal Mail/BNP Paribas Real Estate UK	It is welcomed by Royal Mail that once the preferred routes are selected by Dong Energy it will initiate a further consultation with relevant consultees before the DCO application is submitted. It is also welcomed that Dong Energy will prepare a draft Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) in consultation with stakeholders, which will be submitted in support of the DCO application.	I	Impacts relating to access are addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport. It is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this forms part of the DCO application.
Royal Mail/BNP Paribas Real Estate UK	1. More information should be provided in the ES that is submitted in support of the DCO application on the locations of all the onshore infrastructure elements, details of how and when these infrastructure elements will be constructed, the resultant traffic impact during the construction phase and the mitigation measures that are required. This information should be supported by a TA with an appropriate traffic model.	I	Information relating to the location of onshore infrastructure, construction programme and construction methodology is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description.  Impacts relating to access are addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport, with mitigation measures identified where relevant. A transport assessment accompanies the assessment, presented in Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 7.1: Transport Assessment.
Royal Mail/BNP Paribas Real Estate UK	2. Royal Mail requests that the ES includes information on the needs of major road users (such as Royal Mail) and acknowledges the requirement to ensure that major road users are not disrupted through full advance consultation by the applicant at the appropriate time in the DCO and development process.	I	Hornsea Three has committed to HDD all public roads in order to minimise disruption on the local road network. Impacts relating to access are addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport, with mitigation measures identified where relevant. Furthermore, it is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this forms part of the DCO application.
Royal Mail/BNP Paribas Real Estate UK	3. The ES should include detailed information on the construction traffic mitigation measures that are proposed to be implemented, including Dong Energy's draft CTMP.	I	Impacts relating to access are addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport, with mitigation measures identified where relevant. Furthermore, it is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this forms part of the DCO application.
Royal Mail/BNP Paribas Real Estate UK	4. Full attention should be given by Dong Energy to the potential for cumulative traffic impact during the construction phase. The ES should address the potential cumulative traffic effects arising from the construction of Hornsea Project Three Offshore Wind Farm and all other proposed major developments in the area.	I	Cumulative impacts relating to traffic are assessed within Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport.
Holt County Division	Night time access has been suggested by some, but that then has further implications for residents – with noise and vibration from such vehicles causing disturbance where some properties adjoin the highway.	I	Working hours are set out in the outline CoCP which forms part of the DCO application. The need for any night-time working would be subject to agreement with the local planning authority. Associated impacts relating to noise and vibration are set out in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 8: Noise and Vibration.
Holt County Division	Many access roads are already in need of repair and their use for this project will only increase the problem.	I	Impacts relating to access are addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport. It is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this forms part of the DCO application. Measures include a requirement for Hornsea Three to undertake a schedule of condition on the local roads to identify any damage caused by the increased traffic resulting from Hornsea Three.
Holt County Division	This area is designated within the boundaries of the AONB and many residents and visitors are concerned about the impacts not only to the environment (commented below); but also upon their ability to access rights of way and footpaths during the construction. Therefore, inhibiting their	I	An assessment of impacts on the AONB is presented in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources. To inform this process, Hornsea Three has consulted with the Norfolk Coast Partnership, as well as local authorities, in regard to the

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>49</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>ability to enjoy the natural surroundings of their homes. High Kelling Parish Council have also referenced this concern in their submission. Weybourne residents are obviously anxious about access to the beach and coastal path.</p>		<p>identification of suitable viewpoints within the AONB.</p> <p>Where the onshore cable corridor crossed public rights of way, Hornsea Three has sought to avoid impacts through the use of HDD technology. Where this has not been possible and thus open cut, or HDD with a haul road over, is proposed, the routes will be temporarily diverted along existing tracks, for a maximum of one month per cable. In respect to beach access, a Beach Access Management Plan will be developed in consultation with, and agreed with Norfolk County Council. This Plan would include management measures to be put in place on the beach at either side of the construction working areas to guide walkers along the diverted coastal path, and would also set out the measures to be followed for the reinstatement of the coastal path following the completion of construction works. Information on these temporary changes to the route of the coastal path would be posted in the beach side car park to the north of Weybourne, together with general information of the construction activities</p> <p>Following the completion of the construction works all areas of access land, recreational resources, PRoWs and other linear routes affected by the onshore works would be re-instated to their current condition and/or along their current alignments. There would be no physical effects on these resources arising from the operation or maintenance of Hornsea Three. The measures to be taken to ensure the continued use of all linear recreational resources during the construction phase of the project have been discussed with Norfolk County Council and are set out in the Outline CoCP. This dialogue will continue during the detailed design process.</p> <p>The assessment of impacts on individual public rights of way (where appropriate) are set out in Environmental Statement, volume 3, chapter 6: Land Use and Recreation.</p>
Holt County Division	<p>Transport infrastructure and networks - (With particular attention to Weybourne and Kelling) I fully support the position taken by the County Council in their submission in relation to 'Transport matters'. 'Until such time as a comprehensive Transport Assessment has been completed by the applicant assessing the finalised route options, the County Council (Highway Authority) is unable to endorse the proposal.'</p>	I	<p>A transport assessment has been prepared and is provided in Environmental Statement, volume 6, annex 7.1: Transport Assessment. Hornsea Three has consulted, and will continue to consult Highways England and Norfolk County Council to identify interactions</p>
Holt County Division	<p>I would further add; the nature of the infrastructure is part of the unique character of the area. Single track country lanes with high banks and hedgerows, low bridges, and bridges with weight and width restrictions all make this location incredibly hard to access for HGV traffic. Many areas have no pavements and parking during the school run, rail and bird watching events exacerbate these problems.</p>	I	<p>Impacts relating to access are addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport. It is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this forms part of the DCO application.</p>
Edgefield, Bodham, Corpusty & Saxthorpe, Hempstead and Plumstead Parish Councils (and others)	<p>1. Unacceptability of 'phasing' that requires the same sections of cable corridor to be dug up more than once. We understand that the current commissioning process for projects of this nature could involve consent being granted to the developers in up to three phases. This would involve the digging up of, what is effectively, the same ground along the entire cable corridor up to three times during the length of the project, adversely affect its economic viability, and unnecessarily delay the upgrading and expansion of the nation's electricity supply. This is clearly a ridiculous waste of money. But more importantly, it means all of the negative consequences of the cable corridor will be multiplied and the long-term damage to the area made significantly worse. The effects relate to traffic, tourism and road safety – and above all, the permanent damage to the natural environment. Whatever route it takes, the cable corridor will inevitably involve disrupting areas of unspoiled natural beauty, habitat loss (hedgerows, hedge margins, meadow, wet and ancient woodland), associated habitat fragmentation and the high potential for water pollution (due to soil and nutrient loss to watercourses). We recommend referring to the report produced by the River Glaven Conservation Group for a detailed and thorough explanation of the many significant environmental issues along the route. Several areas of the proposed cable route are areas of High Landscape Value, as well as being</p>	Y	<p>During the design refinement Hornsea Three has sought to minimise the duration of any disruption, and has reduced the total duration of the construction phase onshore to eight years. Within this, the maximum duration for construction of the onshore cable corridor is approximately 2.5 years, this therefore means that the maximum duration over which construction could occur would be 5.5 years incorporating two phases (assuming a three-year gap between the two phases). The work associated with each phase is expected to progress along the Hornsea Three onshore cable corridor with a typical active construction works duration of three months at any particular location.</p> <p>Through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive ecological receptors. For example, Weybourne Cliffs and Kelling Heath SSSI have been avoided and no direct impacts are predicted on these designated sites from Hornsea Three. Additional mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project are outlined in topic specific chapters, and include the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts on local road networks, ecological receptors (e.g. hedgerows) and hydrological features (e.g. main rivers).</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>49</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>subject to deliberate and managed conservation. There is a wide variety of flora and fauna, even in the most apparently straightforward North Norfolk field, the quality of which can only really be appreciated through year-round observation. North Norfolk hosts a significant amount of wildlife, from barn owls to deer, hares and birds of prey including kestrels, buzzards and kites, as well as rare flora and fauna. The natural conditions which make this area of the UK so suitable for wildlife have been preserved for generations, and are unique in the extent to which they have resisted urbanisation, industrialisation and the ensuing noise, light and atmospheric pollution.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Corpusty &amp; Saxthorpe Parish representatives and landowners adjacent to the proposed site of the crossing of the River Bure and its adjacent water meadows are concerned that these environs receive special attention. To mitigate any environmental impact on these, surrounding ancient hedgerows and a domestic water well it is respectfully requested that HDD under-drilling be utilised for approximately 600m length at an appropriate depth below the base of the water well. The above concerns are all grounds on which to object most strongly to the idea of any such development whatsoever carving a decade-long scar through the landscape. Indeed it is extremely rare for a community as wide and representative as the one made up in the signatories of this letter, to come out cautiously in support of something so catastrophic for the local environment. We are, however, understanding of the need the country has as a whole to develop sustainable sources of alternative energy. But we are also mindful of the need to protect and preserve this beautiful and unique asset for generations to come for the benefit of residents, workers and visitors alike.</p> <p>We are reassured to read that the consultation process will give due consideration to the negative impacts of the development on the natural environment. There must, as part of the granting of consent for this development, be a guarantee that the best modern engineering practices (not just the statutory minima) are adopted to repair the effects of the development on the environment and reinstatement of soil, water, flora, fauna and habitats.</p> <p>Nothing will ever be able to be restored completely: no amount of soil stratification will be able to reinstate the balance of soil that has been known and worked by the people here for generations. Visual reinstatement – itself something that takes years – is only one part of the picture.</p> <p>To support this development happening at all has taken patience, understanding and significant compromise, but to allow it to happen three times is patently unacceptable. Minimising the number of times the same areas need digging up had the strongest consensus of all issues connected to the cable route: 95% of respondents rated it as 4 or 5 (out of 5) in importance, with standard deviation of just 0.61 across all responses. Everything that stands to be lost by the construction of the onshore component of this project will be significantly worsened if the work along each point of the cable corridor is not carried out once and once only, quickly and efficiently, and the land reinstated thoroughly and permanently.</p> <p>Whether it is within the control of the developers, or something that only Government can change, we will object vociferously and unendingly to any development consent order that is granted without absolute assurance that individual sections of the cable route will not be 'dug up' on more than one occasion. At the very least, alternative ideas should be explored such as laying all ducting in the first phase so that the land does not need to be dug up more than once.</p> <p>We are utterly dedicated and passionate about this aspect of the proposed development, and will defend our land at all costs – as we have done in the past.</p>		<p>Where impacts have not been avoided, these are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement volume 3.</p>
<p>Mulbarton Parish Council</p>	<p>The Parish Council have concerns regarding construction traffic in the village and surrounding areas particularly on the B1113 and the knock on effect to local public traffic services.</p> <p>The Parish Council suggested that all local parish councils in the locality of the Swardeston substation be consulted on the traffic management plan, ideally with the involvement of the District Councillor that represents those parishes most likely to be affected by construction traffic for this proposal.</p>	<p>I</p>	<p>Impacts relating to access are addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport. It is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this forms part of the DCO application.</p>
<p>Weybourne Parish Council</p>	<p>I am instructed to write as follows :- 1. The parish council asks why Weybourne again ? - there are many miles of similar coastline !</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>A discussion regarding the options considered for landfall are presented in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives. The beach</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>49</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
	There are serious concerns re the impact that the construction works programme will have on the local community and businesses. Weybourne will again have the construction works adjacent to the Beach Road car park significantly compromising the views and remoteness of the area which offers long distance views along both directions of the coast. It will again have huge lorries using roads designed to take traffic in Victorian times !		road car park is not under consideration as a construction compound. Furthermore it is noted that, since the PEIR, a refined landfall location has been identified (western re-route around Kelling) and the area identified for landfall works has reduced. This was informed by a number of factors including engineering/technical considerations, community feedback in the area of Kelling and Weybourne, avoidance of the Kelling Heath SSSI/CWS and Holiday Park.  Regardless, the Project will ensure that sensitive construction management measures, such as noise, dust and traffic control are considered. These are documented in an outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), which accompanies the DCO application.
Swannington with Alderford and Little Witchingham Parish Council	I am writing to provide input into the consultation process, regarding the proposed route for the cables. Alderford and Hall Road, Alderford The proposed route passes close to several residential properties in Alderford. You have explained through parish councillors' meetings the timescales and digging processes. Parishioners' concerns in particular relate to; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noise and dust/dirt attenuation</li> <li>Disruption to Hall road and the Reepham Road</li> <li>The possibility of significant extension of the construction timescales if the project has to be delivered in phases.</li> <li>Dong identifying all utility cables and pipes, including live privately-owned water pipes</li> <li>Accessing the construction area from compounds</li> <li>Local compensation - benefit</li> </ul>	I	Where possible and practicable the cable corridor route selected seeks to avoid passing adjacent to properties. This is to reduce impacts associated with construction disturbance and to seek to minimise conflicts such as Heavy Goods Vehicle (HGV) traffic movements. However, it is not possible to avoid passing in close proximity to all properties on the route. Where properties are located in close proximity, the Project will ensure that sensitive construction management measures, such as noise, dust and traffic control are considered. These are documented in an outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), which accompanies the DCO application.  Potential impacts on residential receptors are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapter (as well as the inter-related effects chapter) contained within Environmental Statement volume 3.
Swannington with Alderford and Little Witchingham Parish Council	Noise attenuation: more detail is needed on how residents are not to be burdened by loud and persistent noise and dust/ dirt.	I	Where properties are located in close proximity, the Project will ensure that sensitive construction management measures, such as noise, dust and traffic control are considered. These are documented in an outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), which accompanies the DCO application.  Potential noise impacts during the operation of the HVDC converter/HVAC substation is addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 8: Noise and Vibration, along with proposed mitigation where appropriate.
Swannington with Alderford and Little Witchingham Parish Council	Accessing the construction area from compounds: it was clear from the meeting at Weston Longville on 10 August that a lot more thought and local consultation needs to take place relating to the siting of the compounds and in particular getting cables/ plant etc. from these compounds to the digging areas. Detailed discussion with local parish councillors is needed to give information to you on ease of access and local problems.	Y	The Main construction compound proposed near Weston Longville has not been taken forward to the application. The main construction compound for the project will be located at Oulton Airfield, accessed off the B1149.
Swannington with Alderford and Little Witchingham Parish Council	Will Hall Road be used as an access point to the digging area in Alderford.	I	Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport provides information relating to construction access routing.
Highways England	Would just like to discuss your plans around the existing A47 road and the preferred route announcement of our dualling scheme between North Tuddenham and Easton where your cables cross. I have previously tried to contact to discuss a solution to where the cables cross our existing and planned roads.	I	Noted, Hornsea Three has consulted, and will continue to consult Highways England to identify interactions between projects. Where highway improvement schemes are sufficiently progressed, potential cumulative effects have been identified and assessed within the relevant topic chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3).
Highways England	Please contact to begin mitigation strategies regarding our schemes	I	Consultation with Highways England has been ongoing and is documented in the Consultation Report which accompanies the DCO Application.
East Carleton & Ketteringham Parish Council	The parish council has concerns about trees that may be in the cable corridor and particularly old established oaks. Avoid the destruction of trees and respect any tree protection orders in place	I	Impacts from Hornsea Three on ecological features, including hedgerows and trees (including woodlands) has been avoided where possible through commitments to use trenchless technologies such as Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD). We recognise that protection and sensitive restoration of hedgerows and trees is important to minimise any negative impact on



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>49</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
			<p>biodiversity or landscape.</p> <p>The replacement of hedgerows at the end of the construction phase to be undertaken will ensure there is no net loss of hedgerow habitat as a result of Hornsea Project Three. Furthermore, restoration of hedgerows, currently in poor condition, provides an opportunity to achieve long term benefits for the biodiversity associated with this habitat type. Further details on hedgerow removal, retention and replacement can be found in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation as well as the Outline Ecological Management Plan and the Outline Landscape Management Plan which form part of the DCO application.</p>
East Carleton & Ketteringham Parish Council	The access to the proposed substation at Swardeston must be fully considered as access from the B1113 is not suitable for the volume and size of vehicles that will be needed in the construction phase. DONG should work with Highways England to provide access even if temporary for the construction of the substation directly from the A47	I	Impacts relating to access are addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport. It is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this forms part of the DCO application.
Kelling Parish Council (Barbara Young)	Cable Corridor - Kelling is a small but busy village. The tea-room near the war memorial is well used. Farm vehicles have to use the street on a regular basis. Bird watchers come in droves, when an unusual bird is blown ashore - and park in the street. The primary school is popular and the street is the only place for parents to park at the start and end of school. The barn (by Beck House) is a rehearsal and performance space.	I	Where sensitive receptors are located in close proximity to the works i.e. at landfall, the Project will ensure that sensitive construction management measures, such as noise, dust and traffic control are considered. These are documented in an outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), which accompanies the DCO application. Impacts on sensitive receptors are landfall are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3).
Kelling Parish Council (Barbara Young)	80m Refinement - There are particular concerns regarding road safety. There are no pavements in Kelling near the route that service vehicles would have to take. The street is often clogged by the level of traffic it already has. There have been near misses on the A149 where children cross with the lollipop man. There is no mobile phone coverage.	I	Impacts relating to access (including pedestrian safety) are addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport. It is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this forms part of the DCO application.
Reepham Town Council	Temporary Construction - The siting of the construction compound adjacent to the Cawston Road (B1145) gives rise to concern. If it is sited on the south-east side of the road there will be problems in providing a safe access from the site to the highway because of limited views for approaching traffic and we would oppose this proposal on safety grounds. A construction site on the north-west side of Cawston Road (B1145) would be preferable provided adequate sight lines for approaching traffic could be provided. The current proposals suggest that construction may take some years to complete and we would ask for reassurance on the continued use, security and condition of the construction site during that period. Reepham is a small market town and the roads through Reepham are not suitable for the passage of large vehicles, particularly earth moving and other large construction equipment. The Town Council requires that the Reepham must be kept free of all construction traffic and it is suggested that access to the construction site should be via the B1145 from the B1149 Norwich - Holt road near Cawston.	I	<p>The main construction compound for the project will be located at Oulton Airfield, accessed off the B1149, as shown in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description.</p> <p>Further information on access is provided in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport, as well as the outline CTMP which forms part of the DCO application.</p>
Reepham Town Council	PEIR - The two main traffic arteries to and from Reepham are the B1145 Bawdeswell to Cawston road, the main East - West route, and the Reepham to Norwich road, the commuter route into Norwich. The closure of either of these routes would entail significant hardship for local residents, public transport and traders. In particular the closure of the B1145 would require an official diversion of some 30 miles. Reepham Town Council would require that road crossings at the construction site on the B1145 and the Reepham Road at Little Witchingham should be carried out without closing the highway by thrust boring or some similar method that would not entail closing the road.	Y	Hornsea Three has committed to HDD all public roads and as such road closures at these locations is not proposed. Further information on access is provided in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport, as well as the outline CTMP which forms part of the DCO application.
Swardeston Parish Council	Substation - 1 The siting of such a large structure so close to a residential area is undesirable. Is there any opportunity to challenge the decision of the National Grid to require Dong Energy to connect Hornsea Project Three to the Norwich Main substation? 2 Has Dong energy exhausted	I	Environmental Statement, volume 3, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives sets out the process of identifying a grid connection location.



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>49</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>all alternatives before determining the precise site location for the substation? 3 Why is the onshore substation not being built adjacent to, and to the South of, the existing Norwich Main substation? This site has direct vehicular access off the A140 and is as removed, if not more removed, from existing residential developments as the proposed site. 4 The proposed substation is an immensely high structure. Has Dong Energy considered acquiring a portion of the Mangreen quarry site so as to be able to construct the substation at least partially below ground level? This site would have direct access off the A140 and A47 and the added benefit of almost totally screening the finished substation by a combination of building below ground and planting around the circumference. 5 Whatever the precise location of the substation site, we believe that access to the site should be directly from the A47 (or the A140-A47 slip road), at least for HGVs and "abnormal loads" and preferably for ALL traffic. The B1113 already fails to meet the needs of pedestrians and cyclists and will struggle to cope with the proposed increase in traffic. It is already gridlocked in places at certain times of day, especially at its junction with the A140. 6 The B1113 north of the A47 underpass has a recent history of flooding in heavy rain, with the majority of that flooding caused by water run-off from the field in which the proposed substation is to be sited. Is Dong energy aware of this historic issue and can users of the road be assured that sufficient drainage will be put in place in order to avoid any increased likelihood of these flooding events? 7 How does Dong Energy intend to alleviate any noise and light pollution consequent upon the construction and operation of the substation? 8 Dong Energy representatives have indicated that substantial tree planting will take place to reduce the visual impact of the substation. The proposed site already contains a number of ancient hedgerows and mature trees. Will Dong Energy be taking all necessary steps to ensure that these trees and hedges are protected, both for the sake of their existing ecology and for the immediate screening effect they will have on the finished substation? 9 Given the height of the proposed structure, we believe that 'bundling' the substation and planting along the crest will not of itself significantly reduce its visibility since most native tree varieties are relatively slow growing. Accordingly, we believe that, wherever possible, planting of semi-mature trees should commence immediately, not only around the boundaries of the site but also in other more distant areas where there is anticipated to be line of sight visibility of the substation. 10 Again, given the height of the structure, will Dong Energy be giving consideration to entering into agreements with mobile telephone network operators to enable mobile phone masts to be placed on the substation so as to improve reception in the area? 11 What assurances will Dong Energy give that Parishioners will not suffer financially from the decision to site the substation in the Parish? Clearly some Parishioners will have their homes permanently blighted such that they will become unsaleable. Many others however will find that their properties are reduced in value. For most people, their homes are an important part of their retirement planning. Any loss of value will have serious financial repercussions. How is Dong Energy planning to address this? 12 We understand that Dong Energy has previously established community funds to compensate the community as a whole for the inconvenience suffered during the construction process and whilst the substation is in operation. We have noted the sums being made available by Dong Energy through Grantscape in connection with the Race Bank and Hornsea Project One offshore windfarms. How have these sums been calculated? 13 The Race Bank and Hornsea Project One compensation schemes appear to have been established to compensate communities over a wide area on the basis, presumably, that they are all adversely affected over the long term through sight of the wind turbines. This will not be the case with the Hornsea Project Three. Since the turbines are well out of sight of land, communities along the cable laying route will only be affected during the relatively brief construction phase. Swardeston alone, with the possible inclusion of the area around the HVAC Booster Station if it is needed, will continue to be affected following the completion of the construction phase by the visual impact and polluting aspects of the continued operation of the substation. Will any community fund either be heavily weighted in favour of this locality, or a separate fund established to compensate Swardeston and its close neighbours. 14 Will Swardeston Parish Council have a leading role in determining how any community funds are distributed?</p>		<p>The aim of the grid connection option appraisal was to identify the most economic and efficient design option for the connection of a project. Although both National Grid and Orsted input into the appraisal process (in respect to economic and strategic factors), the eventual grid connection offer is determined by National Grid. In May 2016, Hornsea Three was formally offered a grid connection at Norwich Main Substation as a result of this appraisal process.</p> <p>Information pertaining to the site selection for the HVAC booster station and HVDC converter/HVAC substation is also provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives.</p> <p>Through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive ecological receptors. For example, the orientation of the HVAC booster station has been optimised to minimise impacts on nearby field boundaries (hedgerows and trees) as well as maximise natural screening. Additional mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project are outlined in topic specific chapters, and include the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts on local road networks; the restoration of habitats (including hedgerows) which cannot be avoided; and landscape planting around the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.</p> <p>In respect to construction impacts, the Project will ensure that sensitive construction management measures, such as noise, dust and traffic control are implemented where required. These are documented in an outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) and outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP), which accompanies the DCO application.</p> <p>In respect to your final point, Hornsea Project Three will review the interactions of the project, as the proposal is refined and consider an appropriate way to feed benefits back into the local community. However, any decision to establish a community benefit fund for Hornsea Three would be made post financial investment decision (FID).</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>49</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 42: Local Authorities (prescribed under section 43 of the Act)</b>			
Norfolk County Council	Additional Comments (Cont) 3.1 DONG Energy are asked to ensure that their underground Cable Route does not fetter on future highway improvement schemes in Norfolk and that where any reinforcement or diversion is needed to the cable route as a result of such highway works, that DONG Energy will be responsible any upgrades or diversion of the cables and will fully meet the costs of these works.	I	Noted, Hornsea Three has consulted, and will continue to consult Highways England to identify interactions between projects. Where highway improvement schemes are sufficiently progressed, potential cumulative effects have been identified and assessed within the relevant topic chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3).
Norfolk County Council	Local Highways Issues 2.27 Until such time as a Transport Assessment (TA) has been completed by the applicant assessing the finalised route options, the County Council (Highway Authority) is unable to endorse the proposal. The County Council as Highway Authority continue to work closely with DONG Energy regarding their TA works. 2.30 DONG Energy should work closely with Highways England and Norfolk County Council (Highway Authority) to ensure that the proposed cable route to the west of Norwich does not fetter any future plans for the dualling of the A47 (T) or any potential Western Link Road.	I	A transport assessment has been prepared and is provided in Environmental Statement, volume 6, annex 7.1: Transport Assessment. Hornsea Three has consulted, and will continue to consult Highways England and Norfolk County Council to identify interactions between projects. Where highway improvement schemes are sufficiently progressed, potential cumulative effects have been identified and assessed within the relevant topic chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3).
Norfolk County Council	From PIER Table 7.141 Given the level of Construction Traffic movements (100+ per day), this will need to be very carefully managed at the access route from A149 and A148 corridors during the peak summer season. Contractors get a lot of criticism of any works/disruption along here during this period. This has been identified in C7 of the PIER T&T proposal item 7.6.3 (P11). We seek to prevent this between arbitrarily Whitsun and Mid-September.  A140 has a similar issue during the peak summer months A1067 is generally manageable, though if pushed we would not wish to see excessive HGV movements to the access during the morning peak time B1149 access point North of Corpusty does not generally present a problem Access point at Oulton Street. This road is weight restricted from the east through the village, to prevent large vehicles travelling through the village. This compound looks to be the same one used by Carillion for the Dudgeon project. B1145 Access point to the construction compound East of Reepham. This junction is on a sharp bent and will need enhanced advance warning to approaching traffic Access point to west of Alderford – this is a one way street for part of its length. Access point is close to the Bernard Matthews processing plant. A1067 Morton on the Hill – This is a very busy junction during the morning peak. Need to avoid HGV movements during this time. A47 – this is HE jurisdiction, however high traffic flows at all times. B1108 SE of Bawburgh - This is a very busy road during the morning peak. Need to avoid HGV movements during this time. B1172 E of Hethersett - This is a very busy road during the morning peak. Need to avoid HGV movements during this time. A11 – this is HE jurisdiction, however high traffic flows at all times. B1113 NE Swardeston-This is a very busy road during the morning peak. Need to avoid HGV movements during this time.	I	Impacts relating to access are addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport. It is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this forms part of the DCO application. Hornsea Three will continue their consultation with Highways England and Norfolk County Council in respect to access and transport matters.
Norfolk County Council	As with other large construction project access' points, there needs to be provision for wheel wash facilities- we've had issues in the past.	I	At the main construction compound, wheel washing system (with rumble grids to dislodge accumulated dust and mud) will be implemented. An adequate area of hard standing will be provided between the wheel wash facility and the site exit, wherever site size and layout permits. This is set out in the outline CoCP which forms part of the DCO application.
Norfolk County Council	The form of these access points – will they be manned? Will they have 'rugby goal' type entry points? They may be in the proposal, but I cannot find them at the moment. It would also have	I	Proposed accesses are shown on the Land Plans.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>49</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
	been useful to have had these proposed access points shown on the plans, to aid identification, though again we may have missed them If you have any queries with the above comments please contact John Shaw (Senior Highway Engineer) on 01603 223231		Impacts relating to access are addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport. It is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this forms part of the DCO application. Hornsea Three will continue their consultation with Highways England and Norfolk County Council in respect to access and transport matters.
Planning, South Norfolk Council	3) How do you propose to minimise the impact of the substation (visual, heritage, transport impacts for example)?	I	Mitigation measures relevant to the onshore HVDC converter/HVAC substation have been identified in each topic chapter of the Environmental Statement (see volume 3). Key measures for during the operational phase include: strategic landscaping around the perimeter of the site to screen the site and provide landscape and heritage mitigation and preparation of an operational noise management plan. A number of other measures will be implemented to minimise and manage impacts during construction, as set out in the outline COCP which forms part of the DCO application.
Broadland District Council	The impact on local communities and residential amenities as a result of the increased vehicular activity including heavy plant associated with the construction phases of the onshore export cable route including the removal of excavated material, the delivery of large sections of cables and the traffic movements associated with delivering backfill material. In addition the impact of the traffic movements being centred around the identified temporary construction compounds and the additional construction compounds that the PEIR states 'will be required to facilitate the construction process will be identified in the Environmental Statement' and the resulting noise disturbance/light pollution in these locations and traffic routes that are in close proximity to residential properties. Figure 8.1 on pg. 8 of Chapter 8 - Noise and vibration does not include the temporary construction compound identified at Oulton Street or the alternative cable route west of Salle Park within the 1 km noise and vibration study area buffer as shown in the 'Phase 2 Statutory Consultation Plan'. The district Council expects the imposition of conditions to set out the permitted hours of working, permitted activities at the temporary construction compounds and maximum permitted noise levels to reduce the impact on the nearby local communities.	I	Impacts on the local road network is assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport. Associated disruption in respect to noise and vibration and dust are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapters 8 and 9: Noise and Vibration and Air Quality respectively.
<b>Section 42: Persons with an interest in the land (prescribed under section 44 of the Act)</b>			
Highways England	Having looked at your plans we can see that the route for the cable laying, crosses one of our schemes for dualling the A47 between North Tuddenham and Easton. We would be interested in meeting with you to discuss possible solutions to ensure our schemes do not conflict. We will be looking to send a representative to the community consultation event on the 12th September at Weston Longville if you would like to meet at that date and time? My contact details are below if you wish to discuss further?	I	Response noted. As a statutory consultee, Ørsted engaged with Highways England during the design refinement process, particularly in respect to future schemes. Where future Highways England schemes were sufficiently progressed within the planning system, these have been considered in the cumulative assessment (reported in each of the technical chapters of the Environmental Statement).  Ørsted met with representatives from Highways England at the Weston Longville public consultation event in September to discuss the potential intersection with A47 widening. A subsequent meeting was held at Ørsted's offices on Friday 24 November 2017 and discussions between the parties will be continued on an ongoing basis whilst the two projects mature.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>49</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
A Hafford	I own a substantial area of land at Kelling Paddock , Holgate Hill, Kelling, which is defined as being in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. And I am alarmed at the thought of the prospect of this project disrupting this quiet and peaceful area which is home to an abundance of wildlife, livestock and a sanctuary to many horses. My land backs directly onto the North Norfolk Steam Railway Line. Why should this be disrupted?	Y	Impacts relating to landscape and visual resources are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual resources. Particular consideration has been given to the AONB as a sensitive receptor, and it is noted that Hornsea Three has consulted with the Norfolk Coast Partnership to agree viewpoints to inform the assessment of impacts on the AONB.  Other impacts to residential receptors are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters, for example impacts from noise are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 8: Noise and Vibration.  Mr Hafford's land is not directly affected by the scheme - he was impacted by the 200metre corridor, but not by the final cable corridor.
A Hafford	I am totally against this project affecting this area. Therefore I would suggest that you use the alternative route as marked in mauve on your site plan (top right).	Y	Hornsea Three has taken forward the alternative route at landfall which was presented as part of the Section 42 consultation. This has resulted in the area which will be directly impacted by the landfall works associated with construction of Hornsea Three having been reduced and avoidance of direct impacts on designated sites (including Kelling Heath SSSI). Impacts on the airstrip close to landfall has also been avoided through a commitment to use trenchless technology (e.g. HDD).
Christopher Bond, Bidwells, on behalf of Evans-Lombe Trust & Great Melton Farms	Algarsthorpe Farmhouse The original route will cross immediately in front of Algarsthorpe Farmhouse, a substantial eight bedroom property with views overlooking the River Yare Valley. The original route would sever the main access to Algarsthorpe Farmhouse which runs from the Bawburgh/Marlingford Road (approaching from the north). Algarsthorpe Barns, which include a recording studio, are used by the business of [REDACTED], a broadcaster and media producer. Therefore, any disturbance, particularly noise, will make it difficult for this business to function. Algarsthorpe Farm House is used by [REDACTED] for her business as a legal and business affairs consultant in the media; hence the need to reduce any disturbance to the property.	Y	The alternative route proposed and adopted is now to the rear of the property with tree screening between the two. Concerns regarding potential noise impact during works noted. Access to property also noted in relation to potential impact.
Jane Kenny, Savills (general comments)	iv. Haul Road – the PEIR refers to two temporary Haul Road's 5 metres wide (7 metres wide at passing places). The image that has been previously supplied as an example of how an AC layout would be positioned only indicates one Haul Road at 6 metres wide. Please clarify.	N/A	Hornsea Three confirmed that the reference to two haul roads in the PEIR is one per phase, not two at the same time.
Jane Kenny, Savills (general comments)	ix. Many of the roads identified for access are minor roads unsuitable for vehicles associated with this size of scheme.	I	Hornsea Three will utilise the access road within the construction corridor for construction vehicles, where possible. Where public roads are required to be used in order to reach this construction corridor, these shall be suitable for the vehicles being used. The traffic management plan will identify any roads that are not deemed suitable for use by construction vehicles.
Jane Kenny, Savills (general comments)	v. On Shore Booster Station –the site identified for the Booster Station is a green-field site without direct highways access. By access to the site I refer to this or other suitable access for the type of vehicles that will be required to bring the materials on site. Why can this not be sited on a brown field site?	N/A	The HVAC Booster Station must be located along the route of the cables, which are routed through rural areas in order to avoid impacting built up and urban areas. Brownfield sites were investigated but were ruled out an early stage for this reason.
Anna Brookman, Strutt & Parker LLP (general comments)	How will the haul road being installed and how will the reinstatement following its removal be carried out The composition of the haul road will greatly affect the reinstatement required and the future condition of the land which it runs over. An indication of what the haul road will be constructed with, at what stage of the project the works will be carried out along the route, and when it is anticipated it will be removed would assist us in advising our clients accordingly.	I	The actual method will be confirmed once a construction contractor has been appointed. Works could be carried out at any stage of the construction along certain sections of the route, more detail on this will only again be available once a construction contractor has been appointed. The haul road will be removed on completion of the construction work, however if there is likely to be an overlap of phased works, or a short time period between phases, this may, by landowner agreement, be left in situ during this period.



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>49</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co on behalf of CJC Lee and Peter Seaman	Access to the Shrubbs Farm recycling site must always be maintained and must be suitable for the use, otherwise an alternative site or sufficient standard must be provided.	I	Impact to access to Shrubbs & Great Farm will be mitigated where possible, with specific access for any HGV loads being discussed and arranged in advance to avoid impact.
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co on behalf of CJC Lee and Peter Seaman	The B1354, Briston Road and B1149 Holt Road are a vital part of the local highways network for the farm, transport and recycling business as they are roads of sufficient width the load bearing capacity to suit the large machinery used by the businesses. Closure of restriction on use of these road could significantly disrupt the effective operation of the businesses operating from Great and Shrubbs Farms.	Y	Both these roads are proposed to be crossed via HDD to avoid impact to local highway network.
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co on behalf of CJC Lee and Peter Seaman	There are several let properties at Shrubbs Farm: i. DONG will need to ensure that residents always have suitable access to their properties. ii. Services must not be disturbed. iii. If the properties become unsuitable or undesirable for habitation for periods during the works DONG will be liable for any costs of losses that arise.	I	Access to properties will endeavour to be maintained. Existing services and utilities will also endeavour to be maintained during construction, although any damage will be repaired in a timely manner.
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co on behalf of Kelling Estate	Highways and Access <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The A149 Coast Road will be crossed by cables. This is a busy road, particularly during summer months as it carries a significant amount of tourism traffic from Sheringham through Salhouse and onto Blakeney.</li> <li>Holgate Hill will be crossed by the cables and this provides a valuable route into Holt from Weybourne.</li> <li>The smaller country roads around Kelling Estate are often very busy during the spring and summer tourist season and can struggle to cope with traffic loading at peak times. Road closures will increase this pressure.</li> </ul> The following question arise: 1. How will the roads be crossed? 2. Will both roads be closed at the same time and for what anticipated duration? 3. If the A149 is closed at the cable crossing how will traffic be managed to ensure that The Street and Holgate Hill don't become rat runs leading to congestion, verge damage and difficulties with day to day management of the farm and estate? 4. How does DONG propose to ensure that access around the Estate can be maintained during the works and how will traffic based disruption to the community will be managed?	Y	Hornsea Three noted Kelling Estate's concerns and addressed the questions as follows: 1. Both roads are proposed to be crossed via HDD, therefore avoiding direct impact to traffic in the area. 2. If HDD is used neither road should be closed and if it all it would be for a very short duration, with traffic management measures put in place. 3. See response to Q2 4. See response to Q2



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>49</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co on behalf of Kelling Estate	<p>Economic Impact</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Estate is run as a commercial operation with enterprises including farming, sporting, property lettings and tourism/recreation.</li> <li>• Installation of the cables on the route will disrupt 6 arable fields and 2 grass fields leading to crop loss and disruption to the rotation of high value root crops.</li> <li>• The arable fields are used for high value root crops such as parsnips and potatoes which command a significant premium income over white straw cereals and oilseed crops.</li> <li>• The Estate benefits from irrigation, in which there has been considerable investment to allow these high value crops to be grown.</li> <li>• Installation of the cables has potential to significantly disrupt soil structure and alter soil temperature profile, thus potentially rendering the land unsuitable for the existing high value cropping profile.</li> <li>• The additional traffic movements through the village that are anticipated because of the road closures when the cables cross the Coast Road and Holgate Hill could result in complaints from occupants of Estate dwellings. This could result in claims for financial recompense and people not being prepared to stay in the Estate properties again.</li> <li>• Sporting activities on the Estate play a vital role in the employment of local staff on the Estate and the conservation of the property. The proposed cable works will significantly disrupt the environment on the eastern side of the Estate, which could jeopardise the effective operation of the sporting ventures during the construction period.</li> <li>• Disrupting the sporting activities has two-fold effect. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o It can damage the reputation of the Estate's sporting business. This can have knock on effects for future commercial operation resulting in negative long-term implications for conservation project and staffing.</li> <li>o It will significantly disrupt the owner's enjoyment of ownership</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Commercial operations, including several small businesses operate from the main complex at Kelling. Disruption to traffic flows in the area and disruption to the overall environment could lead to tenants removing from the main complex.</li> </ul> <p>The following questions arise:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Does DONG consider the economic disruption to the Estate to be less severe than that to other businesses that might be affected by the principle route proposal?</li> <li>2. Has DONG considered the long-term impact on the Estate economic resources over the shorter-term impact on other businesses that might be affected by the principle route proposal?</li> <li>3. How will DONG seek to minimise and mitigate any long and short term economic losses that arise if DONG adopts the route.</li> </ol>	I	<p>Hornsea Three noted Kelling Estate's concerns and addressed the questions as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The proposed alternative route was not proposed or adopted for economic reasons, but due to technical concerns and likely issues with the initially proposed route.</li> <li>2. As above, the proposed route is not based on an assessment of one economic factor above another, but on technical reasons.</li> <li>3. Orsted will pay compensation for any reasonable losses as a result of its works on a proven loss basis, should these losses continue once construction has completed, then claims should continue to be submitted on the basis of the incurred loss with sufficient supporting evidence.</li> </ol>
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co (generic comments)	<p>Generic comments 9:</p> <p>During installation of the cables there will be areas of land and possibly dwellings and buildings that become 'cut off'.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Please confirm that DONG will carry out a survey of all existing access routes and where necessary propose, or receive proposals for, alternative access routes that will be to a suitable standard?</li> </ul> <p>Where land is cut off and not viable to farm all lost crops or cropping opportunity must be compensated. Please confirm this?</p>	I	<p>Crossing points of the construction corridor will be provided, where possible and reasonable. Alternative access routes will be considered, if required.</p> <p>Any smaller areas that become unfarmable as a result of the construction corridor will be subject to payment of compensation on receipt of a claim and sufficient supporting evidence.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>49</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co (generic comments)	Generic comments 9: During installation of the cables there will be areas of land and possibly dwellings and buildings that become 'cut off'. o Please confirm that DONG will carry out a survey of all existing access routes and where necessary propose, or receive proposals for, alternative access routes that will be to a suitable standard? Where land is cut off and not viable to farm all lost crops or cropping opportunity must be compensated. Please confirm this?	I	Crossing points of the construction corridor will be provided, where possible and reasonable. Alternative access routes will be considered, if required. Any smaller areas that become unfarmable as a result of the construction corridor will be subject to payment of compensation on receipt of a claim and sufficient supporting evidence.
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co (generic comments)	Generic comments 9: During installation of the cables there will be areas of land and possibly dwellings and buildings that become 'cut off'. o Please confirm that DONG will carry out a survey of all existing access routes and where necessary propose, or receive proposals for, alternative access routes that will be to a suitable standard? Where land is cut off and not viable to farm all lost crops or cropping opportunity must be compensated. Please confirm this?	I	Crossing points of the construction corridor will be provided, where possible and reasonable. Alternative access routes will be considered, if required. Any smaller areas that become unfarmable as a result of the construction corridor will be subject to payment of compensation on receipt of a claim and sufficient supporting evidence.
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co (generic comments)	Generic comments 9: During installation of the cables there will be areas of land and possibly dwellings and buildings that become 'cut off'. o Please confirm that DONG will carry out a survey of all existing access routes and where necessary propose, or receive proposals for, alternative access routes that will be to a suitable standard? Where land is cut off and not viable to farm all lost crops or cropping opportunity must be compensated. Please confirm this?	I	Crossing points of the construction corridor will be provided, where possible and reasonable. Alternative access routes will be considered, if required. Any smaller areas that become unfarmable as a result of the construction corridor will be subject to payment of compensation on receipt of a claim and sufficient supporting evidence.
Mr & Mrs Wharton	3. If Muckleburgh Lane is used as access to the landfall site, we will expect hours of use to be restricted to 9am to 5pm on weekdays, and no use at all at the Weekend.	I	Proposed working hours will be set out in the DCO application
Sarah Bristow	Onshore Substation - A bit close to my house, worried about noise, and limited access for building works	I	Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts to local residential receptors, either through site selection/route refinement or through the identification of suitable mitigation measures. Where there are impacts to residential receptors, these are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3), for example noise is addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 8: Noise and Vibration.
Sandra Gentle	Temporary Construction - Was not made aware of these! Where are they going to be?	I	A number of secondary construction compounds, and a main construction compound are proposed during the construction phase of Hornsea Three. These are required to enable the construction of the project. The location of these, as well as a summary of their function, is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>49</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Natasha/Steven Hall	Temporary Construction - Yes - this is too close to my boundary. Impact on my current view - currently have a view over Norwich this will be a long project (although told 'only 5 years'). This to me is not temporary as it is for a vast amount of time. B1113 access is not safe access route.	I	<p>Appropriate mitigation measures for visual disturbance are outlined in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources. This includes, for example, the restoration of habitats (including hedgerows) which cannot be avoided and landscape planting around the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.</p> <p>In respect to duration, an indicative construction schedule for Hornsea Three is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description. During the design refinement Hornsea Three has sought to minimise the duration of any disruption, and has reduced the total duration of the construction phase onshore to eight years. Within this, the maximum duration for construction of the onshore cable corridor is approximately 2.5 years, this therefore means that the maximum duration over which construction could occur would be 5.5 years incorporating two phases (assuming a three-year gap between the two phases). The work associated with each phase is expected to progress along the Hornsea Three onshore cable corridor with a typical active construction works duration of three months at any particular location.</p> <p>Impacts associated with access are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport.</p>
<b>Section 47: Duty to consult local community</b>			
Ann Abbott	Depending on the route followed where will the Haul Road for machinery be sited and which village roads will they travel onto the site? Bearing in mind both Holt Road and Station Road are both designated 'C' roads, very narrow and unsuitable for heavy traffic. Holt Road has 2 tight bends and Station Road has an old narrow bridge over the railway line with trains carrying passengers which I understand could not support heavy loads. Health & Safety concerns apply. You will not be able to use the A149 coast road as the railway bridge over the road is not high enough for your loads. Would it be feasible for cables and machinery to be brought to the Shoal by sea?	I	<p>Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport identifies the proposed construction traffic routing in the landfall area.</p> <p>The potential for delivery of equipment by sea has a number of constraints which has resulted in a road transport option being taken forward. Constraints include potential impacts on the beach and coastal road network, as well as technical and health and safety considerations.</p>
Nigel Rogers	<p>Comments on the Impact on [REDACTED]: 5.1 We confirm that, as previously advised to DONG Energy and Dalcour Maclaren, it is essential that the cable corridor does not damage our septic tank drain. This drain runs under Warren Road and into the field through which the corridor is planned, with the inspection pit for the tank at GPS N 525520.2260 E 1 7 38.016 (the tank drain cover is marked by a traffic cone.) We ask that the final 80m corridor is as far to the east of Warren Road as practicable, to avoid damage to this tank as well as reduce noise and disturbance to ourselves and our neighbours during corridor construction.</p> <p>5.2 We, our neighbours and users of Squirrelwood Livery Stables, require access at all times along Warren Road (the only access track for ourselves and emergency vehicles.) This narrow and poorly kept track is unsuitable for use by traffic for the cable corridor. We understand that the Highways Agency has previously advised, as part of another planning application, that junction of Warren Road with Bridge Road is only suitable for very light traffic movements. It is not suitable for cable corridor traffic.</p>	I	<p>Impacts on drainage and private assets/supplies are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 2: Hydrology and Flood Risk.</p> <p>Impacts relating to access are addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport. It is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this forms part of the DCO application.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>49</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Dr. David Lovell-Badge	Whilst generally happy with your proposal we are concerned in relation to the PEIR boundary and alternative near Beckhithe, Little Melton Road and Burnthouse Lane. There is currently a large construction project to the North of Hethersett involving some 1200 homes. We objected to this since there has been no improvement to the infrastructure including the roads. Our main access routes to our property for the last 13 years have been through Little Melton Road and through Back Lane off Hethersett Lane. This development has closed Back Lane. So the only way to access from that direction is a dangerous right turn on to the main Road B1172 and then through Churchfields. This is very difficult at peak periods. Your proposal would appear to have a significant impact on our ability to access our property through Little Melton Road. This would affect many homes around us and the businesses that operate off Little Melton Road e.g. KeyLine. The route is used regularly by many large HGVs and a bus as well as hundreds of cars. It would be essential to ensure that new road links are built before your development and that any work does not interfere with our access.	I	Impacts relating to access are addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport. It is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this forms part of the DCO application.
Shirley Perry	We wish to protest strongly against the proposed Dong Energy Hornsea project three electrical cable. It is dreadful the Norfolk authorities will consider landfall along any part of the North Norfolk Coast line between Hunstanton and Cromer and also the Booster Station options near Holt, Edgefield, Hempstead and Baconsthorpe areas. These locations still manage to retain some semblance of what is left of rural England and must not be damaged by such a project, which is no doubt the cheapest option for Dong Energy. The landfall should be via one of the larger commercial ports either Hull, Grimsby, Boston or Kings Lynn, and then via an underground trench construction, south of Swaffham and Dereham to the Norwich main grid station. This would be far more less disturbing and in the long term more efficient. We need to save North Norfolk from decimation. Unfortunately it is now too late to save the majority of southern England, which is currently undergoing dramatic ruination. A stand is needed in North Norfolk!	N	Further information pertaining to the landfall location and route selection is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives.
Beverley Wigg	This disruption would be greatly minimised if HVDC technology is adopted (narrower cable corridors and no booster station) and this is, in my view, the only acceptable solution, if the current route succeeds through planning. A narrower cable route would also presumably mean less impact in terms of traffic serving the site and the length of time needed in development.	I	Due to current uncertainty (see Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives), a decision on which transmission system (HVDC or HVAC) to adopt will not be made until post consent after extensive engagement with potential systems suppliers has taken place. As a result of this, we have conducted our assessments based on a realistic worst-case scenario, which could be either HVDC or HVDC technology depending on the receptor.
Paul Craske	Weybourne is set in a Conservation area of natural outstanding beauty, and YOU want to come along and disrupt our lives again for up to eleven years! What does the village gain from this.... nothing, we lose the income from holiday makers, which in turn means a loss of income to our already struggling pub and shop, that alone those residents trying to make an income from letting accommodation.?	Y	Since the PEIR, a refined landfall location has been identified (western re-route around Kelling) and the area identified for landfall works has reduced. This was informed by a number of factors including engineering/technical considerations, community feedback in the area of Kelling and Weybourne, avoidance of the Kelling Heath SSSI/CWS and Holiday Park. Impacts associated with works at the landfall are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3).  Notwithstanding this it is noted that where sensitive receptors are in close proximity to onshore works, the Project will ensure that sensitive construction management measures, such as noise, dust and traffic control are considered. These are documented in an outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), which accompanies the DCO application.  Impacts on tourism are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 10: Socio-Economics.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>49</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Paul Craske	One of the main issues for me is that our roads are not suitable for lorries whichever direction you come from, with Dudgeon we had convoys of 6-7 lorries bringing cabling for weeks through our village ,on roads designed for pony and trap. As you can imagine this caused absolute chaos. I had wrongly assumed that you may have acknowledged this problem ,but instead you have proposed a new Road off the A149. How do you propose to get your lorries to your new road? Given the amount of cables that you require, surely you need to look at transporting them by sea..	I	Impacts relating to access are addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport. It is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this forms part of the DCO application.
Paul Craske	If as Dudgeon you propose to turn off the A148 at Sandy Hill Lane ,then I suggest talks are started with the owner of Abbey Farm , as where the road passes over the bridge, the farm depot is on the right hand side, past the station. The farm has an access road to the A149 which would mean that 50% of the village would be spared disruption ,although this is still not an acceptable route. The preferred route would be via Kelling from the A148, which would then join your new road before coming into our village.	I	Impacts relating to access are addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport. It is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this forms part of the DCO application.
David Gurney	Having looked at the project information online and at one of the events I would like to comment on and object to the proposed location of the construction compound (Compound 1) on part of the former airfield south of the village of Weston Longville. The main reasons why this is a highly unsuitable location for a compound relate to highways issues, namely:- 1) the number and speed of vehicles using the road by the site – Honingham Road. This road is also subject to a width restriction. 2) the configuration of the junction of Honingham Road and Weston Road to the north, and Honingham Road and Weston Green Road leading to Breck Lane to the south. Both junctions are highly unsuitable for large vehicles both in terms of safe negotiation and visibility. 3) Breck Lane is very narrow and has high volumes of traffic with no passing places. 4) Traffic use of all these local roads is likely to increase as a result of the Norwich Northern Distributor Road in progress and works planned by Highways England on the A47. They are already "rat runs". I would urge you to consider alternative sites for this compound for the reasons outlined above.	Y	The Main construction compound proposed near Weston Longville has not been taken forward to the application. The main construction compound for the project will be located at Oulton Airfield, accessed off the B1149. Justification for this decision is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives.
J Gurney	I am emailing to comment on and object to the proposed location of the construction compound on the former airfield south of the village of Weston Longville. I think this is an unsuitable location for a compound because of highways issues, including the number and excessive speed of vehicles using Honingham Road (which has a width restriction), the unsuitability of the road junctions to the north and south for large vehicles (both are already dangerous) and the narrowness of Breck Lane.	Y	Weston Longville is no longer under consideration for the main construction compound, which is now proposed at Oulton Airfield. Additional information regarding this decision is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives.
John Hurst	I duly attended the penultimate public consultation on the proposed cable route at Weston Longville on 12th September 2017 but it is still unclear to me how the Applicant's proposals relate to three of the potential routes of the Norwich Distributor Road across the Wensum Valley linking the A1067 to the A47.( the Western Link ) It would appear that in some places the route of the cables actually crosses or follows the route of the potential alternative routes currently being considered for the Western Link and that the current cable route may therefore have a significant effect on both the proposed red and purple routes as well as the proposed new junction on the A47 at Easton.	I	The potential impacts on traffic are detailed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport.  The potential for impacts arising as a result of Hornsea Project Three to combine with other planned developments is assessed in each respective topic chapter, under the heading 'Cumulative Effect Assessment'. However, it is noted that the cumulative developments considered comprise those where sufficient information is available in the public domain, which at this stage does not include the Western Link. Additional detail on the identification of cumulative developments is included in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 5: Environmental Impact Assessment Methodology.



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>49</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
John Hurst	Could the Applicant therefore produce detailed plans showing how it is intended to deal with each of the published alternative routes linking the A1067 with the A47? For example at Marl Hill there is insufficient land at certain points within the 200m wide corridor to accommodate both a cable route and a new road if it is decided at a later date to place any new road in a cutting to protect the surrounding countryside and the village of Weston Longville.	I	The potential for impacts arising as a result of Hornsea Project Three to combine with other planned developments is assessed in each respective topic chapter, under the heading 'Cumulative Effect Assessment'. However, it is noted that the cumulative developments considered comprise those where sufficient information is available in the public domain, which at this stage does not include the Western Link. Additional detail on the identification of cumulative developments is included in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 5: Environmental Impact Assessment Methodology.
David and Julie Brooks	In conclusion our impression is that this is the wrong area and landfall site to bring in offshore cables from Hornsea 3 and expect an 80 metre cable corridor construction to be implemented without major excessive disruption to local people/traffic/tourist trade/wildlife. This is on an altogether different scale to the Sheringham Shoal project which had a single trench of 2 metres width! Like many other older people we have recently retired to Weybourne to get away from the stresses of urban living and enjoy, in our later years, the peaceful environment of a small village on the coast, with accessible countryside on our doorstep. This would all be shattered if this massive landfall project goes ahead at Weybourne, especially if the eastern route(which is very close to residential areas of Weybourne) were to be used. For all the above reasons it could have a serious impact on our daily lives, and therefore on our health and wellbeing.	Y	Further information pertaining to the landfall location and route selection is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives. Where possible, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts to local residential receptors, either through site selection/route refinement (including taking forwards the alternative route further to the west of Weybourne) or through the identification of suitable mitigation measures. Where there are impacts to residential receptors, these are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3).
David and Julie Brooks	With a major project of this scale there will be unprecedented traffic problems with heavy vehicle movement on the country roads in and out of Weybourne which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and tourists. How will you mitigate these concerns? This appears to be a massive construction undertaking and with HGVs delivering cables, equipment and trucks to offload cables at the cable corridor will mean continual blocked roads and delays.	I	Access routes will be required from the nearby road network at various places along the onshore cable route and at the HVAC substation to access the construction works as well as the various compounds along the route that may be set-up in advance of the cable laying. Vehicle movements will vary depending on their purpose but will include heavy goods vehicles as well as abnormal indivisible loads. However, during construction, temporary haul roads will be installed within the cable corridor to facilitate the movement of construction vehicles to the site and to allow trench excavation to take place. These haul roads will also help minimise interactions with the local road networks.  Measures will be implemented to minimise dust, mud and debris associated with the movement of construction vehicles between the compounds and the route, the details of which will be provided in an outline Code of Construction Practice which forms part of the DCO application. Furthermore, prior to the commencement of traffic generating works, a Construction Traffic Management Plan(s) will be agreed with the relevant Local Highway Authority in consultation with the Highways Agency.  Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport provides detailed assessment of potential traffic impacts on the local road network including the B1113 and concludes that there would be no significant effect.
David and Julie Brooks	Construction work at the landfall site on Weybourne beach could cause major disruption as it is scheduled to last for 24 months and there will be excessive traffic travelling up and down Beach Lane. According to Annex 7.4 of the PEIR – HGV traffic movements being 600 and non HGV 1,200 movements. This will also impact on local and tourist traffic access to the beach car park and coastal path. Or will this be closed off for 2 years?	Y	Following design refinement, the area identified for landfall works has reduced and the beach lane car park is not under consideration as a construction compound. Further details on the proposed landfall, including access are set out in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description and volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>49</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
David and Julie Brooks	The proposed onshore cable corridor route (Section 1B) to the east of Weybourne would create major disruption as at 80 metres width it will take up all of the car park and the field area at the top of the cliffs. Also if the area is fenced off while construction takes place it will close off any access to this area and the lane from the Windmill to the Coastguard cottages for about 6 months based on Annex 7.4 which states a rate of construction at 3 months per location per 750 metres. (However, this figure is based on 2 trenches stated in Annex 7.4 whereas there will be 6 trenches in the 80 metre width). So presumably it will take a great deal longer. The cable corridor is also shown very close to the end of Pine Walk which would seriously impact on residents in the adjacent bungalows.	Y	Through design development, the area which will be directly impacted by the landfall works associated with construction of Hornsea Three has been reduced. Where practicable, Hornsea Three has sought to avoid or minimise impacts on nearby residential receptors.  The potential impacts of the construction works at landfall are addressed in topic specific chapters, with impacts on traffic and access considered in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport.
David and Julie Brooks	What will be the effect on house prices in the area as it appears work will be ongoing for about 2 years (or more depending on whether it is a phased project) from Weybourne beach to the A148, for a wind farm life of 20 years! Perhaps you can supply a detailed project schedule for the work to be carried out between Weybourne beach and the A148. There will be potentially a major effect on local B&Bs/Shop/Pub with a detrimental impact on trade.	I	During the design refinement Hornsea Three has sought to minimise the duration of any disruption, and has reduced the total number of phases from three to two, and reduced the duration of the construction phase onshore from eleven to eight years. A full project construction schedule is available in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description.  Potential impacts from Hornsea Three on socio-economic and tourism are identified and assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 10: Socio-Economics. Taking into consideration the mitigation designed into Hornsea Three, no significant adverse effects are predicted.
Sarah Small	Please could the cable be routed further away from the village and cross fewer of the roads that lead into and out of the village.	I	Environmental Statement, volume 3, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives sets out the process of route refinement which considered, amongst other factors, technical and environmental factors.  Where possible and practicable the cable corridor route selected seeks to avoid passing adjacent to properties. This is to reduce impacts associated with construction disturbance and to seek to minimise conflicts such as Heavy Goods Vehicle (HGV) traffic movements. However, it is not possible to avoid passing in close proximity to all properties on the route. Where properties are located in close proximity, the Project will ensure that sensitive construction management measures, such as noise, dust and traffic control are considered. These are documented in an outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), which accompanies the DCO application.
Dr. William Brian Ankers (on behalf of Yvette Gibson)	(b) Volume 3 - Onshore Chapters, Chapter 7: Traffic and Transport, page 32, Table 7.141 details the projected number of HGVs (including Abnormal Indivisible Loads) generated by the construction of the HVAC booster station and states that this will generate a total of 6,503 HGV movements with a maximum daily HGV movement of 24. Volume 6 – Onshore Chapter Annexes, Annex 7.4: Construction Vehicle Trip Generation Assumptions gives a construction duration of 12 months for the HVAC booster station with an average number of staff on site per day throughout this duration of 61. These staff are given a mode share of 50% single occupancy by car, adding further to the traffic generated by the HGVs. My representation of March 2017 in Section 16. Transport expressed serious concerns regarding the adverse impact of heavy transport on the Pond Hills site.	I	Impacts relating to access are addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport. It is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this forms part of the DCO application.
John Rawlinson	Very concerned that any base for workers and materials should not adversely affect traffic and infrastructure in the Reepham area, especially with regard to movements through the town centre. Appropriate routes should be chosen to minimise disruption.	I	Impacts relating to access are addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport. It is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this forms part of the DCO application. It also noted that during construction, temporary haul roads will be installed within the onshore cable corridor to facilitate the movement of construction vehicles to the site and to allow trench excavation to take place. These haul roads will also help minimise interactions with the local road networks.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>49</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Rt Hon Norman Lamb MP	They also have misgivings, which I share, about the plans for a phased delivery of the project that could last for nearly a decade. Were that to happen it would have a major adverse effect on residents' lives, livelihoods- especially fishing and tourism- and environment and a lasting impact on transport infrastructure, wider tourism, flora and fauna.	Y	<p>During the design refinement Hornsea Three has sought to minimise the duration of any disruption, and has reduced the total number of phases from three to two, and reduced the duration of the construction phase onshore from eleven to eight years.</p> <p>Potential impacts from Hornsea Three on socio-economic and tourism are identified and assessed in Environmental Statement Volume 3, Chapter 10: Socio-Economics. Taking into consideration the mitigation designed into Hornsea Three, no significant adverse effects are predicted.</p> <p>Impacts from Hornsea Three on transport and ecological receptors are assessed in Environment Statement volume 3, chapters 7: Traffic and Transport and chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation. Inter-related effects on local residents, as a result of impact interactions, are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 11: Inter-related Effects.</p>
Anna Brookman, Strutt & Parker LLP (general comments)	<p>How will the haul road being installed and how will the reinstatement following its removal be carried out</p> <p>The composition of the haul road will greatly affect the reinstatement required and the future condition of the land which it runs over. An indication of what the haul road will be constructed with, at what stage of the project the works will be carried out along the route, and when it is anticipated it will be removed would assist us in advising our clients accordingly.</p>	I	<p>The actual method will be confirmed once a construction contractor has been appointed. Works could be carried out at any stage of the construction along certain sections of the route, more detail on this will only again be available once a construction contractor has been appointed. The haul road will be removed on completion of the construction work, however if there is likely to be an overlap of phased works, or a short time period between phases, this may, by landowner agreement, be left in situ during this period.</p>
National Farmers Union (NFU)	<p>Haul Road/Access</p> <p>There are general concerns on how will the haul road be built and for different methods to be discussed with farmers and landowners. Further will access be allowed along the haul road or will this only be for construction traffic? How are contractors going to take access to the haul road and that access point must be agreed with farmers and landowners. Further how are farmers to access their land which has been severed by the working strip?</p>	I	<p>Hornsea Three confirmed the actual method will be confirmed once a construction contractor has been appointed. Works could be carried out at any stage of the construction along certain sections of the route, more detail on this will only again be available once a construction contractor has been appointed. The haul road will be removed on completion of the construction work, however if there is likely to be an overlap of phased works, or a short time period between phases, this may, by landowner agreement, be left in situ during this period.</p> <p>Access along the haul road for landowners will be subject to any health and safety/construction requirement taking precedence.</p> <p>Throughout discussions with landowners to date it has been said that access to the construction corridor will be taken from the adjoining public highways where possible, the specific points of access are still to be confirmed. Where this is not possible, additional access routes will be required from the nearest public highway in order to reach the construction corridor.</p> <p>Crossing points may be possible along the working corridor by request where these are feasible and suitable.</p>
Matthew Martin	My view about all this is that I cannot work out why the proposed corridor for the southern end of the onshore route cannot be made to run next to the Norwich Southern by-pass. The environmental damage has already been done by the road and by the overhead cables next to the road	I	<p>Information relating to cable corridor routing is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives. Cable corridor routing was informed by a number of factors including technical and environmental constraints, as well as the availability of a suitably wide easement without disturbing wider highway network.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>49</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Derek Barber	<p>Why can't the substation go in the quarry beside the A140? Access to the substation site should be directly from the A47 (or the A140-A47 westbound slip road) at least for HGVs and abnormal loads and preferably for ALL traffic. Whatever planting is used around the substation perimeter should be native species atop an earth bank in order to achieve maximum effect as quickly as possible and provide a beneficial wildlife habitat. Much of the substation itself looks to be bordered by "ancient hedgerows". It is imperative that these suffer minimal disturbance with zero tree felling and complete restoration upon project completion. This will aid the planned perimeter screening mentioned above. Any Community Fund set up to compensate the local communities affected by this development MUST be heavily biased in favour of Swardeston and its close neighbours as they will suffer some 80% of the permanent blight of this project via the onshore substation. More so if the booster station is relocated or not needed. Having walked the whole site it would seem relatively simple to sink the substation into the ground by several metres and use the spoil so produced to bund the whole site thus reducing visual impact. More so if the bund embankment is planted with trees.</p>	I	<p>We address each of your points in turn:</p> <p>The positioning of complex infrastructure in a quarry or similar, encompasses a range of technical constraints not least the footprint area which is required, accessibility and health and safety considerations. Furthermore, the quarry remains operational, with plans to extend (as assessed in the cumulative assessments in the relevant topic chapters of the Environmental Statement volume 3) and therefore was discounted as a site alternative for the HVDC converter/HVAC substation.</p> <p>Information relating to construction traffic routing is provided in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport, which confirms that access to the HVDC converter/HVAC substation would be from the B1113.</p> <p>Consideration was given to a wide range of potential mitigation in respect to landscape and visual effects of Hornsea Three. The lowering of the HVDC converter/HVAC substation below current ground level was one option which was considered; however, given that multiple underground cables need to connect into this infrastructure, this option would have had significant implications for the depth of cable trenches and thus earthworks needed along a length of the onshore cable corridor. Based on this, Hornsea Three has implemented a range of other mitigation measures which are set out in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources. This includes, for example, the restoration of habitats (including hedgerows) which cannot be avoided and landscape planting around the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.</p> <p>We recognise that protection and sensitive restoration of hedgerows is important to minimise any negative impact on biodiversity or landscape. Impacts from Hornsea Three on ecological features, including hedgerows and trees (including woodlands) has been avoided where possible through commitments to use trenchless technologies such as Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD). The replacement of hedgerows at the end of the construction phase to be undertaken will ensure there is no net loss of hedgerow habitat as a result of Hornsea Three. Furthermore, restoration of hedgerows, currently in poor condition, provides an opportunity to achieve long term benefits for the biodiversity associated with this habitat type. Further details on hedgerow removal, retention and replacement can be found in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation as well as the Outline Ecological Management Plan and the Outline Landscape Management Plan which form part of the DCO application.</p> <p>We have established voluntary Community Benefit Funds (CBFs) for a number of our projects, which are currently under construction. These funds can make a valuable contribution to the local area, by supporting projects such as community building improvements and recreation facilities, conservation and wildlife projects etc. Hornsea Project Three will review the interactions of the project, as the proposal is refined and consider an appropriate way to feed benefits back into the local community. However, any decision to establish a community benefit fund for Hornsea Three would be made post financial investment decision (FID).</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>49</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Dominic Everett	National Grid have offered the project a connection point that is so far from the coast that it requires excessive disruption and cost. The cost will be significant to DONG and be paid for by electricity consumers. The disruption will effect many people.	N	The location of any onshore infrastructure is largely determined by the grid offer we discuss and agree with National Grid. This is assessed by both National Grid and the developer from an economic, efficient and strategic perspective, in relation to additional costs and investments required based on the capacity and timing of energy production sought by the developer. One key element of this assessment is the perceived costs that may be passed on to the end user (the public and businesses) and hence both parties seek to minimise this. Hornsea Project Three received the single offer of Norwich Main National Grid Substation and as such, this is the grid connection point which is described in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description.
Dominic Everett	The proposal should include an intention to enhance the bio-diversity of the land around the building. There are a number of old hedgerows around the proposed site. There should be a commitment to maintain these important habitats. To cause the minimum damage and to repair any damage caused as quickly as possible. The main access road to the site, the Norwich to Swardeston Road should have the maximum speed limit reduced from 60mph to a lower level e.g. 40 mph for the section passing the main entrance to reduce the risk of accidents. The proposed building should be screened by an earth bank and planting using a variety of native species of both trees and shrubs that will increase the biodiversity and provide good habitat for local flora and fauna. The developer should aim to create an access route on/off from the A47 onto the site for heavy vehicles. The developer should mitigate against the disruption to the local area during construction.	I	Impacts from Hornsea Three on ecological features, including hedgerows and trees (including woodlands) has been avoided where possible through commitments to use trenchless technologies such as Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD).  Any hedgerows which cannot be avoided will be replaced at the end of the construction phase. Furthermore, restoration of hedgerows, currently in poor condition, provides an opportunity to achieve long term benefits for the biodiversity associated with this habitat type as well as gap up hedgerows providing landscape and visual mitigation. Further details on hedgerow removal, retention and replacement can be found in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation, the Outline Ecological Management Plan and the Outline Landscape Management Plan.  Impacts associated with access are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport. Specific traffic management measures will be developed during the detailed design stage, however the principles which will be used to develop these are outlined within the outline CoCP and outline CTMP, both of which form part of the DCO.
Ian Dinmore	How will all transportation of materials and equipment be managed in a rural area with traffic problems?	I	Impacts relating to access are addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport. It is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this forms part of the DCO application. It also noted that during construction, temporary haul roads will be installed within the onshore cable corridor to facilitate the movement of construction vehicles to the site and to allow trench excavation to take place. These haul roads will also help minimise interactions with the local road networks.
Marguerite Russel	Comments on PEIR - No - This is not an area I have knowledge of and nothing to compare it with. If the recent experiences with construction of the NDR and the total chaos this has caused is repeated then North Norfolk will come to a holt again, business's will suffer and tourists will avoid us. This would be a disaster.	I	Impacts on socio-economic and tourism are addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 10: Socio-Economics.



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>49</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Martin Davies	Mitigation Methods - Drainage on the B1113 is very poor and is a safety risk. The new station should not worsen this risk, also access must be via A47 or A140 - Not the B1113.	I	Appropriate mitigation measures have been design-in to Hornsea Three to minimise impacts on drainage and flooding (particularly in relation to runoff). Details are provided in volume 3, chapter 2: Hydrology and Flood Risk (see Table 2.17) as well as the outline CoCP which forms part of the DCO application.  Furthermore, the design has sought to minimise run-off through maximising the area of permeable hardstanding and preparing an outline drainage strategy for the HVDC converter/HVAC substation. This outline strategy is provided in Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 2.1: Onshore Infrastructure FRAs and has been developed in accordance with the NPS, NPPF, PPG ID7 and the SuDS Manual, whereby sufficient attenuation storage is provided for 1 in 100 year plus climate change worst case storm event. Drainage provisions will be further developed during detailed design in agreement with the Norfolk County Council as LLFA. The Flood Risk Assessment which has been undertaken for the Project concludes that Hornsea Three meets the requirements of NPS EN-1 and the NPPF.
David Young (NNDC Councillor)	Cable corridor - The roads between A148 and Weybourne/Kelling are narrow, winding, with no pavements. Previous experience of lorries has been bad, especially danger to pedestrians in Kelling. Parking in Kelling during the school run, events at Beck House Barn and bird sightings turn the street into a single carriageway. Kelling is also a 'hot spot' for mobile phones.	I	Impacts relating to access are addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport. It is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this forms part of the DCO application.
T.W.E Wilkinson	Temporary Construction - Mangreen lane linked B1113 to A140 and is quite busy and peak times, serving as a relief route for traffic using the Harford Bridge junction of B1113 and A140. Consideration should be given to minimise any close times of Mangreen Lane	I	Impacts relating to access are addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport. It is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this forms part of the DCO application.
Sarah Bristow	Onshore Substation - A bit close to my house, worried about noise, and limited access for building works	I	Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts to local residential receptors, either through site selection/route refinement or through the identification of suitable mitigation measures. Where there are impacts to residential receptors, these are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3), for example noise is addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 8: Noise and Vibration.
Janet Curtis	Temporary Construction - Weybourne car park is unsuitable due to restricted access, use by the tourists and local residents	Y	The beach road car park is not under consideration as a construction compound. Furthermore it is noted that, since the PEIR, a refined landfall location has been identified (western re-route around Kelling) and the area identified for landfall works has reduced. This was informed by a number of factors including community feedback in the area of Kelling and Weybourne, avoidance of the Kelling Heath SSSI/CWS and Holiday Park as well as engineering/technical considerations.
Ian/Celia Howe	Landfall Zone - my main concern is where you intend to place the depot for materials, cables etc and the route you choose to deliver them to the site. The local road Beach Lane cannot take the very large lorries that are needed to deliver the cable drums.	I	Following design refinement, the area identified for landfall works has reduced and the beach lane car park is not under consideration as a construction compound. A landfall construction compound has been identified and is shown within Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description. The main construction compound, located at Oulton Airfield will also be used for the storage of materials including cables.  In respect to access, access routes will be required from the nearby road network at various places along the onshore cable corridor route, including at landfall, to access the construction works. The route and design of these access roads will be agreed with the relevant landowners in advance of construction and where possible we will seek to use existing roads and tracks. Further details on access routes and the proposed management of traffic and transport are set out in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport as well as the outline Construction Traffic Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>49</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Ian/Celia Howe	Temporary Construction - If the temporary construction compound is at Weybourne, the access routes are a concern.	I	Impacts relating to access are addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport. It is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this forms part of the DCO application.
David Henley	Landfall Zone - Considerable disruption to the holiday business in the area	I	Impacts on socio-economic and tourism are addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 10: Socio-Economics.
David Henley	Landfall Zone Local Matters - Transport. Roads are narrow and cars park on the road by the railway bridge on station road.	I	Impacts relating to access are addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport. It is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this forms part of the DCO application.
David Henley	Cable corridor - Severe disruption to the village. No benefits to the village neither during construction nor on completion.	I	Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on residential receptors, which are assessed in the topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3). Potential beneficial impacts in respect to socio-economics is assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 10: Socio-Economics.
David Henley	80m Refinement - Road Infrastructure	I	Impacts relating to access are addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport. It is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this forms part of the DCO application.
David Henley	Temporary Construction - Access to Beach road car park. Will the public still be able to walk and fish?	Y	Potential impacts to land use and recreation are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 6: Land Use and Recreation. Since the PEIR, a refined landfall location has been identified (western re-route around Kelling) and the area identified for landfall works has reduced. This was informed by a number of factors including community feedback in the area of Kelling and Weybourne, avoidance of the Kelling Heath SSSI/CWS and Holiday Park as well as engineering/technical considerations. Further details are provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives.
David Henley	Further Comments - Disruption to the village over a prolonged period	I	Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts to local residential receptors, either through site selection/route refinement or through the identification of suitable mitigation measures. Where there are impacts to residential receptors, these are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3)
Patricia Dodge (Weybourne Village Hall)	Landfall Zone - The area is of special scientific interest and also a tourist area. It is important to keep the impact to a minimum as roads are narrow and winding particularly through the village and along the Coast Road.	I	Through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive designated sites. For example, Weybourne Cliffs and Kelling Heath SSSI have been avoided and no direct impacts are predicted on these designated sites from Hornsea Three.  Impacts on socio-economics and tourism are assessed within Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 10: Socio-economics.
Patricia Dodge (Weybourne Village Hall)	Landfall Zone Local Matters - The car park and Beach Road are used extensively by the public and regular walkers as part of the Norfolk coastal path. Station Road bridge is old and narrow and there are tight double bends in Holt Road and the coast road by the church	Y	The beach road car park is not under consideration as a construction compound. Furthermore it is noted that, since the PEIR, a refined landfall location has been identified (western re-route around Kelling) and the area identified for landfall works has reduced. This was informed by a number of factors including community feedback in the area of Kelling and Weybourne, avoidance of the Kelling Heath SSSI/CWS and Holiday Park as well as engineering/technical considerations. Further details are provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>49</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Patricia Dodge (Weybourne Village Hall)	Temporary Construction - Please avoid beach car park as it is an integral part of living in Weybourne. As a keen dog walker I would be devastated if I was unable to walk down the Beach Road or use the car park. It is the reason I moved into the village. Dudgeon have already put us through extensive disruption and we do not relish further upheaval to our small coastal village	Y	The beach road car park is not under consideration as a construction compound. Furthermore it is noted that, since the PEIR, a refined landfall location has been identified (western re-route around Kelling) and the area identified for landfall works has reduced. This was informed by a number of factors including community feedback in the area of Kelling and Weybourne, avoidance of the Kelling Heath SSSI/CWS and Holiday Park as well as engineering/technical considerations. Impacts associated with works at the landfall are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3).
Patricia Dodge (Weybourne Village Hall)	Mitigation Methods - The route by road of the heavy lorries and cabling. The need for any structures and portacabins to be shielded and fit as well as possible into the natural landscape. Maybe a fenced compound?	I	A Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this forms part of the DCO application. Impacts relating to access are addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport.
Brian Robinson	Further Comments - There is a proposed new road linking Easton and Attlebridge to complete the Norwich Ring Road. How does the DONG route affect this? How long will roads be closed when the cable is laid? I am particularly concerned with Hall Road, Alderford	I	Impacts on the local road network is assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport.
Sylvia Kavanagh (Swardeston Village Hall Trustee)	HVAC - As a resident of Swardeston, I have some concerns regarding the build process, i.e. Traffic management etc.	I	Impacts relating to access are addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport. It is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this forms part of the DCO application.
Sylvia Kavanagh (Swardeston Village Hall Trustee)	Construction Methods - Access must be restricted	I	Details of security and access management measures during the onshore construction phase of Hornsea Three are set out in outline CoCP which establishes the principles which any principal contractor must follow, the outline CoCP forms part of the DCO application. The operational substation, will be secured in accordance with established standards, with specific measures developed during the detailed design phase.
R. Richards, (G E Carman, Timber Merchant)	Landfall Zone - Wherever it is decided to bring the cables in I would hope access to and enjoyment of the Weybourne car park/beach area will be maintained during engineering work	Y	The beach road car park is not under consideration as a construction compound. Furthermore it is noted that, since the PEIR, a refined landfall location has been identified (western re-route around Kelling) and the area identified for landfall works has reduced. This was informed by a number of factors including community feedback in the area of Kelling and Weybourne, avoidance of the Kelling Heath SSSI/CWS and Holiday Park as well as engineering/technical considerations. Impacts to the recreational use of the beach are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 6: Land Use and Recreation.
Dawn Moore	Landfall Zone - Concerns with construction traffic if it is intended to use Holt Road to Weybourne (lane too narrow for any oncoming traffic) and Station Road into Weybourne as the bridge is too narrow and dangerous (the person I spoke to suggested that the main road would be used and not the country lanes)	I	Impacts relating to access are addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport. It is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this forms part of the DCO application.
Dawn Moore	Local Matters Landfall - I was led to understand following the consultation that Beach lane is not going to be used. I expect this is still to be the case as otherwise it will affect tourism and businesses on that route	Y	Following design refinement, the area identified for landfall works has reduced and the beach lane car park is not under consideration as a construction compound. Further details on the proposed landfall, including access are set out in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description and volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport.
Dawn Moore	Onshore cable corridor - I would suggest the plan to use the right hand channel around Weybourne village should not be considered as it trails next to the cemetery. The best route would be the 'purple' Kelling route to use as it has less impact on residents	Y	Since the PEIR, a refined landfall location has been take forward (western re-route around Kelling) and the area identified for landfall works has reduced. This was informed by a number of factors including community feedback in the area of Kelling and Weybourne, avoidance of the Kelling Heath SSSI/CWS and Holiday Park as well as engineering/technical considerations.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>49</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Dawn Moore	Temporary Construction - Only concern with construction traffic access and length of time for upheaval/noise. Would prefer main road routes are utilised as specified on previous page, as the two country lanes coming into the village of Weybourne will not be suitable due to bends and narrow lanes.	I	Impacts relating to access are addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport. It is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this forms part of the DCO application.
Dawn Moore	Information - I would like to be kept informed of the decisions made with access routes/roads	I	Impacts relating to access are addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport. It is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this forms part of the DCO application.
Sandra Gentle	Temporary Construction - Was not made aware of these! Where are they going to be?	I	A number of secondary construction compounds, and a main construction compound are proposed during the construction phase of Hornsea Three. These are required to enable the construction of the project. The location of these, as well as a summary of their function, is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description.
Stephen Huntley	HVAC - There is an existing quarry site close to your proposed location for the substation which would be much more suitable. It has existing access off the A140 (close to the A47 southern bypass) designed to take heavy vehicle access. It also provides an existing hole in the ground where the 25m high buildings could be well disguised immediately without the need for new screening measures to develop over many years. I am concerned about the potential noise from the site you are considering. Existing information is very hazy and needs to be fleshed out in much more detail before any meaningful observation can be made. My property is relatively close in a straight line across the fields and could be affected.	I	Information pertaining to the site selection for the HVDC converter/HVAC substation station is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives, whilst maximum dimensions are provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description.  Through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive ecological receptors. Additional mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project are outlined in topic specific chapters, and include the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts on local road networks, ecological receptors (e.g. hedgerows) and hydrological features (e.g. main rivers); and landscape planting around the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.
Stephen Huntley	Temporary Construction - Using the quarry site would resolve access concerns to the substation site. If your proposed site is taken forward, access must not be allowed off the B1113 as the junction with A140 is already inadequate. New access must come directly off the A47. Construction workers should be made to use the new access off A47 or use the Park and Ride car park and be ferried on site. Any increase in traffic delays on B1113 would result in Short Lane/Intwood Lane being used as a 'rat run'. These lanes are narrow single lane highways with limiting passing bays. Restrictions would need to be put in place to stop it being used as a shortcut.	I	Impacts relating to access are addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport. It is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this forms part of the DCO application.
John Walker, (SHOOT)	Mitigation Methods - Timing is critical for this time of year and access across the route (i.e. from side to side) will be essential	I	An indicative programme for the construction phase is presented in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description. Impacts relating to access are addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport.
Hugh Guyatt	80m Refinement - The farmer at Abbey Farm has an access road from just past the station over the fields to the Coast Road, coming out west of the low railway bridge, so that could be used, avoiding Station Road and Church Street	I	Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport identifies the proposed construction traffic routing in the landfall area.
Hugh Guyatt	Temporary Construction - Beach Road car park at Weybourne cannot be used. This would hit local people and the holiday businesses on which depend for our income.	Y	The beach road car park is not under consideration as a construction compound. Furthermore it is noted that, since the PEIR, a refined landfall location has been identified (western re-route around Kelling) and the area identified for landfall works has reduced. This was informed by a number of factors including community feedback in the area of Kelling and Weybourne, avoidance of the Kelling Heath SSSI/CWS and Holiday Park as well as engineering/technical considerations.



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>49</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Hugh Guyatt	Local Matters Landfall - Local roads are not suitable for large lorries, particularly down Sand Hill lane, past the station and limits Station Road and Church Street. Last time we had convoys of up to 7 lorries carrying huge drums of cable.	I	Impacts relating to access are addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport. It is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this forms part of the DCO application.
Pat Floyd	Offshore Array - Weybourne is a small and central village in an AONB. The village may be reached by the Coast Road or Station Road. This however has an overhead railway bridge if approaching from Sheringham, too low for high vehicles and the latter is totally unsuitable for large vehicles due to the width in some places and the need to cram a Victorian railway bridge built originally for horses and carts. Weybourne has recently been the landfall sight for Dudgeon Wind Farm and has carried many problems with roads etc plus affecting the tourism industry on which this village relies. Weybourne has had enough and in danger of becoming a building site	I	Since the PEIR, a refined landfall location has been identified (western re-route around Kelling) and the area identified for landfall works has reduced. This was informed by a number of factors including community feedback in the area of Kelling and Weybourne, avoidance of the Kelling Heath SSSI/CWS and Holiday Park as well as engineering/technical considerations.  Impacts related to access are assessed within Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport, with principles for the traffic management measures outlined in the outline CTMP which forms part of the DCO application.  Impacts on the AONB are assessed within the relevant topic specific chapters, most notably Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources.
Pat Floyd	Temporary Construction - As there areas are only proposed at the moment it is difficult to comment but as previously stated, Weybourne is not an ideal location	I	Further information pertaining to the landfall location and route selection is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives. Where possible, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts to local residential receptors, either through site selection/route refinement or through the identification of suitable mitigation measures. Where there are impacts to residential receptors, these are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3).
Peter Halls	PEIR - We notice that there is to be a construction compound at Weston Longville. What will you do about the legal restrictions for lorries and 6'6" width limit for all through vehicles. We are also expecting further traffic calming restrictions. How do you propose to deal with works traffic?	I	The Main construction compound proposed near Weston Longville has not been taken forward to the application. The main construction compound for the project will be located at Oulton Airfield, accessed off the B1149.
Claire Hopkins	HVAC - I have concerns about the B1113 will not be able to handle the additional traffic caused by the substation and that where this road meets the A140 would be significantly impacted as the traffic light system is not very well designed. I am also concerned that the value of the property in Swardeston will fall if there is additional noise generated by the substation.	I	Impacts relating to access are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport, whilst impacts relating to noise are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 8: Noise and Vibration.
Ray Bennett	Onshore Cable Corridor - Will there be any hold ups on the A148 where the cable crosses between High Kelling and Bodham? This is a very busy road.	I	Impacts relating to access are addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport. It is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this forms part of the DCO application.
Maria Veronese	Landfall Zone Local Matters - Norfolk County Council is proposing to close Paddy's Lane once the 3/4 Northern Distributor Route (NDR) is opened. Paddy's Lane is to the south of Weston Longville. Any lorries etc from the construction compound will require routes around Weston	I	Impacts relating to access are addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport. It is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this forms part of the DCO application.
Maria Veronese	Onshore Cable Corridor - Closure of Paddy's Lane, Weston Longville. The future dualling of the A47 at Wood Lane will make the proposed construction compound less accessible, if done at the same time. It is proposed an underpass will be built at the A47, Wood Lane junction	I	Impacts relating to access are addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport. It is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this forms part of the DCO application.



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>49</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Maria Veronese	80m Refinement - See above - you are possibly unaware of the proposals as the NDR and A47 evolves. Please ensure traffic is not increased through Weston Longville to and from the proposed construction compound	Y	Weston Longville is no longer under consideration for the main construction compound, which is now proposed at Oulton Airfield. Additional information regarding this decision is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives.  Impacts relating to access are addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport. It is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this forms part of the DCO application.
Maria Veronese	PEIR - No - we understand the need for power! We are sure the works will cause as little disruption as possible	N	Noted.
Maria Veronese	Proposal - Please see 7 and 8 - important planning proposals. Please avoid having lorries and other forms of traffic go through Weston Longville	Y	The Main construction compound proposed near Weston Longville has not been taken forward to the application. The main construction compound for the project will be located at Oulton Airfield, accessed off the B1149.  Impacts relating to access are addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport, with mitigation measures identified where relevant. Furthermore, it is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this forms part of the DCO application.
Valerie Stubbs	Local Matters - HGVs need to keep off the small local roads in Weybourne. Sandy Hill Lane/Station Road is very narrow, with limited passing places, caravans, equestrian centre, children on ponies, very narrow railway bridge. Holgate hill - narrow, deer crossing. Holt Road has no path for pedestrians and there are a lot of holiday lets on that road, which means there are often children on that road, including on the blind bend. The junction from Church Street onto the A149 is narrow, there are usually parked cars, and visibility is poor.	I	Information relating to construction access routing is provided in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport. It is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this forms part of the DCO application.
Valerie Stubbs	Temporary Construction - Access via Holgate Hill or Gypsy Lane for any articulated HGVs is completed impractical and potentially dangerous.	I	Hornsea Three will utilise Holgate Hill, off Bridge Road, to access the onshore cable corridor. Further details on construction routing is provided in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport.
Christine Walton	Mitigation Measures - It has to consider using more of the infrastructure there already/ from previous projects. Reduce noise/disruption and destruction of the countryside/coastline	I	Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on sensitive receptors including landscapes, designated sites and residential receptors both through design (e.g. refinement of the onshore cable corridor route to avoid sensitive sites) as well through commitments to be implemented during construction and operation. Mitigation measures are identified in each topic chapter of the Environmental Statement, as well as in the outline Code of Construction Practise which forms part of the DCO application.
Christine Walton	Landfall - At present this is near and a spectacular beautiful countryside and coast line. Noise, disruption and dirt for 11 years with the outcome to local residents - definitely not.	Y	During the design refinement Hornsea Three has sought to minimise the duration of any disruption, and has reduced the total number of phases to two and the total duration of the construction phase onshore to eight years. Within this, the maximum duration for construction of the onshore cable corridor is approximately 2.5 years, this therefore means that the maximum duration over which construction could occur would be 5.5 years incorporating two phases (assuming a three-year gap between the two phases). The work associated with each phase is expected to progress along the Hornsea Three onshore cable corridor with a typical active construction works duration of three months at any particular location.  Hornsea Three has identified appropriate mitigation measures to minimise visual, noise and dust impacts which are set out in the relevant topic chapters of the Environmental Statement.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>49</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Christine Walton	HVAC - I do not believe that as this is the 3rd project that you cannot use the infrastructure you already have or at least significantly reduce the amount of new building work necessary. 25m high building - really? Serious green screening and noise reduction needs to be sorted out being dealing with the building of it. I do not believe there has been enough consideration given to the reality of the disruption, noise and destruction of the countryside	I	Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts to local residential receptors, either through site selection/route refinement or through the identification of suitable mitigation measures. Where there are impacts to receptors, these are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3), for example visual impacts associated with the HVDC converter/HVAC substation is addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources. This chapter also identifies appropriate mitigation measures. This includes, for example, the restoration of habitats (including hedgerows) which cannot be avoided and landscape planting around the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application. Impacts relating to noise during the operational phase is assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 8: Noise and Vibration.
Christine Walton	Substation - There has already been considerable land destruction/disruption/noise in East Anglia due to unthought through building against local residents wishes and through the building of the Northern bypass around Norwich and through Norfolk. Consideration to routes put in place for this would also apply to other building projects. More thinking needs to take place re minimising this destruction and also honest feedback re how long it will take and how much disruption there would be. I do not think the occurrence of this project is worth losing our beautiful countryside.	I	Further information on the site selection and refinement process for the HVDC converter/HVAC substation is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Alternatives. Hornsea Three has sought to minimise disturbance through the identification of relevant mitigation measures which are outlined in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3).
Ruth Bullard	HVAC - Already huge pressure on area around Swardeston and a variety of planning applications. I am concerned about noise, landscaping, additional traffic	I	Impacts relating to landscape, traffic and noise are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapters 4, 7 and 8 respectively. Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts through site selection/route refinement, or the identification of suitable mitigation measures, this is also documented in the relevant topic specific chapters as well as in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives.
Ruth Bullard	Substation - See above (10). What will happen to access roads once the construction has finished? Could these then be used by future developments as access to housing? There is already danger that Swardeston becomes another suburb of Norwich and loses its rural identity. I am very concerned about noise during construction and then during operation	I	All temporary access roads construction to enable the delivery of Hornsea Three would be removed following the completion of construction, and the land restored to the baseline condition. Further information regarding restoration of temporary access roads is provided in the outline CoCP which forms part of the DCO application.
G. Dansey-Smith	Substation - Siting the HVDC converter and HVAC substation on the proposed site south of A47 and north of Swardeston will pose difficulties with its position and construction. The building will be an absolute eyesore if it is not bunkered to a large extent. It will be difficult to access with large heavy items, such as turbines on large vehicles. The B1113 is totally unsuitable due to its width and tight bends. The only access point by road could be the access road off the A140 to the A47 in a westerly direction. The road could then run parallel to the A47 to the site	I	Impacts relating to access are addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport. It is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this forms part of the DCO application.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>49</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Mark Cook	HVAC - The booster station will have a huge impact in the villages of Edgefield and Little Barningham especially. We live in a very rural environment with little or narrow roads. It will be hit on the landscape and lead to an industrialisation of our countryside. What plans have been made to cope with run off of rain water? I assume a lot of concrete will have to be built and also the surface area of the buildings will be large. Light pollution is another problem I foresee. And the screening of it - trees will take years to cover a building of this size.	I	<p>Appropriate mitigation measures have been designed-in to Hornsea Three to minimise impacts on drainage and flooding (particularly in relation to runoff). Details are provided in volume 3, chapter 2: Hydrology and Flood Risk (see Table 2.17) as well as the outline CoCP which forms part of the DCO application.</p> <p>Furthermore, the design has sought to minimise run-off through maximising the area of permeable hardstanding and preparing an outline drainage strategy for the HVDC converter/HVAC substation. This outline strategy is provided in Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 2.1: Onshore Infrastructure FRAs and has been developed in accordance with the NPS, NPPF, PPG ID7 and the SuDS Manual, whereby sufficient attenuation storage is provided for 1 in 100 year plus climate change worst case storm event. Drainage provisions will be further developed during detailed design in agreement with the Norfolk County Council as LLFA. The Flood Risk Assessment which has been undertaken for the Project concludes that Hornsea Three meets the requirements of NPS EN-1 and the NPPF.</p> <p>In respect to lighting, site lighting at the HVDC converter/HVAC substation will only operate when required and will be directional to avoid unnecessary illumination.</p> <p>Landscape planting is proposed around the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation to minimise impacts, though it is noted there would be a period of time during which the planting would need to mature. This is reflected in the assessment presented in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources which assesses both a year 1 and year 15 scenario. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.</p>
Sue Lowther	PEIR - Water access to our homes is restricted. Considerable noise effect. Safety of underground cables. Possible effect on surrounding properties of 'dirty electricity'. Wildlife has already been affected by the A47 - you will find no birds the closer you get to the A47. The substation will further affect wildlife. I regularly walk my dog around fields between the properties and the A47, and regularly see deer around. Their habitat will be further reduced.	I	<p>Through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive ecological receptors. For example, Weybourne Cliffs and Kelling Heath SSSI have been avoided and no direct impacts are predicted on these designated sites from Hornsea Three; furthermore landscape planting is proposed at the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation to provide additional screening. Additional mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project are outlined in topic specific chapters, and include the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts on local road networks, ecological receptors (e.g. hedgerows) and hydrological features (e.g. main rivers).</p> <p>Where impacts remain, these are assessed in the relevant topic chapter of the Environmental Statement, volume 3.</p>
Neil Buxton	Proposal - Selecting Weybourne as the site for landfill is completely unacceptable. No work done or understanding how long term work with impact on the community. Inadequate infrastructure to allow HGVs to access the proposed construction site. No thought given to compensation for local business and residents. No economic gain for the locality e.g. long term jobs. Impact on the environment in an AONB	I	<p>Impacts to socio-economics and tourism are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 10: Socio-Economics. In respect to compensation, we will compensate landowners who are directly affected by the cable through their land. Compensation is paid for the freehold depreciation of the land affected by the easement and for all reasonable and substantiated losses arising from construction of the project.</p> <p>Impacts on the environment and the AONB are assessed within the topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3).</p>
Neil Buxton	Local Matters Landfall Zone - Transportation of cable into Weybourne - the road infrastructure is completely inadequate. Access to the beach and Norfolk coastal path. Lots of parking for visitors. Impact on the local economy.	I	<p>Impacts relating to access are addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport. It is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this forms part of the DCO application.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>49</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Louisa Peaver	PEIR - Construction Methods - Using HDD for all road crossings would significantly reduce impacts. No replacing of old hedgerows would be needed. Public access issue and traffic inconveniences would be negated. A three phase construction approach is completely unacceptable. It would have significant impacts on my community	Y	During the design refinement Hornsea Three has sought to minimise the duration of any disruption, and has reduced the total duration of the construction phase onshore to eight years.  In respect to the construction methodology, impacts from Hornsea Three on the local road network, hydrological features, designated sites and ecological features (including hedgerows) has been avoided where possible through commitments to use trenchless technologies such as Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD). A full list of crossings, along with the methodology proposed, is provided in Environmental Statement volume 4, annex 3.6: Onshore Crossing Schedule.
Justin Conn	Landfall - Possible closure to Paddy's Lane . Proposed duality of A47 may result in undergrowth with no direct link to A47 from Wood Lane	I	Impacts relating to access are addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport. It is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this forms part of the DCO application.  Hornsea Three has consulted, and will continue to consult Highways England to identify interactions between Hornsea and the proposed A47 improvement works. Where highway improvement schemes are sufficiently progressed, potential cumulative effects have been identified and assessed within the relevant topic chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3).
Justin Conn	80m Refinement - Current duality of NOR with no western link from A1067 to A47 will have massive increase in traffic flow through Weston Longville. Please consider other areas for the construction compound so as not to increase traffic flow further	Y	Weston Longville is no longer under consideration for the main construction compound, which is now proposed at Outlon Airfield. Additional information regarding this decision is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives.
Sarah Griggs-Smith	Further Comments - With indigenous trees, shrubs etc growth. Access from the A47 = B140 Road is very narrow. Compensation for any loss of value - if happens. Fence building around Part View Cottage for the duration of building (for the safety of small children). Face to face visit with Mangreen residents	I	Through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including landscapes and other sensitive receptors (e.g. ecological and residential). Mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project, including at the HVDC converter/HVAC substation and HVAC booster station are outlined in topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement, and include the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts on local road networks, ecological receptors (e.g. hedgerows) and hydrological features (e.g. main rivers).  Information on construction and operational access routing is provided in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport.  Appropriate mitigation measures for visual disturbance are outlined in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources. This includes, for example, the restoration of habitats (including hedgerows) which cannot be avoided and landscape planting around the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.  Details of security measures during the onshore construction phase of Hornsea Three are set out in outline CoCP which establishes the principles which any principal contractor must follow, the outline CoCP forms part of the DCO application. The operational substation, will be secured in accordance with established standards, with specific measures developed during the detailed design phase.



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>49</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
John Aisthorpe	2) The roads surrounding our park are old cart tracks with virtually no sub base and are single track unsuitable for construction traffic which will cause serious traffic problems for our customers both in vehicles, on foot and cycles. Taverham road has no passing places for 2 lorries. Weston Road is accessed from the roundabout has a small narrow bridge. Honingham Lane from Taverham Road has no passing places. Telegraph Hill is a narrow single track road unsuitable for any goods vehicles as well as traffic issues, it is also the noise from extra traffic going past the park. [Please see enclosed marked map No.7. - See feedback form PH2_072]	I	Impacts relating to access are addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport. It is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this forms part of the DCO application. It also noted that during construction, temporary haul roads will be installed within the onshore cable corridor to facilitate the movement of construction vehicles to the site and to allow trench excavation to take place. These haul roads will also help minimise interactions with the local road networks.
Geoff Fisher	Temporary Construction - Careful consideration will need to be given about heavy vehicle access to a compound in Salle/Reepham on the B1145. No route is easy given the narrow roads, especially through Townsend Corner, Reepham, and at Sall Bridge near Cawston	I	Impacts relating to access are addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport. It is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this forms part of the DCO application.
Brian Donovan	Local Matters Landfall Zone - Please don't damage the cliffs or beach. They are historical and have been disrupted many times (above) . Your cable going out to sea from the land will need to be deep under the beach to account for the significantly shifting shingle on the beach. The very low cliffs to the west of the car park are very fragile and are eroding quickly. Please do not add to the damage of them. Beach Lane is not wide enough for HGV vehicles delivering to the beach	Y	Following design refinement, the area identified for landfall works has reduced and the beach lane car park is not under consideration as a construction compound. Further details on the proposed landfall, including access are set out in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description and volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport.
Simon Clarke	Landfall - This will inevitably cause disruption locally	I	Through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive ecological receptors. For example, Weybourne Cliffs and Kelling Heath SSSI have been avoided and no direct impacts are predicted on these designated sites from Hornsea Three. Additional mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project are outlined in topic specific chapters, and include the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts on local road networks, ecological receptors (e.g. hedgerows) and hydrological features (e.g. main rivers).
Graham & Susan Mette	Landfall - The flood does not only affect the car park, it affects up to Watermill Cottage, beyond The Rocket House. But also concerned of Beach Lane is to be used for any transportation, as it is really only a single-lane track.	Y	Following design refinement, the area identified for landfall works has reduced and the beach lane car park is not under consideration as a construction compound. Further details on the proposed landfall, including access are set out in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description and volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport.
Graham & Susan Mette	Temporary Construction Compounds - Very concerned about Beach Lane car park being used as a compound. Both the visual impact to us at The Rocket House for the period of up to 11 years! And the potential for the shingle bank being affected by the works and increasing the flood risk to our home.	Y	Following design refinement, the area identified for landfall works has reduced and the beach lane car park is not under consideration as a construction compound.  Furthermore it is noted that Hornsea Three has sought to minimise the duration of any disruption close to the landfall, reducing the total duration of the construction phase onshore to eight years. Within this, the maximum duration for construction of the onshore cable corridor is approximately 2.5 years, this therefore means that the maximum duration over which construction of the onshore cable corridor could occur would be 5.5 years incorporating two phases (assuming a three-year gap between the two phases).  In respect to flood risk, Hornsea Three has assessed potential impacts on flood risk within a flood risk assessment provided in Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 2.1: Onshore Infrastructure FRAs. Taking into consideration the measures designed into Hornsea Three to minimise impacts on drainage and flood risk, the FRA concludes that Hornsea Three meets the requirements of NPS EN-1 and the NPPF. Details of these measures are provided in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 2: Hydrology and Flood Risk (see Table 2.17) as well as the outline CoCP which forms part of the DCO application.



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>49</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Graham & Susan Mette	Mitigation measures - The compound at Weybourne MUST NOT be in the car park at the end of Beach Lane. Working hours need to be adhered to and weekends kept free from noise, light and disruption. Shingle Bank must be protected.	Y	Following design refinement, the area identified for landfall works has reduced and the beach lane car park is not under consideration as a construction compound. Further details on the proposed landfall, including access are set out in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description and volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport.
Graham & Susan Mette	Support - However Weybourne village will be seriously affected. Walkers, holiday makers, retired residents will all have to live with the long period of works, noise, traffic, etc etc. The village needs to be compensated, and residents immediately affected need to be compensated, and businesses need to be compensated. In particular the important crab/lobster industry. Personally, I need some assurances about protection from flood and maybe a combination of installing flood protection would be helpful.	I	<p>Potential impacts from Hornsea Three on socio-economic and recreational receptors are identified and assessed in Environmental Statement Volume 3, Chapter 10: Socio-Economics and chapter 6: Land Use and Recreation respectively. Hornsea Project Three will review the interactions of the project, as the proposal is refined and consider an appropriate way to feed benefits back into the local community. However, any decision to establish a community benefit fund for Hornsea Three would be made post financial investment decision (FID).</p> <p>In respect to flooding, appropriate mitigation measures have been designed-in to Hornsea Three to minimise impacts on drainage and flooding. Details are provided in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 2: Hydrology and Flood Risk (see Table 2.17). The Flood Risk Assessment which has been undertaken for the Project concludes that Hornsea Three meets the requirements of NPS EN-1 and the NPPF.</p>
Tina Hayward	Temporary Construction Compound - Your proposed temporary construction compounds at Salle appear to be both sides of a busy road on a blind bend. This presumably involves a lot of crossing the road at a dangerous point	I	A Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase, this will include safety measures relating to access to and from the main and secondary compounds. An outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this forms part of the DCO application.
RA & ME Briggs	Their property is 300 metres due west of the proposed route at Weston Longville This location is almost exactly the same as the Norwich Northern Distributor Road (NDR) which is with Norfolk County Council (NCC) Wants to know if HOW03 will affect the NCC proposed route? and if they will be affected by both projects?	N	<p>1. Projects may cross depending on final routes chosen for the NDR however as there is no formal route yet for the NDR we are unable to confirm any locations.</p> <p>2. This is unable to be confirmed yet due to unknown project timescales and location of the NDR.</p>
<b>Section 48: Duty to publicise</b>			
George Carman, Geodirect Resources P/L	Onshore Cable Corridor - Grave concerns on impact of installation operations generating disruptive traffic and long term damage to rural landscape (ancient hedgerows) and fragile country single track lanes	I	<p>Impacts relating to access are addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport. It is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this forms part of the DCO application.</p> <p>In respect to hedgerows, impacts from Hornsea Three on ecological features, including hedgerows and trees (including woodlands) has been avoided where possible through commitments to use trenchless technologies such as Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD). We recognise that protection and sensitive restoration of hedgerows and trees is important to minimise any negative impact on biodiversity or landscape.</p> <p>The replacement of hedgerows at the end of the construction phase to be undertaken will ensure there is no net loss of hedgerow habitat as a result of Hornsea Project Three. Furthermore, restoration of hedgerows, currently in poor condition, provides an opportunity to achieve long term benefits for the biodiversity associated with this habitat type. Further details on hedgerow removal, retention and replacement can be found in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation as well as the Outline Ecological Management Plan and the Outline Landscape Management Plan which form part of the DCO application.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>49</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
George Carman, Geodirect Resources P/L	Temporary Construction - We are very concerned that the proposed Oulton Construction Compound is some 5 km from the cable corridor invoking much traffic disruption through Itteringham village for access to corridor north of the River Bure and through Corpusty/Heydon village environs for access to the corridor south of the River Bure. We are also concerned on the Environmental impact on ALL North Norfolk access country routes which are predominantly single-lane, high-earth-banked, and hedge-rowed lanes with fragile flora and fauna. We are exceptionally concerned that access to the south of the River Bure crossing will be heaviest immediately south of the river which is on, and in the vicinity of, stakeholder property.	I	<p>Through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive ecological receptors. Additional mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project are outlined in topic specific chapters, and include the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts on local road networks, ecological receptors (e.g. hedgerows) and hydrological features (e.g. main rivers).</p> <p>In respect to the main construction compound at Oulton, Hornsea Three recognises the sensitivity of this location and since its identification as the main construction compound, Hornsea Three has sought to identify measures to minimise any impacts on Oulton village, local residents and the local road network. In this regard, where properties are located in close proximity to the Oulton Airfield, the Project will ensure that sensitive construction management measures, such as noise, dust and traffic control are considered. These are documented in an outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), which accompanies the DCO application. Furthermore, it is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this also forms part of the DCO application.</p> <p>In respect to the River Bure, Hornsea Three has committed to crossing this feature by HDD, thus avoiding the potential for direct impacts. Mitigation measures have also been identified to minimise indirect impact and are summarised in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 2: Hydrology and Flood Risk and the outline CoCP which forms part of the DCO application.</p>
Richard Perry	80m Refinement - Heavy traffic re HVAC Booster Station location. This effects bridleways which are used every day of the year especially Shrub Farm entrance road to the proposed station. Horses and traffic of a heavy nature do not mix. Also bridleway from Pimlico Cottage towards Plumstead area.	I	Principles for construction traffic management, including interaction with other road or recreational users (e.g. bridleways and pedestrians) are set out in the outline construction traffic management plan (CTMP) which forms part of the DCO application. The CTMP will be developed in consultation with the local authorities during the detailed design stage, in order to identify site specific measures, with separation of users prioritised wherever possible.
Richard Perry	HVAC - Heavy traffic to booster station at New Covert, Old Covert, route from Shrub Farm. This is a bridleway not a road. We use this path every day all year round with our horses. Horses and heavy traffic do not mix. The path is narrow with no get off points if horses and traffic meet. This would be a health and safety issue.	I	Principles for construction traffic management, including interaction with other road or recreational users (e.g. bridleways and pedestrians) are set out in the outline construction traffic management plan (CTMP) which forms part of the DCO application. The CTMP will be developed in consultation with the local authorities during the detailed design stage, in order to identify site specific measures, with separation of users prioritised wherever possible.
Richard Perry	Mitigation Methods - Bridleways: not supporting access for horses if the plans go ahead. Narrow roads needed to access bridleways. No heavy traffic please on road. Edgefield to Little Barningham via Norwich - Holt Road. No access for heavy traffic to this road past Fuel Farm, this is the horse location	I	Principles for construction traffic management, including interaction with other road or recreational users (e.g. bridleways and pedestrians) are set out in the outline construction traffic management plan (CTMP) which forms part of the DCO application. The CTMP will be developed in consultation with the local authorities during the detailed design stage, in order to identify site specific measures, with separation of users prioritised wherever possible.
Richard Perry	Proposal - The disturbance to wildlife and bridleways in the area of Edgefield. Heavy traffic access to rural areas of Norfolk causing disruption to our every day riding of our horses	I	<p>Principles for construction traffic management, including interaction with other road or recreational users (e.g. bridleways and pedestrians) are set out in the outline construction traffic management plan (CTMP) which forms part of the DCO application. The CTMP will be developed in consultation with the local authorities during the detailed design stage, in order to identify site specific measures, with separation of users prioritised wherever possible.</p> <p>Impacts on ecological receptors are addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation.</p>

Table 3.16: Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Further Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.B) relating to traffic and transport

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>50</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 42: Prescribed consultees (The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009: Schedule 1))</b>			
Estelle Hook, Norfolk Coast Partnership	We suggest that construction traffic should use carefully selected routes within the AONB, to minimise disruption, damage and pollution.	I	Impacts relating to access are addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport. It is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this forms part of the DCO application.
CPRE Norfolk	Map 7. The current proposals for the dualling of the A47 from North Tuddenham to Easton envisage the removal of the Easton roundabout, and as such the proposed access at Church Lane to the A47 would be stopped at some stage and block off the proposed access from the A47. The Easton roundabout would be replaced by a junction at Blind Lane and Taverham Road. This location has been proposed because it would provide an east and west to the Food Hub (and would serve any future Norwich Link Road from the western end of the NDR to the A47). There is an LDO in place for that part of the Food Hub site within Broadland Council. The cabling corridor now runs through the adjacent South Norfolk part of the Food Hub Site, which as yet has no LDO in place. The dualling work for the A47 is programmed to start in 2021. Orsted may want to follow what is happening, and timescales, by contact with the county council. Initially the vehicles – mainly HGV - will be accessing the Food Hub by also using the route marked in red for access via the existing Easton roundabout.	I	Noted, Hornsea Three has consulted, and will continue to consult Highways England and other relevant project developers to identify interactions between projects. Where schemes are sufficiently progressed, potential cumulative effects have been identified and assessed within the relevant topic chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3).
David Wildon	I do have a question about a new red line that has appeared on Detailed Onshore Plan Map 7: am I correct in thinking that the line, which runs south from the Bawburgh Road, Marlingford, to the River Yare, is an access route?	N	It is confirmed that the red line shown on Map 7 is indeed an access route, for HDD monitoring only. This is shown on the plans which accompany the DCO application.
Edgefield and Corpusty & Saxthorpe Parish Councils	Also, it is noted that one of the accessways to the booster station is running along a footpath through the woods. This is an especially beautiful walk, which will be detrimentally affected should you tarmac it for a roadway. Is it possible to re-route it?	I	The assessment of impacts on individual public rights of way (where appropriate) are set out in Environmental Statement, volume 3, chapter 6: Land Use and Recreation.
High Kelling Parish Council	I have noted from your latest consultation stuff the proposed additional access route from Bridge Road, High Kelling across the field track, along part of Warren Road, etc. My concern is about the use of Bridge Road, the field road and Warren Road for access. There are already a lot of people concerned about the railway bridge. I am sure that allowing a number of large vehicles to use the bridge will only cause even more problems. Access to Bridge Road from the A148: I think this would need to be looked into professionally by the Highways people. The A148 junction is probably not suitable for large vehicles turning into Bridge Road – and the junction with the field road even more so. I am sure the residents of privately maintained Warren Road will be out in force at the mere thought of the use of Warren Road!	I	Hornsea Three will utilise the northern section of Warren Road, however in developing the access strategy we have sought to avoid the nearby residential receptors through the use of a unnamed street to the north-west which links Bridge Road to the northern section of Warren Road. The comments associated with Bridge Road have been taken into consideration and associated impacts addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport.  It is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this forms part of the DCO application.
Costessey Town Council	Costessey Town Councillors have concerns regarding the cable corridor route and ask that particular considerations be given to the points where a) Cables are not buried very deep so different companies' cable routes may conflict with each other and cause issues with existing utilities and proposed major infrastructure routes – eg dualling of A47 and the proposed Norwich Western Link Road b) Routes will cross the Norfolk Vanguard cable corridor (from the latest proposed Vattenfall route) c) Routes cross the Wensum Valley & might affect the proposed Norwich Western Link.	I	Parameters of the cable trench are provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description, with a minimum depth of cables of 1.2 m.  Where cumulative schemes are sufficiently progressed, potential cumulative effects have been identified and assessed within the relevant topic chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3).

<sup>50</sup> Y = Yes change made; N = No change made; I = Incorporated into or considered when producing the assessment or landowner voluntary agreement offer; N/A = Not applicable.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>50</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Marlingford and Colton Parish Council	The Council also welcomed the information that the access road, from the Bawburgh Road south to the Yare, was for monitoring, not construction.	N	Noted
Oulton Parish Council	<p>Re: Oulton Old Airfield Compound</p> <p>Oulton Parish Council have now been made aware that the Construction compound on the old airfield is now a possibility.</p> <p>It has also come to our attention that there is very little information in your online documents at this stage giving an indication as to how this will affect Oulton as a village regarding HGV movements, Lighting, Noise and Hours of operation.</p> <p>It would be useful to know exactly what will be on this compound and how long the compound would be used for and the reason for choosing a compound away from the cable route.</p> <p>The two projects Hornsea Three &amp; Norfolk Vanguard are meeting very close to this area and have similar timescales.</p> <p>Oulton village now faces the prospect of Two compounds very close to each other and the very real possibility of the same access road (B1149 &amp; The Street) being used by both projects. Having looked at the documents we can see very little information as to how this can be managed.</p> <p>If this information is in the public domain and has been missed we would be grateful that it is pointed out to us.</p>	I	<p>As noted, the main construction compound for the project will be located at Oulton Airfield, accessed off the B1149. This would operate as a central base for the onshore construction works and would house the central offices, welfare facilities, and stores, as well as acting as a staging post and secure storage for equipment and component deliveries.</p> <p>Where sensitive receptors are located in close proximity to the main construction compound, the Project will ensure that sensitive construction management measures, such as noise, dust and traffic control are considered. These are documented in an outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), which accompanies the DCO application. Furthermore, a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this forms part of the DCO application.</p> <p>The main construction compound will be removed and sites restored to its original condition when construction has been completed.</p> <p>Cumulative effects associated with Hornsea Three in combination with other projects (including Vanguard) are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3).</p>
Little Melton Parish Council	<p>Great Melton Road</p> <p>A site entrance from GM Rd is required because the haul road is interrupted both to the east and west where the cables will be placed under roads by directional drilling. LMPC has pointed out that GM Rd is not suitable for HGVs and that there is a 7.5tonne restriction on part of Burnthouse Lane. The preferred access point is from the lorry route on Burnthouse Lane. Ørsted will provide information about the traffic predicted to use the GM Rd site entrance.</p>	I	<p>It is acknowledged that Hornsea Three proposes two access off of Great Melton Road, these are primarily to facilitate initial site preparation until the haul road from Little Melton Road to Market Lane is established. The main access for HGV movements will be from Little Melton Road, from Burnthouse Lane as it routes south from Little Melton.</p> <p>It is furthermore noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this forms part of the DCO application. Impacts relating to access are addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport.</p>
<b>Section 42: Local Authorities (prescribed under section 43 of the Act)</b>			
Broadland District Council	It is noted that within Broadland the proposals have been revised so that works are now proposed beyond the original 200 metre wide onshore cable corridor route with a potential storage area beyond the search area previously presented. In detail these are a cable corridor re-route to the west of Reepham Road at Little Witchingham, additional associated access routes from the highway to the cable corridor and an additional construction compound on the former airfield in Oulton Street.	N	Noted, a full project description is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description.
Broadland District Council	<p>The District Council requests that further detailed investigation and assessments are undertaken in respect of the following matters:</p> <p>(1) In general where the additional associated access routes, the additional construction compound and the highway route between the compound and the cable corridor are located in close proximity to a residential property then adequate assessment of the impact of the noise and disturbance on the occupants of that property should be undertaken and where necessary appropriate noise mitigation measures identified for that part of the construction period.</p>	I	Where possible, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts to local residential receptors, either through site selection/route refinement or through the identification of suitable mitigation measures. Where there are impacts to residential receptors, these are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3). The Project will ensure that sensitive construction management measures, such as noise, dust and traffic control are considered. These are documented in an outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), which accompanies the DCO application.



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>50</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Broadland District Council	(2) The implications of the additional vehicular traffic within the highway network as a result of the inclusion of the proposed additional construction compound at the former airfield at Oulton Street, shown on map 4 at a location remote from the proposed cable corridor should be investigated and assessed.	I	Impacts relating to access are addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport. It is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this forms part of the DCO application.
Broadland District Council	(3) An additional associated access route is shown on map 5 to the north east of Reepham, crossing the popular and well used Marriott's Way footpath, cycleway and bridleway and the proposed access route runs either alongside or within the Marriott's Way footpath for a distance of 0.68km approx. Details should be provided as to how the use of this section of the Marriott's Way footpath will be safeguarded for members of the public to continue to use it or an alternative route proposed during that part of the construction period.	I	Several PRoW and areas of land with informal public access will potentially be affected by the construction of the onshore elements of the Hornsea Three. Where a PRoW crosses the onshore cable corridor the contractor is to either: seek to maintain a pedestrian access route. This route will be maintained by fencing and the use of a gating, ensure that the users of the access route have a safe route to cross the onshore cable corridor; or · Provide a localised diversion. It is noted that a number of PRoW will be crossed using HDD to avoid direct impacts e.g. Marriot's Way.  Signage will be erected to direct pedestrians when the construction traffic requires access over the designated pedestrian route, or of diversions if so implemented. Where an alternative route is reasonably available, with the agreement of the relevant PRoW Officer, a short term permissive diversion will be formed around the active construction area. Advanced warning notices will be provided to users identifying the diversion route. Following completion of construction activities, all public access within the working area will be reinstated with a standard commensurate to that existing prior to the commencement of construction works.  Further information on impacts to PRoW and land use is provided in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 6: Land Use and Recreation.
<b>Section 42: Persons with an interest in the land (prescribed under section 44 of the Act)</b>			
Christopher Bond Bidwells on behalf of Ms M Lofty	Please note any correspondence relating to this response or representation should be sent to Bidwells at the above address (see response), reference C F Bond. We note that the proposed cable route will pass directly across our clients property, [REDACTED], a substantial property where Ms Lofty lives. The cable route will cross horse paddocks between the farmhouse and the public road and we, therefore make the following points:- (1) It will be necessary to maintain access to the farmhouse across the working wifth at all times.	I	Access to the property will be able to be maintained during construction. Should this need to be disrupted for any amount of time for any reason then this would be arranged with Mrs Lofty in advance.
C F Bond, Bidwells (on behalf of clients) on behalf of Nicholas Edward Evans-Lombe, Frances Marilyn Evans-Lombe & Great Melton Farms Limited	We now respond and comment, on a without prejudice basis, as follows:- Access to the west of Beech Grove – we assume that access is required around Beech Grove, as Beech Grove itself is to remain in situ with the cable route installed by Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD) beneath it. Could you please confirm this is the case-if so we have no objection to this access route.  Please contact Christopher Bond if any further explanation is required on the points raised. Christopher Bond would be prepared to meet on site with Ørsted's representatives if required. Please could you acknowledge receipt of this email.	Y	The cables are proposed to be installed under Beech Grove via HDD as suggested, with the access to the west being outside of the woodland to avoid this being directly impacted.
Jane Kenny, Savills (general on behalf of clients)	I am writing on behalf of our clients who are Landowners affected by the second consultation following our Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) response which was submitted on 20th September 2017. [REDACTED]	N	Hornsea Three responded to the issues raised as follows:  1. It has been proposed that access with vehicles would generally be taken along the construction strip where possible, with additional routes being required where this was not possible. Information within the FAQ document sent to landowners under section "How will you access the onshore cable corridor?" contains further information on access.  2. The suggested alterations to the route have been made with reference to the PEIR



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>50</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>1. PROPOSED ACCESS ROUTES There have been no discussions with landowners with regard to access points. It has always been understood that access to the working corridor/cable route would be obtained from compound/mobilisation zones which in turn would have been sited with suitable access to them so avoiding using the narrow country roads. In general, the possible routes identified are unsuitable for any quantity or size of machinery/vehicles. Greater clarification is needed on the use and purpose of these access routes to be able to comment more fully.</p> <p>2. POTENTIAL ONSHORE CABLE CORRIDOR RE-ROUTES A number of the re-routes have been identified following consultation with the landowners, however these re-routes need to take into consideration the issues/concerns raised in our response to the PEIR dated 20th September 2017.</p> <p>3. POTENTIAL STORAGE AREAS There has been no discussion with landowners with regard to the location of compound/mobilisation zones. The site at Oulton is nearly 3km, in a direct line, to the closest point on the corridor. This will have to be accessed via a network of country lanes which are unsuitable due to the adverse impact on the local environmental, ecology as well as the increased risk to safety due to the increased use of narrow country roads. Clarity on the actual use/purpose of the compound is needed to be able to comment on the extent of the impact. What mitigation is proposed?</p> <p>4. OTHER MATTERS There is a real concern over the following issues:  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Outstanding information - a lot more information needs to be sought before the DCO is submitted which is expected to be second quarter of 2018. It is noted that there are a number of fundamental types of surveys outstanding including ecology, archaeological and hydrology which are important in assessing the viability of the route selected. It is also understood that intrusive surveys will not be undertaken until after the DCO is submitted. Our clients are perplexed by this approach and enquire as to how a scheme can be proposed when all the necessary "due diligence" has not been undertaken to ensure it can be delivered.</li> <li>• Easement requirement – Can you explain why you have selected the current design to support a 2.4 GW scheme which requires a 60m easement when Vattenfall require a 17m easement for a 1.8 GW scheme. On the Vattenfall design a 2.4 GW would require a 23m easement a 37m difference equalling to approx 500 acres of land.</li> <li>• Resourcing labour – It is claimed that this scheme is the largest of its kind. This coupled with Norfolk Vanguard (Vattenfall) planning to commence their construction in the same time frame raises real concerns of the availability of appropriately skilled labour.</li> </ul> <p>On behalf of our clients we are expecting to receive a full response to the points raised here and for the record our clients are still waiting for response following the issues raised in our submission of the PEIR. I trust you find this self explanatory but should you have any queries please do not hesitate to contact me. In the meantime please can you acknowledge safe receipt of this email.</p> </p>		<p>responses received, some alternative route requests have been adopted, but others have not. as they would have further impacts to land that need to be considered. The landowner was asked to review the updated route and respond with further comments if it was still deemed unacceptable.</p> <p>3. Information pertaining to the site selection for the main construction compound is provided in the Environmental Statement, volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives. Given the nature of the Oulton Airfield, which comprises existing hardstanding, its use as the main construction compound has less potential for significant effects than other sites which were under consideration.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, Hornsea Three recognises the sensitivity of this location and since its identification as the main construction compound, Hornsea Three has sought to identify measures to minimise any impacts on Oulton village, local residents and the local road network. In this regard, where properties are located in close proximity to the Oulton Airfield, the Project will ensure that sensitive construction management measures, such as noise, dust and traffic control are considered. These are documented in an outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), which accompanies the DCO application. Furthermore, it is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this also forms part of the DCO application.</p> <p>Impacts associated with the use of Oulton Airfield as the main construction compound are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3). Impacts relating to traffic and transport are specifically assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport.</p> <p>4.a. Surveys have been undertaken along the vast majority of the proposed route corridor, with additional ones being required where data may be missing. There is no requirement to undertake intrusive surveys prior to the DCO application, which will also lessen the impact to any private land given consent is still required for the scheme to proceed.  b. The two projects are completely separate and being developed by separate companies. Orsted have completed sufficient investigation into the electrical and protective requirements for the cables, resulting in a 60m easement being the area considered suitable and appropriate.  c. It is too early to assess the likely timescales and future resource requirements for the Hornsea Three project, Orsted are currently building the world's two largest windfarms in parallel at Hornsea 1 and 2 and have plenty of experience in assessing the construction requirements for schemes and the resource and labour available on the market.</p>
Jane Kenny, Savills, on behalf of Mr Ed Jones – Church Farm, Little Witchingham	<p>POTENTIAL ONSHORE CABLE CORRIDOR RE-ROUTES There are a number of requested route changes which have not been considered. In particular:  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mr Ed Jones – Church Farm, Little Witchingham – the alternative route suggested has only</li> </ul> </p>	N	The requested alternative route here was considered in full, with the revised route being adopted in part. At the southern end of the route the presence of the existing overhead power line will restrict routing as the route nears the road as these two cannot follow the same route. There is insufficient space to take the cable corridor through the gap between

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>50</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
	been partly adopted. Attached is a plan showing the rest of the suggested route hatched red which our client considers to be a more suitable option as it is more forgiving land and will reduce the sterilisation of productive farmland which should be avoided as stipulated within the PEIR.		the pylon (which has an exclusion zone for works around it) and the field boundary/residential property at the southern end of the Church Farm Belt of woodland, and it would increase the impact to the adjacent residential property.
Christopher Bond, Bidwells on behalf of Edward Christopher Evans-Lombe & Great Melton Farms Limited	<p>We write as agents on behalf of our clients detailed below. We have shown the relevant consultation plan number for each client in brackets.</p> <p>Christopher Bond would be prepared to meet on site with Orsted's representatives to address the individual clients concerns.</p> <p>1. Edward Christopher Evans-Lombe, [REDACTED] [REDACTED] (map 7 of 9)</p> <p>Proposed access routes</p> <p>We note that two potential access routes are shown on the statutory consultation plan and comment as follows:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Access from the north from the Bawburgh-Marlingford Road — this route is the main access to Algarsthorpe Farmhouse and the associated Algarsthorpe Barns (as described in our earlier representation dated 19 September 2017). It is used both by the Buxton family who live in the farmhouse and Adam Buxton's business based in the Algarsthorpe Barns and will need to remain open at all times unless alternative arrangements can be agreed. Clearly, it is impractical to mix private cars with heavy construction traffic on a narrow unmade track. We suggest an alternative access should be proposed.</li> <li>- Access to the west of Beech Grove — we assume that access is required around Beech Grove, as Beech Grove itself is to remain in situ with the cable route installed by Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD) beneath it. Could you please confirm this is the case.</li> </ul>	Y	<p>Hornsea Three responded to the landowner's response as follows:</p> <p>1. Due to the proximity to the adjacent main road, river, drains and woodland, this area is difficult to be reached via other means. Access will be taken along the haul road within the construction corridor where possible as an alternative. However in order to cross over the river, and especially whilst a HDD is in progress, access will likely be required along the track in question. Where this is required, access will be coordinated with Mr &amp; Mrs Buxton in order to minimise impacts.</p> <p>2. The cables are proposed to be installed under Beech Grove via HDD as suggested, with the access to the west being outside of the woodland and to avoid this being directly impacted.</p>
Christopher Bond, Bidwells on behalf of Martin Kemp	<p>3. Martin P Kemp / M P Kemp Limited, [REDACTED] [REDACTED] (Map 8 of 9)</p> <p>Potential onshore cable corridor re-routes</p> <p>We note the potential cable re-route (alternative route) which is totally unacceptable to our client. As stressed in the earlier representation of 19 September 2017, the future development of the Kemp's land is of primary importance and, hence, all measures suggested in the earlier representation must be made to reduce the impact of the cable route proposed on their land. The proposed re-route in no way complies with this request and would, if anything, sterilise a greater area of the Kemp's farm.</p> <p>Potential access routes</p> <p>We note the potential access corridor to the cable route. This is unacceptable and must be kept closed for security purposes. There is a potential access available directly to the preferred route from the Norwich Road which should be used (see attached plan A).</p>	Y	<p>Hornsea Three addressed the landowner's response as follows:</p> <p>1. Concern regarding the alternative route option is noted. This has since been discounted following accurate identification of the route of the disused MOD pipeline on this land.</p> <p>2. The alternative access route suggested has now been added to proposals, with the other option also being maintained in case this is required as a back-up option.</p>
Christopher Bond, Bidwells on behalf of Charles Watt	<p>Charles Jonathan Watt, [REDACTED] [REDACTED] (Map 8 of 9)</p> <p>Potential onshore cable corridor re-routes</p> <p>We note the potential re-route and associated proposed storage areas to the east of the preferred route which is totally unacceptable to our client for the following reasons:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- It is too close to Wychwood House, a substantial property standing in a parkland setting.</li> <li>- It will cross historic parkland of ancient grass (unimproved for many years) known as The Old Hethersett Racecourse where it is proposed to open cut which cannot be readily reinstated.</li> <li>- The alternative route will cross (by HDD) areas of substantial woodland including Wychwood adjoining the Norwich Road. Under no circumstances should the roots of these substantial trees be</li> </ul>	Y	<p>Hornsea Three addressed the landowner's response as follows:</p> <p>1. Concern regarding the alternative route option is noted. This has since been discounted following accurate identification of the route of the discussed MOD pipeline on this land.</p> <p>2.a. An alternative access route into land north of Norwich Road has now been incorporated following feedback received.</p> <p>b. The access to the south of the A11 will be required in relation to the proposed HDD under the A11 and railway. This will likely be constructed to facilitate vehicle access and will be fully reinstated following completion of the work.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>50</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>disturbed which would occur if HDD takes place</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The alternative route will be in close vicinity to The Lodge at the entrance to Wychwood House drive.</li> <li>- We cannot understand why the preferred route cannot be adopted, bearing in mind it is a disused MOD pipeline that appears to be blocking the route.</li> <li>- The preferred route crosses open farmland with the exception of the wood (The Glade)</li> </ul> <p>Proposed access route</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- We note a proposed access from the Norwich Road southwards to the preferred route which is acceptable.</li> <li>- We note the proposed access to Mr Kemp's land leads off the Norwich Road directly opposite the Lodge- clearly, a traffic hazard which would lead to traffic using the Lodge drive as a run off area which is totally unacceptable.</li> <li>- We note a proposed access route to the south of the All on this land — could you please confirm the construction and reinstatement details</li> </ul>		
Christopher Bond, Bidwells on behalf of Benjamin Robert Goodfellow & Phillip George Day	<p>. Benjamin Robert Goodfellow, c/o Birketts, [REDACTED] (map 8 of 9)</p> <p>Potential onshore cable corridor re-routes</p> <p>We note the potential corridor cable re-route to the west of the preferred route which is unacceptable to our clients as this will be more intrusive into their fields and further affect agricultural operations.</p> <p>Proposed access routes</p> <p>We note 2 proposed access routes and comment as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- (Northern) across the River meadows — this is impractical being low lying land prone to flooding (very wet in winter) and follows the line of an Anglian Water sewer.</li> <li>- (Southern) known as Racecourse track — This is an existing track which we believe would need to be upgraded before use by heavy vehicles — can we have details of what is proposed.</li> </ul>	Y	<p>Hornsea Three addressed the landowner's response as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Concern regarding the alternative route option is noted. This has since been discounted following accurate identification of the route of the discussed MOD pipeline on this land.</li> <li>2.a. Information regarding the land on this proposed access route is noted and appreciated, an alternative route has now also been incorporated following receipt of this feedback.</li> <li>b. Where required, existing tracks would be upgraded prior to be used for access by the project, and also reinstated following completion of the work as required and in accordance with the schedule of condition. Detail on the specific construction of access tracks will be available in due course and once a construction contractor has been appointed.</li> </ol>
Nigel R Rogers & Deborah A Rogers	<p>We note that you now propose access to the cable corridor along the concrete tracks marked in red in map 2 of Statutory Consultation Plan, despite road safety concerns set out in our letter of 7 August 2017 (attached). We should clarify that the concerns of the Highways Agency noted in our previous letter referred to the junction of Bridge Road with the section of concrete track that runs from Warren Road along the northern edge of Holt Rugby Football Club. We have a legal right to use both these tracks to access our property.</p>	I	<p>Comments noted. Access at that location will be subject to a traffic assessment based on the potential vehicle movements during construction. This will be set out in more detail in the forthcoming DCO application.</p>
Nigel R Rogers & Deborah A Rogers	<p>We would be grateful if you could clarify what steps will be taken to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Ensure the access to our property is not impeded by cable corridor traffic;</li> <li>2) Avoid anticipated road safety issues at the junction of the track with Bridge Road (turning into or out of the junction from Bridge Road can be hazardous due to the volume of traffic and restricted visibility);</li> <li>3) Ensure the concrete surface of these tracks are restored to at least their existing state of repair during and following completion of the work (we and other neighbours are in part responsible for the upkeep of these tracks)</li> </ol>	I	<p>Hornsea Three addressed the landowner's response as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There may be some form of traffic control to ensure health and safety but access to the properties will remain unrestricted.</li> <li>2. Traffic assessments based on potential vehicle movements will be assessed in the DCO application.</li> <li>3. A record of condition of the track will be taken before any works are carried out and Hornsea Three will be responsible for returning the track in the same state at the end of works (and ensuring that it is in a usable condition during works).</li> </ol>
Michael and Louise Savory The Muckleburgh Military Collection	<p>With regard to the cable route on the land: Access to the landfall area would be considered via either the existing site entrance, or across</p>	Y	<p>The main proposed access route to the point of cable landfall is via the existing entrance to the Muckleburgh Collection in order to utilise the existing track.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>50</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
	the arable field to the east Reaffirm the request for the airfield to not be open cut, if the route is taken in this direction A waterproof membrane or similar may need to be considered to reinstate the scrape adjacent to where the borehole were drilled.		The cables are proposed to be installed under the airfield via Horizontal Direction Drill (HDD) as opposed to open cut. Reinstatement will be undertaken in line with the proposed schedule of condition, with a waterproof membrane, or similar, being considered here if required.
Michael and Louise Savory The Muckleburgh Military Collection	I confirm that all the points recorded are correct and that I have received the latest consultation documents. In addition I mentioned that access to the transition area could be made via our main entrance on the condition that the entrance road is repaired after the project is completed. I am now patching holes etc and have in mind that when Hornsea Three is completed the road will be tar sprayed and chipped. J A Asphalt who undertake our road maintenance estimate this will cost about £10,000. This would be the cheaper alternative to making and restoring a temporary road off the A149.	N/A	Hornsea Three noted the response, no further action was required.
Strutt & Parker (on behalf of (1) Charles & Arlie Inglis (2) Beckhithe Farms)	The particular areas we would like to submit comments regarding are Inset 1 on Statutory Consultation Plan Map 3 of 9, and Inset 2 on Statutory Consultation Plan Map 8 of 9. Inset 1 – Map 3 of 9 Inset one on map 3 of 9 shows a proposed access route to the onshore cable corridor. The proposed access is in the south west corner of our client's field. The proposed access is neither suitable nor practical. It is situated on a blind corner of a single track road, which is also a "Y" junction, where another single track road joins it. As the photograph below, from Google Earth Street View, shows, the roads are incredible narrow and not suitable for increased volumes of traffic. [See full response for image] It is our understanding that a haul road will be installed along the route, and therefore it would seem practical that accesses to the cable corridor and this haul road are situated close to main roads, rather than on rural lanes.	Y	Concern regarding this proposed access was noted by Hornsea Three. This proposed access arrangement has since been removed from proposals and will not form part of the DCO application.
Strutt & Parker (on behalf of Beckhithe Farms)	Inset 2 – Map 8 of 9 The proposed access shown on inset 2 of map 8 of 9 is again located on a narrow road between the villages of Little Melton and Hethersett. There is no existing agricultural entrance located at the proposed entrance, so it would mean creating a new access from the public highway. The image below has been taken from Google Earth Street View, and shows the narrow width of the road, and the existing boundary of the field. [See full response for image] Having reviewed the plans provided, it would seem that a more appropriate location for an access point would be using an existing agricultural entrance situated south east of inset two where the proposed cable route crosses Colney Lane. Colney Lane is a single carriageway road, which is more capable of safely accommodating turning vehicles and an increased volume of traffic. Alternatively, there is an established field entrance at the north-eastern corner of the field, and should Orsted choose to approach us to discuss this as a potential access to the cable corridor we would be prepared to have the discussion with our client.	N	The size of the road here is acknowledged. Access into the construction corridor is proposed to also be taken from Colney Lane and via the existing agricultural entrance off Burnthouse Lane into the refined route corridor. The additional new access off Burnthouse Lane has been proposed in order to facilitate access to either side of the proposed Horizontal Directional Drill (HDD), if required, in order to avoid a longer route utilising the afore mentioned access points. It is unlikely the proposed new access will be utilised throughout construction.
Strutt & Parker (on behalf of (1) Charles & Arlie Inglis (2) Beckhithe Farms)	General Comments Our clients are very disappointed that neither Orsted or Dalcour Maclaren have made no attempt to contact them to discuss the proposed access routes shown in the additional consultation documents. Our clients have occupied the land which Hornsea Project Three is proposing to cross for a long time, and have a wealth of local knowledge which could greatly benefit the route and access planning process. When Orsted presented the project update to land agents in Norwich on 30th November 2017, they informed us that the proposed access routes had been carefully assessed. Having reviewed the two access routes which affect our clients we would like more details on what is considered to be a safe and practical entry point to the cable corridor, as we disagree that the ones currently proposed fit those criteria.	Y	The proposed access routes, and other areas and routes, have been assessed in line with the project requirements for review and consideration by landowners and the public via the relevant methods of consultation. The feedback on this point is important and gratefully received and changes have been reviewed in line with this feedback.



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>50</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Stephen John Clifford	<p>The works propose must do several things to appease me please:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Not disruption to our daily access to our property.</li> <li>2. Comply with the 10 MPH speed limit - there are small children and dogs living here.</li> <li>3. We have run-off rain water problems from the field at the top of this road. Kelling Estate have installed a temporary barn at the field - this could become permanent and another in the other field direct rainwater to the far side of Warren Road.</li> <li>4. The installation of a drain at the upper end of the road would also prevent undue run off down Warren Road and into my property. Willing to discuss - there measures would be cost-minded to Dong but valuable to as residents in the new state.</li> <li>5. Works traffic will damage the road. A relaying of the road after works are completed would also be suitable recompense.</li> </ol>	I	<p>Hornsea Three responded to the landowner's queries as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 &amp; 2. There may be some form of traffic control to ensure health and safety but access to the properties will remain unrestricted.</li> <li>3. Noted</li> <li>4 and 5. The drainage required will be assessed at a later date once a construction contractor is appointed. A record of condition of the track will be taken before any works are carried out and the company will be responsible for returning the track to the same state at the end of works (and ensuring that it is in a usable condition during works). If the track requires drainage works these will be completed and restored in line with the record of condition.</li> </ol>
Ray & Diane Pearce	<p>4. In the letter Ørsted made assurances that: "... more detailed assessment ... will be further updated for the final application to take into account the latest information from Vattenfall which is anticipated to be available in their PEIR."; the Vanguard PEIR has been published and there has been nothing further forthcoming from Hornsea Three? Therefore, we will take this opportunity to re-address the issues and have them included as part of the Public consultation. In addition, the inclusion of extra access routes from the B1145 (Online Map 5) and the potential 'Main Construction Compound', with 2 out of the 3 possible sites being adjacent to our property, will have a further adverse impact on us. Also, by now, the choice of cable routing to either the west or east of Salle Church should have been decided upon. The number of decisions being left open to the DCO is stretching the premise of the Rochdale Envelope beyond what could be considered reasonable. Also, the level of uncertainty for the Public has been further heightened by this further consultation.</p>	I	<p>The main construction compound for the project will be located at Oulton Airfield, accessed off the B1149. Since the PEIR, Hornsea Three has refined the proposals for the secondary compounds, with five located along the onshore cable corridor. The closest secondary compound to the located referenced is at XXX which is shown in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description.</p> <p>Cumulative effects from Hornsea Three in combination with other proposed projects (including Vanguard) are addressed in topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3). This assessment does not refer to specific properties, but does provide a realistic worst case assessment which considers potential effects on the nearest sensitive receptors to onshore construction works.</p> <p>In respect to Salle Church, the Hornsea Three onshore cable corridor has been subject to rerouting since the production of the PEIR and now passes 110 m from Salle Park at its nearest point, thus avoiding any effect on the relationship between the Salle Church and Salle Park. An assessment of impacts on heritage assets is provided in Environmental Statement, volume 3, chapter 5: Historic Environment.</p> <p>The Environmental Impact Assessment considers to apply the Rochdale Envelope. By identifying, and assessing based on the maximum design scenario, it can therefore be concluded that the all issues have been addressed and any impacts will be no greater for any other design scenario. The full details of the EIA methodology are set out in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 5: Environmental Impact Assessment Methodology.</p>
Ray & Diane Pearce	<p>13. If this statement were true, in isolation, there would be no point to the Public consultation as the developer has already concluded that, as the majority of their assessments are no worse than 'moderate adverse', they can be justified in the ES and that will be an end to any discussion! This attitude is not conducive to an open dialogue or progressive plan and is outside of any directive from the Planning Inspectorate.</p> <p>Construction Compounds "The PEIR documentation consulted on identifies that one main construction compound (with other storage compounds) will be required operating as a central base for the onshore construction works, along with smaller compounds of various sizes along the onshore cable corridor, for laydown and storage of materials, plant and staff, as well as space for small temporary offices, welfare facilities, security and parking. The main construction compound does not need to be located on the route itself but on a suitable site in a central location in close proximity to the export cable route. Hornsea Three has identified three potential locations for a main compound. These options are shown on Figure 3.22."</p>	I	<p>The purpose of the Environmental Statement is to provide the environmental information which has been gathered in order to carry out an assessment of the likely significant environmental effects of Hornsea Three. This will provide statutory and non-statutory consultees with sufficient information to complete the examination of Hornsea Three and will form the basis of agreement on the content of the DCO.</p> <p>It is noted that through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive ecological receptors. As such, the number of potentially significant effects associated with Hornsea Three has reduced. Additional mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project are outlined in topic specific chapters (Environmental Statement (volume 3), and include the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts on local road networks, ecological receptors (e.g. hedgerows) and hydrological features (e.g. main rivers).</p>



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>50</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Ray & Diane Pearce	<p>14. A copy of Figure 3.22 is at Attachment 3 with the location of our home annotated. This figure is inadequate to graphically support the importance of the construction compounds. We acknowledge that a further site has been identified away from the cable route. However, the details we were presented with in the PEIR were the provision of 2 out of the 3 proposed construction compound locations being immediately adjacent to our property. Despite the assertion that Hornsea Three will take "into consideration" all the impacts their project will have on our home, health and way of life, we have no confidence or trust that our situation will be or ever has been considered.</p> <p>Summary</p>	I	<p>The main construction compound for the project will be located at Oulton Airfield, accessed off the B1149. Since the PEIR, Hornsea Three has refined the proposals for the secondary compounds, with five compounds located along the onshore cable corridor. The nearest secondary compound to the location mentioned in the response is located approximately 2.5 km to the south, although a storage area is located to the north of the potential Vanguard crossing (in the corner of a field to the south of Cawston Road B1145) which is shown in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description.</p> <p>Impacts on sensitive receptors are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3).</p>
<b>Section 47: Duty to consult local community</b>			
Jo Herbert-Mondal	<p>I'm writing to give you feedback re. The three proposed routes for the cables, which will pass [REDACTED], Little Melton. We are most in favour of the third option - the blue route, as this takes the cables a good way from our barns. We strongly object to the second route, which would closely border our gardens and those of our neighbours, at [REDACTED]. We also object to route 1 if it was located directly next to the gardens of [REDACTED]. Our objections are based not just on the disruption caused by the construction, but also uncertainties about the biological and developmental effect of long term exposure to low levels of electromagnetic radiation, especially on our young children. I hope this is helpful feedback for the next stage of the process.</p>	I	<p>As set out in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives, the southern route has been taken forward by Hornsea Three. This route is shown on the plans which are submitted in support of the DCO application and has been chosen based on a review of technical and environmental constraints as well as community feedback.</p>
Mark Flatman on behalf of Mr & Mrs DW Flatman	<p>Representation in Respect of Onshore Plan Map 2 Proposed Access Route In the unfortunate event that the proposal to utilise Warren Road were to proceed, my parents and other residents of Warren Road would vehemently resist any suggestion by Orsted, or its contractors, that construction traffic might seek to use Warren Road for access, particularly as it itself in any event a private road and maintained wholly at the expense of the residents themselves.</p>	I	<p>Hornsea Three will utilise the northern section of Warren Road, however in developing the access strategy we have sought to avoid the nearby residential receptors through the use of a unnamed street to the north-west which links Bridge Road to the northern section of Warren Road.</p> <p>Further information on access is provided in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport.</p>
Mark Flatman on behalf of Mr & Mrs DW Flatman	<p>It is therefore imperative that prior approval to a Construction Traffic Management Plan and a Construction Traffic Routing Agreement be required as a condition prerequisite to development commencing for any approval granted and that such routing be required to only use publically owned highways or routes to which express consent is given by all affected landowners. I set out below suggested possible wording for such conditions (see full response). I appreciate that the application will constitute a NSIP under the auspices of the 2008 Planning Act, and therefore not be determined by NNDC, If it is also the case that NNDC will not be responsible for administering the specifics of subsequent onsite development activities, then reference to the determining and administrative body should be substituted for that of the local planning authority in the conditions above.</p>	I	<p>It is noted that Hornsea Three avoids all direct impact on public roads through a commitment to use trenchless technologies (i.e. HDD).</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, impacts relating to access are addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport. It is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this forms part of the DCO application.</p>
Councillor Greg Peck, Broadland District Council	<p>I have concerns about the use of the old Oulton Airfield as a compound and storage site. This was used as a storage site for the Sheringham Shoal Wind Turbine project and for over a year local residents suffered from light pollution which lit up the sky for miles around. So your assurance that all security lighting will be down lighting and/or reactive lighting is essential. The hum of generators needs to be addressed to avoid those in Oulton Street suffering from sleep deprivation. Finally I would want an assurance that all site traffic will enter and exit via the Norwich - Holt road, to avoid going through the village. A recent application for a for an Anaerobic Digester was turned down on this very site because of Highways Department concerns about the level of traffic on what is effectively a single track road.</p>	I	<p>In respect to the main construction compound at Oulton, Hornsea Three recognises the sensitivity of this location and since its identification as the main construction compound, Hornsea Three has sought to identify measures to minimise any impacts on Oulton village, local residents and the local road network. In this regard, where properties are located in close proximity to the Oulton Airfield, the Project will ensure that sensitive construction management measures, such as noise, dust and traffic control are considered. These are documented in an outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), which accompanies the DCO application. Furthermore, it is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this also forms part of the DCO application.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>50</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Judy Holland	I am now extremely concerned about the entire wind farm cabling routes by both Ørsted and Vattenfall (I have written to them too) which will cross in the field behind our home (address below) and which will have far more impact on us than we previously thought now that the working corridors, site access routes and construction compounds/marshalling yards are coming to light. If plans are passed this will have a massive long term impact on us with noise, dust and access in and out of our home.	I	Generally, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts to local residential receptors, either through site selection/route refinement or through the identification of suitable mitigation measures. Where there are impacts to residential receptors, these are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3), for example noise during the construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning of the project is addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 8: Noise and Vibration. Impacts associated with dust are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 9: Air Quality and impacts in relation to access are considered in volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport. In all cases, a cumulative impact assessment is presented where the potential for combined impacts with other projects are considered.
Councillor Jo Coplestone, Broadland District Council	Finally I support the use of Oulton Airfield as a compound and storage site, subject to local concerns being addressed. I have concerns about the proposed cable crossing point at Salle (Ørsted & Vattenfall Schemes) and I hope there will be collaborative working between both companies to mitigate the disruption to the community there.	Y	Following this consultation, Hornsea Three has confirmed that the Oulton Airfield will be used as the Main Construction Compound.  We are in close contact with Vattenfall at all levels of the project in relation to their proposed Norfolk Vanguard and Norfolk Boreas projects; we liaise on environmental consents, communications, stakeholder engagement, technical aspects etc., so it's not just one point of contact for both businesses. We are of course paying extra attention to where the proposed projects may cross in terms of the underground cables, as we recognise that, if both projects are built simultaneously, coordinating construction works will minimise disruption. Additionally, we are in close consultation regarding any areas where there could be potential for cumulative impacts to arise as a result of both developments to ensure we progress the projects appropriately and sensitively.  Notwithstanding the above, it is important to note that Norfolk Vanguard is a project with its own technical and environmental characteristics and constraints, and is subject to a separate DCO process.
CPRE Norfolk	Map 7. The current proposals for the dualling of the A47 from North Tuddenham to Easton envisage the removal of the Easton roundabout, and as such the proposed access at Church Lane to the A47 would be stopped at some stage and block off the proposed access from the A47. The Easton roundabout would be replaced by a junction at Blind Lane and Taverham Road. This location has been proposed because it would provide an east and west to the Food Hub (and would serve any future Norwich Link Road from the western end of the NDR to the A47). There is an LDO in place for that part of the Food Hub site within Broadland Council. The cabling corridor now runs through the adjacent South Norfolk part of the Food Hub Site, which as yet has no LDO in place. The dualling work for the A47 is programmed to start in 2021. Ørsted may want to follow what is happening, and timescales, by contact with the county council. Initially the vehicles – mainly HGV - will be accessing the Food Hub by also using the route marked in red for access via the existing Easton roundabout.	I	Noted, Hornsea Three has consulted, and will continue to consult Highways England and other relevant project developers to identify interactions between projects. Where schemes are sufficiently progressed, potential cumulative effects have been identified and assessed within the relevant topic chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3).
Councillor Graham Everett, Broadland District Council	1). I support the use of the old Oulton Airfield as a compound and storage site subject to local residents/businesses concerns being addressed.	Y	Noted, where sensitive receptors are located in close proximity to the main construction compound, the Project will ensure that sensitive construction management measures, such as noise, dust and traffic control are considered. These are documented in an outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), which accompanies the DCO application. Furthermore, a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this forms part of the DCO application.  Following this consultation, Hornsea Three has confirmed that the Oulton Airfield will be used as the Main Construction Compound.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>50</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Councillor Graham Everett, Broadland District Council	2) The alternative route around Salle appears to be better than the original route, however, I still have concerns around the sensitivity of this whole area, therefore I seek assurances that residents and business concerns are fully addressed, also that the impact on this area is kept to the absolute minimum time period required for the works to be completed with a minimal land area being affected and disrupted.	I	<p>Noted, where sensitive receptors are located in close proximity to the onshore cable corridor, the Project will ensure that sensitive construction management measures, such as noise, dust and traffic control are considered. These are documented in an outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), which accompanies the DCO application.</p> <p>During the design refinement Hornsea Three has sought to minimise the duration of any disruption, and has reduced the total duration of the construction phase onshore to eight years. Within this, the maximum duration for construction of the onshore cable corridor is approximately 2.5 years, this therefore means that the maximum duration over which construction could occur would be 5.5 years incorporating two phases (assuming a three-year gap between the two phases). The work associated with each phase is expected to progress along the Hornsea Three onshore cable corridor with a typical active construction works duration of three months at any particular location.</p>
<b>Section 48: Duty to publicise</b>			
<i>No comments were received from the duty to publicise relating to traffic and transport under Phase 2.B.</i>			

Table 3.17: Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Focused Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.C) relating to traffic and transport

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>51</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 42: Prescribed consultees (The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009: Schedule 1))</b>			
Oulton Parish Council	<p>Oulton Parish Council (OPC) sets out its concerns following the receipt of limited information from Orsted obtained at one public meeting on 6th March 2018 and the answer to a number of written questions received late on 20th March 2018. The late adoption of Oulton airfield as the proposed Main Construction Compound and the inability of Orsted to engage with OPC earlier has meant that OPC has not had the chance to adequately consider many of the wider issues of this project Some are touched on here (for example, project phasing, ducting, HVAC or HVDC transmission) but the PC reserves the right to raise other issues in the coming months. OPC remains very concerned that this and the similar Vattenfall project has significant issues for the road network and quality of life of residents in our area. To date, nothing that has been provided in the Oersted documentation provides any comfort and the consequences of this project for this area for up to 8 years and beyond are significant.</p> <p>OPC have been advised by PINS that we can respond to this focused consultation even though we do not appear on maps in this round of the consultation. Oulton did however appear in Orsted's announcement on 12th February 2018 as the choice of Main Construction Compound. The implications of this fact were not immediately fully appreciated by the parish council because of a lack of information and a lack of Reponses from Orsted, despite request questions and a request from OPC to attend a parish council meeting to explain. After repeated requests, Orsted representatives finally came to a parish council meeting on 6th March 2018 to meet with councillors and residents. Answers to most questions were still not forthcoming until 20th March 2018. The document from Emily Woolfenden, emailed to OPC on that date, has been the first attempt at specific information that we have had from Orsted, and there are still many substantive gaps. - OPC acknowledges that the document contains some facts previously unknown to us but it deeply disappointed by the small number of these. Some of the facts have been useful to us in grasping the scale and implications of the compound - but some have only served to exacerbate our concerns.</p>	I	<p>Information pertaining to the site selection for the main construction compound is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives. Given the nature of the Oulton Airfield, which comprises existing hardstanding, its use as the main construction compound has less potential for significant effects than other sites which were under consideration.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, Hornsea Three recognises the sensitivity of this location and since its identification as the main construction compound, Hornsea Three has sought to identify measures to minimise any impacts on Oulton village, local residents and the local road network. In this regard, where properties are located in close proximity to the Oulton Airfield, the Project will ensure that sensitive construction management measures, such as noise, dust and traffic control are considered. These are documented in an outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), which accompanies the DCO application. Furthermore, it is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this also forms part of the DCO application.</p> <p>Impacts associated with the use of Oulton Airfield as the main construction compound are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3).</p>

<sup>51</sup> Y = Yes change made; N = No change made; I = Incorporated into or considered when producing the assessment or landowner voluntary agreement offer; N/A = Not applicable.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>51</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Oulton Parish Council	<p>Noise disturbance - The noise generated by activities on the compound would impact severely on the quality of life of Oulton residents especially those surrounding the airfield - at The Old Railway Gatehouse and Manor Farm - and the prevailing wind would carry noise over to the 24 dwellings in Oulton Street. This is an extremely rural area: at night it is utterly quiet here, so any noise would be intrusive and cause disturbance. The PC is extremely concerned about the reference to generators on site ( @ ) why would generators be necessary at all, as electricity is already installed on the airfield to power the landowner's animal housing?</p> <p>We note that silenced power generators would be used but it is our experience that there is no such thing as an absolutely silent generator, as yet. If generators would have to be used for a short period, then it would be essential for acoustic fencing to be employed, especially to protect as much as possible the residents at Manor Farm. The PC is also concerned about the likelihood of noisy reversing alarms, which are a curse in a rural area. Can Orsted assure residents that only white -noise alarms will be used and that this will be included in a planning condition that will specifically place upon Orsted the responsibility to ensure that all contractors using the site have such alarms fitted? The PC is similarly appalled by the proposal of the traffic notice to be generated by 134 HGV movements on a daily basis - at least at peak times. We cannot reiterate too strongly or too often that the HGV traffic through Oulton Street has already reached absolute saturation point in terms of noise disturbance to residents and highway function and safety. The addition of any more traffic noise would constitute a severe and unacceptable adverse impact on the quality of life of our residents.</p>	I	<p>Information pertaining to the site selection for the main construction compound is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives. Given the nature of the Oulton Airfield, which comprises existing hardstanding, its use as the main construction compound has less potential for significant effects than other sites which were under consideration.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, Hornsea Three recognises the sensitivity of this location and since its identification as the main construction compound, Hornsea Three has sought to identify measures to minimise any impacts on Oulton village, local residents and the local road network. In this regard, where properties are located in close proximity to the Oulton Airfield, the Project will ensure that sensitive construction management measures, such as noise, dust and traffic control are considered. These are documented in an outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), which accompanies the DCO application. Furthermore, it is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this also forms part of the DCO application.</p> <p>Impacts associated with the use of Oulton Airfield as the main construction compound are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3). Impacts relating to traffic and transport are specifically assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport.</p>
<b>Section 42: Local Authorities (prescribed under section 43 of the Act)</b>			
No comments were received from the local authorities relating to traffic and transport under Phase 2.C.			
<b>Section 42: Persons with an interest in the land (prescribed under section 44 of the Act)</b>			
Bidwells (Christopher Bond) on behalf of Edward Christopher Evans-Lombe & Great Melton Farms Limited	<p>We note that access to the working width is still via the main drive to Algarsthorpe Farmhouse and, bearing in mind the comments we submitted in our representation of 20 December 2017, can we please discuss the practicalities of how this will work.</p> <p>§ We note and support the proposed HDD for the route immediately south of the Bawburgh-Marlingford Road and the wood immediately west of Algarsthorpe Farmhouse. Would it be possible to HDD the intervening section (not open cut) so that the full length of the route from the Bawburgh-Marlingford Road to the south of the wood is installed by HDD, particularly bearing in mind that the HDD plant will already be on site.</p>	N	<p>The access along the track to Algarsthorpe Farm is required in order to access the area to the south of the River Yare in relation to the proposed HDDs under the adjacent woodland and river. Where possible, access will be taken to these areas from the public roads either side of the section of the route in order to avoid impact to the users of this track. Once a construction contractor is appointed and prior to commencement of the work it is suggested a meeting is held on site to assess the potential traffic interference here and how this can be managed.</p> <p>The suggested HDD would be over 500m in length raising technical concerns, especially given the proximity to the River Yare and wet land either side. There is also a slight bend in the route here which, although not impossible to achieve, would add further complexities to the HDD, in addition to the change in topography leading down towards the river. At this stage of the project, it is too early to commit to a complete HDD of this section given there is suitable land available to support two shorter HDD's.</p>
Bidwells (Christopher Bond) on behalf of Charles Watt	As referred to in the representation submitted on 20 December 2017, we note that one of proposed accesses to Mr Kemp's land still leads off the Norwich Road directly opposite the Lodge – clearly a traffic hazard which would lead to traffic using the Lodge drive as a run off area which is totally unacceptable. We, therefore, request that this access route is not used.	N	Response noted. An alternative access route into the field in question has been added following receipt of earlier feedback. The proposed access in question remains as an alternative option, should this be required, with the western access being the preferred point of entry.



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>51</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Bidwells (Christopher Bond) - On behalf of Charles Watt	<p>Further to your letter and enclosures dated 27th February 2018 concerning the above matter, we write as agents on behalf of our clients detailed below. We have shown the relevant consultation plan number for each client brackets.</p> <p>Charles Johnathan Watt, [REDACTED] [REDACTED] (Map 5 of 6)</p> <p>Benjamin Robert Goodfellow, c/o Birketts [REDACTED] [REDACTED] (Map 5 of 6)</p> <p>Please note any correspondence relating to this response or representation should be sent to Bidwells at the above address, reference CF Bond. We now response and comment on the proposed addition access routes shown within the consultation plans, on a without prejudice basis as follows:</p> <p>1. Charles Jonathan Watt, [REDACTED] [REDACTED] (Map 5 of 6)</p> <p>We note a Potential Access Route (New) to Mr. Kemp's land to the North of the Norwich Road which we support</p> <p>We presume the proposed access to Mr. Kemp's land which leads off the Norwich Road directly opposite the Lodge - clearly, a traffic hazard which would lead to traffic using the Lodge drive as a run off area will not now be required - could this please be confirmed (as referred to in our previous representation dated 20/12/2017)</p>	N	The proposed access in question remains as an alternative option, should this be required, with the western access being the preferred point of entry.
<b>Section 47: Duty to consult local community</b>			
John Hurst (copied in Lady Ann Prince-Smith - Landowner on route)	<p>I am the landowner immediately to the north of Marl Hill at Morton on the Hill and although I will not be directly affected by your proposals to established a Construction and Storage Compound immediately to the south of the A1067 at Morton on the Hill in my opinion this is not a suitable site for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) Marl Hill is a particularly busy road which currently carries up to 4000 cars a day and this particular junction is extremely busy and is an accident black spot. The A1067 was closed due to an accident at this junction for a couple of hours only this week.</p>	N	<p>Hornsea Three noted Lady Prince Smith's comments in relation to the proposed storage area adjacent to the A1067 which have been taken on board and will be considered by the project. This area has been identified to provide a storage area for work relating to the proposed Horizontal Directional Drill (HDD) under the A1067 &amp; The Street.</p> <p>Access to the proposed storage area is NOT to be taken directly off the A1067, rather it is via the proposed access further down Marl Hill, as opposed to the junction of the two roads.</p>
John Hurst (copied in Lady Ann Prince-Smith - Landowner on route)	<p>2) The junction with the A1067 regularly floods and this winter this particular junction was under two feet of water for approximately four weeks during the months of December and January.</p>	N	<p>Lady Prince Smith's comments were noted regarding the water and will be taken into account in the design process. Should the ground conditions here not be suitable for use as a compound at the time, then additional materials could be used to create a more robust surface which should in turn assist with reinstatement of the land back to agricultural use.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>51</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Robert Shoals	<p>One thing that was touched on was that of vehicle movement in and out of the site, the majority of this movement will involve heavy plant and in the case of cable delivery to site storage and distribution from that storage to various installation sites it will be Abnormal Loads. The Street, Oulton is the feed road to the site and is totally unsuitable for this traffic as has already been proven on previous planning applications. This road already carries more than that its fair share of heavy traffic. To the immediate south of the site entrance is a cottage which sits atop of a hump in the road, to the north of the site entrance is the homes of the streets residents which also sit roadside, numerous cars sit on the road outside these properties. Other concerns about noise and light pollution which I also have fade into insignificance by comparison. The choice of this site is completely WRONG.</p>	I	<p>Since its identification as the main construction compound, Hornsea Three has sought to identify measures to minimise any impacts on Oulton village, local residents and the local road network. In this regard, where properties are located in close proximity to the Oulton Airfield, the Project will ensure that sensitive construction management measures, such as noise, dust and traffic control are considered. These are documented in an outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), which accompanies the DCO application. Furthermore, it is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this also forms part of the DCO application.</p> <p>It is noted that lighting during the onshore construction phase will be short term and temporary, used only when required (and generally limited to certain working hours) and designed to avoid unnecessary illumination. Light spill during out of hours working will be minimised through the use of task-orientated lighting, as set out in the outline CoCP which accompanies the DCO application.</p> <p>Impacts associated with the use of Oulton Airfield as the main construction compound are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3).</p>
Pam Birtles	<p>As a resident of The Street Oulton, I write to register my very strong objection to the proposal to use Oulton Airfield as a construction site for Hornsea 3. Access to the site is completely inadequate for the type of traffic proposed. When asked to consider a planning application for a bio-digester nearby the District Council refused permission on the grounds that Street was unsuitable for the increase in traffic. Farm vehicles (especially at harvest time) often have trouble negotiating their way past the houses and have been known to rip wing mirrors off parked cars. Oulton Parish Council is responding to this proposal. I agree with all they say.</p>	I	<p>Information pertaining to the site selection for the main construction compound is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives. Given the nature of the Oulton Airfield, which comprises existing hardstanding, its use as the main construction compound has less potential for significant effects than other sites which were under consideration.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, Hornsea Three recognises the sensitivity of this location and since its identification as the main construction compound, Hornsea Three has sought to identify measures to minimise any impacts on Oulton village, local residents and the local road network. In this regard, where properties are located in close proximity to the Oulton Airfield, the Project will ensure that sensitive construction management measures, such as noise, dust and traffic control are considered. These are documented in an outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), which accompanies the DCO application. Furthermore, it is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this also forms part of the DCO application.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>51</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Hannah Sturt	I write to tell you of my disagreement with the above proposal. Although we are a small number of residents we are unused to high amounts of traffic, noise and lighting. You will be intruding on our country way of life and that of the wildlife, there are endangered bird species living here, including the song thrush which is in the conservation status red list. It must also be noted that while the airfield was offered to you as a proposed site, none of the residents were asked by the owner if this would be acceptable. I hope that you will consider the proposal as if it were your home in the village.	I	<p>Information pertaining to the site selection for the main construction compound is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives. Given the nature of the Oulton Airfield, which comprises existing hardstanding, its use as the main construction compound has less potential for significant effects than other sites which were under consideration.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, Hornsea Three recognises the sensitivity of this location and since its identification as the main construction compound, Hornsea Three has sought to identify measures to minimise any impacts on Oulton village, local residents and the local road network. In this regard, where properties are located in close proximity to the Oulton Airfield, the Project will ensure that sensitive construction management measures, such as noise, dust and traffic control are considered. These are documented in an outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), which accompanies the DCO application. Furthermore, it is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this also forms part of the DCO application.</p> <p>Impacts associated with the use of Oulton Airfield as the main construction compound are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3).</p>
Gordon Fryett	Observations and Objections regarding the proposal to use Oulton Airfield as the Main Storage / Operating Compound as follows: The inappropriateness of the scale of this proposal and its activities in this location. In effect, this proposal is for massive industrial-scale use. It is based purely on commercial and financial benefit for the proposer whilst attempting to hid behind the smoke-screen of National Infrastructure when other options were identified.	I	<p>Information pertaining to the site selection for the main construction compound is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives. Given the nature of the Oulton Airfield, which comprises existing hardstanding, its use as the main construction compound has less potential for significant effects than other sites which were under consideration.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, Hornsea Three recognises the sensitivity of this location and since its identification as the main construction compound, Hornsea Three has sought to identify measures to minimise any impacts on Oulton village, local residents and the local road network. In this regard, where properties are located in close proximity to the Oulton Airfield, the Project will ensure that sensitive construction management measures, such as noise, dust and traffic control are considered. These are documented in an outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), which accompanies the DCO application. Furthermore, it is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this also forms part of the DCO application.</p>
Gordon Fryett	The serious inadequacies of the immediate road network to cope with such a development. Local roads are predominately very narrow, single-track country lanes with numerous very tight bends, small hump-backed bridges and fragile surfaces which can barely cope with current domestic traffic. The only road of any substance in the area is the B1149 and even that has many obstacles and shortcomings	I	It is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this also forms part of the DCO application.
Gordon Fryett	We have very serious concerns about and object most strongly to any proposal which would bring traffic through Oulton Street from either direction. The road is not able to cope with lorries or large, heavy vehicles. Any such activity would be extremely dangerous and damaging for local residents and other road users resulting in a very serious and unacceptable health and safety risk.	I	It is noted that impacts to pedestrian safety, amenity, severance and driver delay, amongst others, are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport. Notwithstanding this, a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this also forms part of the DCO application.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>51</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Gordon Fryett	We are very concerned by the serious negative environmental impact that such a development would have not only on the local flora and fauna but even more importantly on the health and wellbeing of the residents of Oulton Street, of Oulton Village and of the wider Community	I	<p>Through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive ecological receptors. Additional mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project are outlined in topic specific chapters, and include the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts on local road networks, ecological receptors (e.g. hedgerows) and hydrological features (e.g. main rivers).</p> <p>In respect to the main construction compound at Oulton, Hornsea Three recognises the sensitivity of this location and since its identification as the main construction compound, Hornsea Three has sought to identify measures to minimise any impacts on Oulton village, local residents and the local road network. In this regard, where properties are located in close proximity to the Oulton Airfield, the Project will ensure that sensitive construction management measures, such as noise, dust and traffic control are considered. These are documented in an outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), which accompanies the DCO application. Furthermore, it is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this also forms part of the DCO application.</p>
CD Lambert	<p>To whom it may concern. PLEASE THINK AGAIN. I live with my family in Oulton Street and have down so for 30 years. Oulton street is adjacent to the proposed site of the huge Construction compound for the Hornsea Project. Oulton is a small rural community that is already in the middle of a 3,000 plus acre farm, the current owners of the proposed site. We get a constant stream of heavy agricultural traffic 7 days a week and up to 15 hours a day passing through the Street in an addition to regular local traffic. This is a country road barely wide enough to pass another car coming the opposite way. A proposed anaerobic digester plant was refused on the basis that it could not legitimately absorb the increased traffic it would generate on such a small road with blind corners and such restricted access to increased heavy traffic movements without running a real and increased risk of accidents. There is only two ways of accessing the proposed site and they both use Oulton Street. Yet you are proposing to do just that by increasing the amount of heavy traffic and all the noise lighting and disturbance that would cause to the local residents in the name of green energy. There has already been an alternative site proposed at Western Longville on a main road but Oulton is not being proposed instead, WHY?</p> <p>We have had wind farms, anaerobic digesters, solar farms and now this, we are mentally exhausted trying to protect our way of life. We are not being over defensive or selfish we are distraught by this proposal. The proposed old airfield site was built in the second world war to protect our freedom not to take it away. We do not need to protect the planet by destroying small rural communities such as ours and we will fight to keep ours.</p> <p>Please think again and withdraw this proposal if you have any sense of what is right and respect for others there are other options.</p>	I	<p>Information pertaining to the site selection for the main construction compound is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives. Given the nature of the Oulton Airfield, which comprises existing hardstanding, its use as the main construction compound has less potential for significant effects than other sites which were under consideration.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, Hornsea Three recognises the sensitivity of this location and since its identification as the main construction compound, Hornsea Three has sought to identify measures to minimise any impacts on Oulton village, local residents and the local road network. In this regard, where properties are located in close proximity to the Oulton Airfield, the Project will ensure that sensitive construction management measures, such as noise, dust and traffic control are considered. These are documented in an outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), which accompanies the DCO application. Furthermore, it is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this also forms part of the DCO application.</p> <p>Impacts associated with the use of Oulton Airfield as the main construction compound are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3). Impacts relating to traffic and transport are specifically assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport.</p>



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>51</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Robert Sturt	<p>I am writing in response to your consultation with regards to the proposed construction at the Oulton Airfield Site. I wonder if your team has properly researched the area? The surrounding roads are not suitable for such a level of traffic - HGV vehicles will really struggle. There are no pavements and limited room for 2-way car traffic.</p> <p>A previous application for an anaerobic digester was refused because of traffic issues. The street is populated with houses on the main roads with no pavements</p> <p>There is already farm traffic</p> <p>The street is often used as a shortcut</p> <p>In Winter weather your traffic will experience serious issues</p> <p>Simply put you really need to consider this carefully?</p> <p>Use a warehouse somewhere with good access and not a rural farm location. I also wonder about the merit of your project anyway? Isn't this yet another poorly thought out government scheme to help your business maximise profits? Solar technology is going to improve massively over the next couple of decades - when people fully adopt the technology, nobody is going to want to buy your government backed subsidy energy scheme.</p>	I	<p>Information pertaining to the site selection for the main construction compound is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives. Given the nature of the Oulton Airfield, which comprises existing hardstanding, its use as the main construction compound has less potential for significant effects than other sites which were under consideration.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, Hornsea Three recognises the sensitivity of this location and since its identification as the main construction compound, Hornsea Three has sought to identify measures to minimise any impacts on Oulton village, local residents and the local road network. In this regard, where properties are located in close proximity to the Oulton Airfield, the Project will ensure that sensitive construction management measures, such as noise, dust and traffic control are considered. These are documented in an outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), which accompanies the DCO application. Furthermore, it is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this also forms part of the DCO application.</p> <p>Impacts associated with the use of Oulton Airfield as the main construction compound are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3). Impacts relating to traffic and transport are specifically assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport.</p>
Clive Searson & Nicola Tanner	<p>We are the residents at [REDACTED], Oulton Street. We are totally horrified that your company propose to put a compound in without any correspondence with local residents, especially when it is going to have an adverse impact on our lives. It is unacceptable to have a compound that will be disruptive to our quality of life. We purchased our house in good faith and were told that no planning applications would be forthcoming due to the rejection of the AD plant in 2014. We have to deal with noise from cars and farm traffic on a daily basis, it is noticeably loud especially as when it goes over the hump in the road it intensifies the noise. The noise levels in our house are very clear, you can hear cars and farm traffic as it passes our house clearly. All of our windows on our house are viewable from the road and even though double glazed it is intrusive and does not shut out the sound. It will be unacceptable to have heavy construction traffic passing our house night and day. It will have a serious impact on our lives and well being. As I work in staff recruitment I take phone calls from 7.00am through to 9:00pm. My work day is already disrupted through passing traffic, if it were to increase it would make my job unworkable. The noise levels generated during harvest are bad enough. We are the only house that will be seriously affected by all the traffic to and from site and it is unacceptable that we should have to live with it.</p> <p>There are no footpaths along the road and only a few unofficial passing places. The road is very popular for local dog walkers and for cyclists following "The Tudor Route". The road itself is quite narrow and in places when cars and farm traffic are passing each other it can be dangerous. Adding construction traffic and low loaders to traverse this route as it is not wide enough. We accept that farm traffic is going to pass our house as it is a farming community, the noise can be disruptive now, with construction traffic too it will be unbearable. The compound itself will be offset to the right behind our house. The lights and generators will be very disturbing especially at night when sound travels. The lit compound would light a normally dark sky and will stand out like a sore thumb. The constant hum of generator's in the background are not conducive with relaxation time in our garden. There your proposal would result in material harm in the living conditions as of us as residents.</p>	I	<p>Hornsea Three recognises the sensitivity of this location and since its identification as the main construction compound, Hornsea Three has sought to identify measures to minimise any impacts on Oulton village, local residents and the local road network. In this regard, where properties are located in close proximity to the Oulton Airfield, the Project will ensure that sensitive construction management measures, such as noise, dust and traffic control are considered. These are documented in an outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), which accompanies the DCO application. Furthermore, it is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this also forms part of the DCO application.</p> <p>Impacts associated with the use of Oulton Airfield as the main construction compound are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3). Impacts relating to traffic and transport are specifically assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport. Impacts to pedestrian safety, amenity, severance and driver delay, amongst others, are also assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport.</p> <p>It is noted that lighting during the onshore construction phase will be short term and temporary, used only when required (and generally limited to certain working hours) and designed to avoid unnecessary illumination. Light spill during out of hours working will be minimised through the use of task-orientated lighting, as set out in the outline CoCP which accompanies the DCO application. Lighting during construction will take into account the requirements set out in British Standard (BS) EB 12464-2:2014 (BSI, 21014) and guidance from the Institute of Lighting Professionals (Institute of Lighting Professionals, 2011 'Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Obtrusive Light').</p>



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>51</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Peter Glenser	<p>Oulton Street - The obvious detrimental impact of the increased traffic movements through the village have been covered in the Parish Council response. I do not rehearse them here. However it is of particular concern that no traffic assessment has been conducted as yet. As the PC observe "This situation is entirely unsatisfactory as it will prevent OPC from reviewing the assessments for accuracy before they are submitted. We must also point out that this approach is entirely invalid as it pre-judges the outcome of the assessments to be positive."</p>	I	<p>Impacts associated with the use of Oulton Airfield as the main construction compound are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3). Impacts relating to traffic and transport are specifically assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport.</p>
Peter Glenser	<p>██████████ - I note that that the proposed hours of operation are from 6 am to 7 pm during the week and from 6 am until 5 pm on Saturdays. I vividly remember looking at the Norfolk Churches website when we made the decision to buy this house. It contained the following description of the immediate vicinity: "The area between Aylsham and Holt can seem among the most remote in Norfolk, a landscape of scattered villages unknown to the busy traffic a few miles off on the Cromer road... At a lost crossroads where four deep cut narrow roadways meet is St Peter and St Paul, not far from the great Hall. Elms and oaks are all about, their treetops restless on this late summer day. When the wind drops, you can hear a car approaching from miles off - but not many come this way." The peace and quiet of this remote location was a major factor in our decision to buy the house. The quiet enjoyment of this property will be severely effected by the construction of a site nearly eight acres in size, with lights, generators, facilities for staff and heavy vehicle movements just a few hundred metres away and in the direction the house faces. It is difficult to overstate how quiet this area is and how much vehicle reversing alarms, engines and even voices will disturb this silence. Similarly the area is very dark at night – inevitably security lighting will cause light pollution in this dark skies area.</p>	I	<p>Proposed working hours are set out in the outline CoCP which forms part of the DCO application. The outline CoCP is a 'living' document that will be updated as required post submission of the DCO application, during the Examination Period following more detailed engagement with stakeholders and post examination by way of instruction of the Examining Authority and Secretary of State.</p> <p>Given the nature of the Oulton Airfield, which comprises existing hardstanding, its use as the main construction compound has less potential for significant effects than other sites which were under consideration. Notwithstanding this, Hornsea Three recognises the sensitivity of this location and since its identification as the main construction compound, Hornsea Three has sought to identify measures to minimise any impacts on Oulton village, local residents and the local road network. In this regard, where properties are located in close proximity to the Oulton Airfield, the Project will ensure that sensitive construction management measures, such as noise, dust, light and traffic control are considered. These are documented in an outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), which accompanies the DCO application. Furthermore, it is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this also forms part of the DCO application.</p> <p>Impacts associated with the use of Oulton Airfield as the main construction compound are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3).</p> <p>It respect to lighting in particular, lighting during construction will take into account the requirements set out in British Standard (BS) EB 12464-2:2014 (BSI, 21014) and guidance from the Institute of Lighting Professionals (Institute of Lighting Professionals, 2011 'Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Obtrusive Light'). Based on the mitigation and management measures in place, no significant light spill is anticipated.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>51</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Simon & Zoe Dunford	<p>We live in Oulton Street - a conservation area on the National Trust's flagship Blickling Hall estate - and are extremely worried about the significant disruption to our lives that this would cause. If it was just a matter of months, we would put up with it. But it seems this would go on for years, not months. And potentially as many as eight years in the worst case scenario.</p> <p>We attended the meeting at Oulton Chapel with completely open minds about the project - but I'm afraid came away feeling seriously concerned about noise, traffic, light pollution, dust etc etc. We live at the Old Post Office, which like most of the properties in the Street, is built immediately on the roadside (no front garden or pavement). The farm traffic is already at saturation point, and already makes peaceful enjoyment of our home a real challenge.</p> <p>To introduce further heavy traffic into this small, rural village - with its walkers, cyclists, children, and visitors to Blickling Hall and the RAF Oulton museum and memorial - would be incredibly insensitive and no doubt harm the reputation of your company.</p> <p>Even if the traffic did not come all the way through the village, being directly downwind of the site we know that we would be disrupted by the noise/dust as this is something we already have to put up with from the existing farm works. With two asthma sufferers in the family (one adult and one child) the thought of more dust heading our way is very worrying.</p>	I	<p>Given the nature of the Oulton Airfield, which comprises existing hardstanding, its use as the main construction compound has less potential for significant effects than other sites which were under consideration. Notwithstanding this, Hornsea Three recognises the sensitivity of this location and since its identification as the main construction compound, Hornsea Three has sought to identify measures to minimise any impacts on Oulton village, local residents and the local road network. In this regard, where properties are located in close proximity to the Oulton Airfield, the Project will ensure that sensitive construction management measures, such as noise, dust, light and traffic control are considered. These are documented in an outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), which accompanies the DCO application. Furthermore, it is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this also forms part of the DCO application.</p> <p>Impacts associated with the use of Oulton Airfield as the main construction compound are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3).</p>
Simon & Zoe Dunford	<p>And of course we drive almost daily from our home to the Holt Road and have had our share of heart-stopping near-misses on the tight/blind bends, narrow stretches, mud-strewn sections, and at the busy junction. This is real stuff that we experience. And it happens even in daylight and fine weather.</p>	I	<p>Impacts relating to access are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport,. Furthermore, it is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this also forms part of the DCO application.</p>
Simon & Zoe Dunford	<p>So we are really struggling to understand how - despite the recent, crystal-clear decision from the planning inspector that the road is too narrow and too bendy to cope safely with increased movements of large vehicles - you have settled on this as your preferred site. It doesn't seem to make any sense.</p>	I	<p>Impacts relating to access are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport,. Furthermore, it is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this also forms part of the DCO application.</p>
Simon & Zoe Dunford	<p>But surely the Planning Inspector will come to the same conclusion about traffic safety and you will have to look again at the other sites you were previously considering, but which might be more costly and/or less expedient? National infrastructure project or not, a fatal RTA at the junction of the Holt Road and Oulton Street is a fatal RTA at the junction of the Holt Road and Oulton Street. Isn't it?</p>	I	<p>Impacts relating to access are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport, this is informed by Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 7.4: Personal Injury Accident Locations which is based on data obtained from NCC and has been used to consider the road safety record of the study area. It is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>51</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Mrs M L and Mr R L G Williams	<p><b>The Proposed use of Oulton farmland as Main Compound</b> As the major problem with this project is the total unsuitability of local roads for the volume of HGVs, it is worth mentioning that this issue has been tried and tested twice in the very recent past.</p> <p>1. Broadland District rejected a Planning Proposal and then the appeal turned down for an Aerobic Digester in Oulton Street</p> <p>2. The National Trust dropped a project for a large Caravan Park at Middle Farm (opposite Oulton Lodge)</p> <p>We are concerned to see at this late stage that the promise at the open meetings that Oulton Street/Blickling Road would not be affected was not true.</p> <p>We wish to object to the proposed development to use Oulton as a storage depot which would transform the character of a peaceful rural village into a noisy living hell and a dangerous place to live.</p>	I	<p>Since its identification as the main construction compound, Hornsea Three has sought to identify measures to minimise any impacts on Oulton village, local residents and the local road network. In this regard, where properties are located in close proximity to the Oulton Airfield, the Project will ensure that sensitive construction management measures, such as noise, dust and traffic control are considered. These are documented in an outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), which accompanies the DCO application. Furthermore, it is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this also forms part of the DCO application.</p> <p>Impacts associated with the use of Oulton Airfield as the main construction compound are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3).</p>
Mrs M L and Mr R L G Williams	<p><b>For the inhabitants of the village</b> The applicant's estimate of traffic seems totalling unrealistic for the area and we foresee that the roads will gridlocked.</p> <p>The houses in Oulton Street abut straight onto the road. Many do not have front gardens or drives to lessen the noise of heavy traffic.</p> <p>More importantly these houses do not have a pavement on either side of the road. Many do not have garages or space and thus cars are parked on the side of the road which is narrow.</p> <p>The absence of pavements make serious risk for children walking or running along between houses or to the village playing field to the north of the village- thus a serious hazard for children.</p>	I	<p>It is noted that impacts relating to access as well as pedestrian safety, amenity, severance and driver delay, amongst others, are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport. A Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this also forms part of the DCO application.</p>
Mrs M L and Mr R L G Williams	<p><b>For domestic and commercial drivers from Saxthorpe via C1354 to Oulton Street.</b> The proposed route has major problems along the way.</p> <p>There are no pavements and no cycle lanes.</p> <p>On the C1354, the small narrow bridge over River Bure, with stop sign which is often ignored because of inadequate visibility to see oncoming traffic on Saxthorpe Road.</p> <p>The road then narrows to a sharp corner where there was a fatal accident. (Hall Road)</p> <p>The C1354 from Saxthorpe to the turn-off at Oulton Street has been the subject of the review for normal traffic in view of the number of accidents over many years. The stretch of road between the Itteringham turnoffs and New Road, Oulton Street is already recognised as vulnerable. A substantial volume of HGVs and cars would make the safety threshold totally unacceptable.</p> <p>The current situation already generates regular accidents.</p> <p>The road is already used as cut through between Saxthorpe and Aylsham -Oulton Street and the Holt Road.</p> <p>The verges are already being eroded by farm traffic as can currently be seen.</p>	I	<p>Impacts relating to access are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport, this is informed by Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 7.4: Personal Injury Accident Locations which is based on data obtained from NCC and has been used to consider the road safety record of the study area. It is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this also forms part of the DCO application.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>51</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Mrs M L and Mr R L G Williams	<p>By [REDACTED], vehicles straddle the centre WHITE line in middle of road which is misleading as insufficient width of road (4.9/5.3 ft). Vehicles try and overtake in front of the hidden driveway entrances on both sides of the road.</p> <p>The camber of the road appears incorrect and with the narrow roadway a mile either side of our property at [REDACTED], where three entrances converge on road – [REDACTED] and tall historic wall adjacent to road, Vehicles are continuing breaking to avoid collision.</p> <p>(One of the reasons the National Trust dropped their plans to build a major caravan park at [REDACTED] in 2017)</p> <p>Thus use of driveways onto the Blickling Road would become more difficult and not be safe. Requests for reduced speed limit and no overtaking signs have been refused, although some reflectors have now been installed (but not cleaned on regular basis) and “slow” signs are under discussion. but this has not reduced the speed of vehicles.</p> <p>Dangerous turning from Blickling Road into New Road Oulton Street with poor visibility</p>	I	Impacts relating to access are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport, this is informed by Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 7.4: Personal Injury Accident Locations which is based on data obtained from NCC and has been used to consider the road safety record of the study area. It is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this also forms part of the DCO application.
Mrs M L and Mr R L G Williams	<p>Stopping distances and visibility from Blickling Hall from the east are of vital importance and not sufficient for fast moving traffic and large slow moving vehicles in and out of junction with New , Oulton Street. Fatal accidents will be the consequence.</p>	I	Impacts relating to access are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport, this is informed by Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 7.4: Personal Injury Accident Locations which is based on data obtained from NCC and has been used to consider the road safety record of the study area. It is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this also forms part of the DCO application.
Mrs M L and Mr R L G Williams	<p>The accidents on Blickling Road have been raised with Norfolk County Council after a series of accidents increased from August 2016. It is unsafe for vehicles travelling at 60 mph as can be shown with the alarming and increasing number of accidents last year along this stretch.(even 30 mph is difficult to stop)</p>	I	Impacts relating to access are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport, this is informed by Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 7.4: Personal Injury Accident Locations which is based on data obtained from NCC and has been used to consider the road safety record of the study area. It is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this also forms part of the DCO application.
Mrs M L and Mr R L G Williams	<p><b>New Road,Oulton Street</b> is not wide enough for a large vehicle and a car to pass, without slowing down and waiting at informal stopping intervals along the road which have been created through increase in size of larger farming vehicles.</p>	I	Impacts relating to access are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport. It is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this also forms part of the DCO application.
Mrs M L and Mr R L G Williams	<p><b>Oulton Street Village</b> itself is very narrow and problems as highlighted above. The total unsuitability of this road to HGVs was one of the main reasons why previous application for Aerobic Digester at Oulton was rejected on appeal. Large farm vehicles regularly access this site..</p>	I	Impacts relating to access are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport. It is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this also forms part of the DCO application.
Mrs M L and Mr R L G Williams	<p><b>Narrow bridge</b> when leaving depot to the south and major disruption to adjacent cottage.</p>	I	Noted, impacts relating to access are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>51</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Mrs M L and Mr R L G Williams	Similar situation with large vehicles exiting onto the <b>Holt Road from Oulton Street</b> into fast moving traffic at junction which has seen fatal accidents in the past- as well as other large vehicles between <b>Docking Farm and Holt Road</b> .	I	Impacts relating to access are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport, this is informed by Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 7.4: Personal Injury Accident Locations which is based on data obtained from NCC and has been used to consider the road safety record of the study area. It is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this also forms part of the DCO application.
Mrs M L and Mr R L G Williams	The introduction of more large slow-moving vehicles would cause dangerous congestion from Saxthorpe to Oulton into the already unsafe mix of large, slow-moving agricultural traffic and fast-moving cars/vans/transporters often travelling at 50-60mph (within current speed limit.)	I	Noted, impacts relating to access are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport. This assessment takes into consideration the road safety record of the area.
Mrs M L and Mr R L G Williams	Land from Saxthorpe to Oulton is owned by various farmers and thus they all have their own larger and larger machinery, which already causes issues and not be part of any restrictions in one-way traffic. Added to farmers from afar who use the C1354 to move material outside the area to digesters/sugar refiners/aylsham growers etc.	I	Noted, impacts relating to access are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport.
Mrs M L and Mr R L G Williams	Alternative site close to the northern bypass/A.47 or direct existing access onto A roads should be sought. (OR a number of sites across the County should be sought to spread the disruption)	I	Although the main construction for the project will be located at Oulton Airfield, Hornsea Three has also identified five secondary compounds and numerous storage areas along the onshore cable corridor. These sites along the onshore cable corridor have been identified to act as support bases for the onshore construction works as the cable work fronts pass through an area. Further details on the site selection process undertaken to identify the main construction compound is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives. Additional detail on the functioning of the construction compounds are provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description, as well as the outline CoCP which accompanies the DCO application.
<b>Section 48: Duty to publicise</b>			
No comments were received in response to the Public Notice relating to traffic and transport under Phase 2.C.			



### 3.7 Land Use and Recreation

Table 3.18: Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.A) relating to land use and recreation

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>52</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 42: Prescribed consultees (The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009: Schedule 1))</b>			
East Midlands Airport	I have recently been sent the consultation pack for the proposed wind farm off of the Norfolk Coast - Ref.- HOW03_s42_25072017. You have identified East Midlands Airport as a consultee for this application and I wanted to check that this is the case please? The pack is addressed to a [REDACTED] who was previously the Safeguarding Officer here but he left the business some time ago. During his time here, [REDACTED] was also responsible for the safeguarding of Humberside Airport, something we are not responsible for now, and I just wanted to check if it was them who were actually the consultee and not East Midlands Airport?	N	Whilst the PEIR was sent to East Midlands Airport, further assessment of potential sources of impact has highlighted that given the distance from East Midlands Airport and Humberside Airport to the project, there is no pathway for impact.
Norfolk Rivers Trust	Norfolk Rivers Trust would like to register their concern on the management of land and water.	I	Noted. Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including land and water either through design, or identification of built in mitigation measures. Potential impacts on geology, hydrology and land use are identified and assessed in Environmental Statement Volume 3, chapters 1: Geology and Ground Conditions, 2: Hydrology and Flood Risk and 6: Land Use and Recreation respectively.
Norfolk Rivers Trust	7. On non agricultural land native UK seed mixes must be the standard application.	I	New planting will be carried out in accordance with the Landscape Management Plan and associated biosecurity risk assessments. The Outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application includes planting methodologies and plant species lists. These comprise native UK seed mixes.
Norfolk Rivers Trust	The Norfolk Rivers Trust are working with Land agents and Landowners on the current Vattenfall project on proposed river crossing points.	N	Noted.
High Kelling Parish Council	3) Interruption to rights of way - in particular interruption of access along the footpath from the A148 to Bodham wood, which is used by many residents. No answer has yet been given with regards alternative access during the periods of disruption.	Y	Through design refinement, Hornsea Three has committed to using trenchless technologies (e.g. HDD) beneath the footpath from the A148 to Bodham Wood in order to minimise disruption to the local community.  Furthermore, traffic management measures will be implemented over the relevant part of Warren Road, as set out in the outline construction traffic management plan which forms part of the DCO application, to maximise pedestrian safety.
High Kelling Parish Council	The parish council wish to express the following concerns regarding your plans; 1) Phasing- it appears the construction will take place in phases over quite a number of years, thus potentially causing multiple periods of disruption, which is of great concern to residents. The council would wish the total construction period to be kept to an absolute minimum.	Y	During the design refinement Hornsea Three has sought to minimise the duration of any disruption, and has reduced the total duration of the construction phase onshore to eight years. A breakdown of the maximum construction durations is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Project Description.
Little Melton Parish Council	<b>Development</b> - No buildings can ever be constructed over the cable. Some parishioners think that this is good as it prevents housing development.	N	Noted.

<sup>52</sup> Y = Yes change made; N = No change made; I = Incorporated into or considered when producing the assessment or landowner voluntary agreement offer; N/A = Not applicable.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>52</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Norfolk County Council	<p>Public Rights of Way</p> <p>5.14 The County Council have checked the Public Rights of Way and linear routes shown on Figure 6.2 and have identified two additional paths that may be affected by the cable route and that do not appear to be included in the PEIR:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Salle FP9 may intersect the search area at TH10702428; and</li> <li>• Keswick FP4 is within the search area, joining Keswick BR4 and East Carleton FP1.</li> </ul> <p>5.15 In terms of PRow, the network that will be affected comprise:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Norfolk Trails: the England Coast Path and the Marriott's Way.</li> </ul> <p>Promoted circular walks that use PRow and which will potentially be affected: "Explore More Coast" Weybourne Circular; Cromer and Sheringham Health Walk No.6 – Weybourne to Sheringham via Norfolk Coast Path; and Aylsham Health Walk No.10 – Reepham via Salle Church;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tas Valley Way; and</li> <li>• The remaining PRow network.</li> </ul>	I	<p>Several PRow and areas of land with informal public access will potentially be affected by the construction of the onshore elements of the Hornsea Three. Where a PRow crosses the onshore cable corridor the contractor is to either: seek to maintain a pedestrian access route. This route will be maintained by fencing and the use of a gating, ensure that the users of the access route have a safe route to cross the onshore cable corridor; or · Provide a localised diversion.</p> <p>Signage will be erected to direct pedestrians when the construction traffic requires access over the designated pedestrian route, or of diversions if so implemented. Where an alternative route is reasonably available, with the agreement of the relevant PRow Officer, a short term permissive diversion will be formed around the active construction area. Advanced warning notices will be provided to users identifying the diversion route. Following completion of construction activities, all public access within the working area will be reinstated with a standard commensurate to that existing prior to the commencement of construction works.</p> <p>Further information on impacts to PRow and land use is provided in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 6: Land Use and Recreation.</p>
Norfolk County Council	<p>PRow - Comments</p> <p>5.16 Although routes of regional and national importance are noted above, the wider un-promoted PRow network serve a number of settlements within or near to the current search areas. Un-promoted PRow should not be considered of lesser importance; settlements such as Reepham will see disruption to its PRow network not only from this development but cumulatively through the Vattenfall Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project, which it is understood could co-inside with this project. The closure and diversion of routes near to populated areas such as this need to be considered in the wider context of both the type of use they receive and the potential implications of other projects.</p>	I	<p>Several PRow and areas of land with informal public access will potentially be affected by the construction of the onshore elements of the Hornsea Three. Where a PRow crosses the onshore cable corridor the contractor is to either: seek to maintain a pedestrian access route. This route will be maintained by fencing and the use of a gating, ensure that the users of the access route have a safe route to cross the onshore cable corridor; or · Provide a localised diversion. It is noted that a number of PRow will be crossed using HDD to avoid direct impacts e.g. Marriott's Way.</p> <p>Signage will be erected to direct pedestrians when the construction traffic requires access over the designated pedestrian route, or of diversions if so implemented. Where an alternative route is reasonably available, with the agreement of the relevant PRow Officer, a short term permissive diversion will be formed around the active construction area. Advanced warning notices will be provided to users identifying the diversion route. Following completion of construction activities, all public access within the working area will be reinstated with a standard commensurate to that existing prior to the commencement of construction works.</p> <p>Further information on impacts to PRow and land use is provided in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 6: Land Use and Recreation.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>52</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Norfolk County Council	<p>PRoW - Comments (cont.)</p> <p>5.17 In terms of mitigation, the County Council would therefore expect that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For all PRoW affected, Temporary Traffic Regulation orders should be put in place to cover the periods of closure, with reopening as soon as possible i.e. the very minimum periods of closure. Signed and maintained alternative routes for the closures should be provided where appropriate. These alternative routes should consider cumulative effects and where possible be of equal value to the communities they affect.</li> <li>Alternative routes on the Marriott's Way and England Coast path should be as of high a standard as practicable, should be off-road where possible, and should be identified well in advance of closures so that the information can be advertised.</li> <li>Where phasing of works is necessary, the County Council would anticipate that reinstatement of PRoW is carried out between construction phases. This will be particularly necessary for the England Coast Path, the Marriott's Way, and other frequently used PRoW around settlements. Both the aforementioned Norfolk Trails have ecological value and designations and there may be opportunities for some holistic mitigation for both access and ecology during the potential 11 year maximum duration of construction phase.</li> <li>Consideration will need to be given to the public car park on the Marriott's Way at TG12801760 during construction.</li> </ul>	I	<p>Several PRoW and areas of land with informal public access will potentially be affected by the construction of the onshore elements of the Hornsea Three. Where a PRoW crosses the onshore cable corridor the contractor is to either: seek to maintain a pedestrian access route. This route will be maintained by fencing and the use of a gating, ensure that the users of the access route have a safe route to cross the onshore cable corridor; or · Provide a localised diversion. It is noted that a number of PRoW will be crossed using HDD to avoid direct impacts e.g. Marriot's Way.</p> <p>Signage will be erected to direct pedestrians when the construction traffic requires access over the designated pedestrian route, or of diversions if so implemented. Where an alternative route is reasonably available, with the agreement of the relevant PRoW Officer, a short term permissive diversion will be formed around the active construction area. Advanced warning notices will be provided to users identifying the diversion route. Following completion of construction activities, all public access within the working area will be reinstated with a standard commensurate to that existing prior to the commencement of construction works.</p> <p>Further information on impacts to PRoW and land use is provided in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 6: Land Use and Recreation.</p>
Norfolk County Council	<p>PRoW - Comments (cont.)</p> <p>5.17 Post-construction, the County Council would seek</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Opportunities for enhancements, such as surfacing and connectivity enhancements to the network where appropriate.</li> <li>That any trees or other vegetation that was removed during construction is replaced within a reasonable timeframe and that measures are put in place to ensure such reinstatement is delivered.</li> </ul> <p>Norfolk County Council Environment Team would be happy to work with DONG to find effective solutions to issues relating to the PRoW network</p>	I	<p>Several PRoW and areas of land with informal public access will potentially be affected by the construction of the onshore elements of the Hornsea Three. Where a PRoW crosses the onshore cable corridor the contractor is to either: seek to maintain a pedestrian access route. This route will be maintained by fencing and the use of a gating, ensure that the users of the access route have a safe route to cross the onshore cable corridor; or · Provide a localised diversion. It is noted that a number of PRoW will be crossed using HDD to avoid direct impacts e.g. Marriot's Way.</p> <p>Signage will be erected to direct pedestrians when the construction traffic requires access over the designated pedestrian route, or of diversions if so implemented. Where an alternative route is reasonably available, with the agreement of the relevant PRoW Officer, a short term permissive diversion will be formed around the active construction area. Advanced warning notices will be provided to users identifying the diversion route. Following completion of construction activities, all public access within the working area will be reinstated with a standard commensurate to that existing prior to the commencement of construction works.</p> <p>Further information on impacts to PRoW and land use is provided in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 6: Land Use and Recreation. It is furthermore noted that a Public Rights of Way Management Plan will be developed in consultation with Norfolk County Council.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>52</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Norfolk County Council	7.5.1.7 Major adverse effect on PROW's. This has been an issue particularly near the coast at Weybourne with the Dudgeon project. There is a need to maintain the coast path – temp bridges have been used previously.	I	<p>Several PROW and areas of land with informal public access will potentially be affected by the construction of the onshore elements of the Hornsea Three. Where a PROW crosses the onshore cable corridor the contractor is to either: seek to maintain a pedestrian access route. This route will be maintained by fencing and the use of a gating, ensure that the users of the access route have a safe route to cross the onshore cable corridor; or · Provide a localised diversion.</p> <p>Signage will be erected to direct pedestrians when the construction traffic requires access over the designated pedestrian route, or of diversions if so implemented. Where an alternative route is reasonably available, with the agreement of the relevant PROW Officer, a short term permissive diversion will be formed around the active construction area. Advanced warning notices will be provided to users identifying the diversion route. Following completion of construction activities, all public access within the working area will be reinstated with a standard commensurate to that existing prior to the commencement of construction works.</p> <p>Further information on impacts to PROW and land use is provided in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 6: Land Use and Recreation.</p>
Norfolk County Council	7.7.1.8 As 7.5.1.7 - Impact on PROW's particularly at the coast.	I	<p>Several PROW and areas of land with informal public access will potentially be affected by the construction of the onshore elements of the Hornsea Three. Where a PROW crosses the onshore cable corridor the contractor is to either: seek to maintain a pedestrian access route. This route will be maintained by fencing and the use of a gating, ensure that the users of the access route have a safe route to cross the onshore cable corridor; or · Provide a localised diversion.</p> <p>Signage will be erected to direct pedestrians when the construction traffic requires access over the designated pedestrian route, or of diversions if so implemented. Where an alternative route is reasonably available, with the agreement of the relevant PROW Officer, a short term permissive diversion will be formed around the active construction area. Advanced warning notices will be provided to users identifying the diversion route. Following completion of construction activities, all public access within the working area will be reinstated with a standard commensurate to that existing prior to the commencement of construction works.</p> <p>Further information on impacts to PROW and land use is provided in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 6: Land Use and Recreation.</p>
Ministry of Defence	In relation to the onshore element of the development scheme, the plans provided indicate that the extent of the PIER assessment area and proposed re-route for cable installation on the north Norfolk coast are in proximity to a MOD transmitter site at RAF Weybourne. This technical facility is encompassed with a statutory safeguarding consultation zone in which the MOD must be consulted upon all forms of development or land use change. The safeguarding criteria applicable to the type of transmitter operated at this site would impose constraints of the installation of metallic cabling above or below ground or creation of earth works in proximity to the transmitter. In addition constraints would be applicable on the siting and design of new structures within the designated safeguarding zone. The extent and relevance of this statutory safeguarding zone should be taken into account in the evaluation of the cable and infrastructure development scheme being prepared. The information provided at this stage indicates that cable and associated infrastructure development within the northern part of the re-route corridor and western most part of PIER boundary identified may not be compatible with MOD statutory safeguarding requirements.	I	Response noted, Hornsea Three will consult with the MoD as part of the detailed design development post submission.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>52</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Holt County Division	This area is designated within the boundaries of the AONB and many residents and visitors are concerned about the impacts not only to the environment (commented below); but also upon their ability to access rights of way and footpaths during the construction. Therefore, inhibiting their ability to enjoy the natural surroundings of their homes. High Kelling Parish Council have also referenced this concern in their submission. Weybourne residents are obviously anxious about access to the beach and coastal path.	I	<p>An assessment of impacts on the AONB is presented in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources. To inform this process, Hornsea Three has consulted with the Norfolk Coast Partnership, as well as local authorities, in regard to the identification of suitable viewpoints within the AONB.</p> <p>Where the onshore cable corridor crossed public rights of way, Hornsea Three has sought to avoid impacts through the use of HDD technology. Where this has not been possible and thus open cut, or HDD with a haul road over, is proposed, the routes will be temporarily diverted along existing tracks, for a maximum of one month per cable. In respect to beach access, a Beach Access Management Plan will be developed in consultation with, and agreed with Norfolk County Council. This Plan would include management measures to be put in place on the beach at either side of the construction working areas to guide walkers along the diverted coastal path, and would also set out the measures to be followed for the reinstatement of the coastal path following the completion of construction works. Information on these temporary changes to the route of the coastal path would be posted in the beach side car park to the north of Weybourne, together with general information of the construction activities</p> <p>Following the completion of the construction works all areas of access land, recreational resources, PRowS and other linear routes affected by the onshore works would be re-instated to their current condition and/or along their current alignments. There would be no physical effects on these resources arising from the operation or maintenance of Hornsea Three. The measures to be taken to ensure the continued use of all linear recreational resources during the construction phase of the project have been discussed with Norfolk County Council and are set out in the Outline CoCP. This dialogue will continue during the detailed design process.</p> <p>The assessment of impacts on individual public rights of way (where appropriate) are set out in Environmental Statement, volume 3, chapter 6: Land Use and Recreation.</p>
Holt County Division	Impact on local communities Residents of Weybourne are concerned that this stretch of coastline appears to be becoming the landfall of choice for new offshore windfarm developments. How many other parishes along the east coast have had as many developments come through their boundaries?	N	<p>The process for identifying the most suitable landfall location is set out in the Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives.</p> <p>It is however noted that, since the PEIR, a refined landfall location has been identified (western re-route around Kelling) and the area identified for landfall works has reduced. This was informed by a number of factors including community feedback in the area of Kelling and Weybourne, avoidance of the Kelling Heath SSSI/CWS and Holiday Park as well as engineering/technical considerations.</p>
Holt County Division	The size of the project and current government processes, dictate construction is likely to take place in phases over several years, thus potentially causing multiple periods of disruption, which is of great concern to residents. It is essential householders receive binding commitments that the total construction period will be kept to an absolute minimum. (I believe this also endorses the views of High Kelling Parish Council).	I	During the design refinement Hornsea Three has sought to minimise the duration of any disruption, and has reduced the total duration of the construction phase onshore to eight years. A breakdown of the maximum construction durations is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Project Description.
Marine Management Organisation	Farming: The farm land is used to grow a full arable rotation including cereals, legumes, oilseeds and high value root crops, such as parsnips, potatoes and carrots. Disturbance to soil structure will compromise productive capacity and versatility of crop	I	Noted.



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>52</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
River Glaven Conservation Group (RGCG) and CPRE Norfolk	<p><b>OVERVIEW ON KEY ISSUES</b></p> <p>The RGCG and CPRE Norfolk made separate submissions to the Phase 1B consultation, and also verbal input prior to that at the 'roadshow' events. The RGCG did so from the remit of enhancing and protecting the Glaven and its catchment, and CPRE from a wider remit with landscape being the main issue. However we have felt for some time that wildlife and landscape go hand-in-hand. This is particularly so in the context of a river valley and the catchment area, which have the key role in a wider ecological network, and so now make a joint submission. The reason is well expressed by Brendan Joyce, Chief Executive of the Norfolk Wildlife Trust when he said in the preface to the CPRE Norfolk policy document A Vision for Norfolk (July 2017):</p> <p>The county is famous for its wildlife and habitats and extremely rich in its biodiversity, but so much of it is rare and endangered and confined to isolated, fragmented nature reserves. It is not enough to protect what is there from growing threats. Its future survival depends on us taking a more landscape approach to its conservation and this means creating more space for wildlife and repairing broken ecological networks.</p> <p>It is only in recent years that we have realised the potential of the restoration of farmland ponds in repairing a key part of this network, particularly those on a watershed between the two river systems and this work was initiated on the Glaven-Bure catchment 'boundary'. Such an area, particularly if sited on a watershed, can be the weakest link in ecological network. Our experience shows us that rivers and aquatic habitats can, with the appropriate restoration techniques, regain their wildlife in a relatively short space of time. We attach as evidence on this point the RGCG Strategy 2016-20 to illustrate this; also what we now see as the greatest threats, arable run-off and invasive species. A recent RGCG Newsletter Autumn 2016 contains an article on the ponds work, and Spring 2017 on the Dong project at it was at that time.</p> <p>However our most important evidence is a paper written by RGCG members on the Upper Glaven Ecological Network (August 2017) (ATTACHED IN EMAIL) and is the result of many years of experience. However this remains an ongoing exercise, and we expect to contribute further on this and other topics throughout the whole Project Three timescale.</p>	I	<p>Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive ecological receptors.</p> <p>Potential impacts which remain on ecological receptors are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation. This assessment considers the interactions between the project and ecological receptors, and is informed by the relationship between hydrogeology, hydrology and water-dependant habitats which are described in the Hydrological Characterisation Note which forms Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 2.4. This approach was discussed and agreed with the onshore ecology expert working group which comprised Natural England, the Wildlife Trust, Environment Agency and the RSPB amongst others.</p> <p>Potential impacts on landscape and visual resources are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources.</p> <p>The interaction between landscape and ecological receptors is acknowledged and addressed through cross-referencing between the outline landscape management plan and the outline ecological management plan (both of which form part of the DCO application). For example, restoration of hedgerows, currently in poor condition, provides an opportunity to achieve long term benefits for the biodiversity associated with this habitat type as well as gap up hedgerows providing landscape and visual mitigation.</p>
River Glaven Conservation Group (RGCG) and CPRE Norfolk	<p><b>COMMENTS ON ECOLOGY AND NATURE CONSERVATION:</b></p> <p>3.2.15: We note that the PEIR assessment is based on the wider 200 m wide onshore cable corridor search area which includes the proposed locations for the onshore HVAV booster station and onshore HVDC converter/HVAC substation. The final 80 m wide cable corridor construction area (60 m wide permanent cable corridor) will continue to be refined before being confirmed in the final DCO. It is anticipated that a number of potential impacts identified through this assignment will be mitigated or removed, through the refinement of the onshore cable corridor, particularly where the onshore cable corridor search area currently crosses designated sites. We comment: This 'wriggle room' might be particularly useful for avoiding impact on the restored (and those yet to be restored) farmland ponds in the upper Glaven, proving to be important as a key link in the ecological network.</p> <p>3.3.1.4, Table 3.1, Field surveys undertaken and associated survey area: We note in this list in particular the comments on hedgerows, white-clawed crayfish, great crested newt, bats, otters and water voles. All present in the upper Glaven, see attached Ecological Network document.</p> <p>3.9.1.3 and Table 3.11; and 3.9.2.2 and Table 3.12: We note the impact assessment criteria and definition of terms relating to the sensitivity of the receptor, and the magnitude of the impact. We comment: we agree with the hierarchy order of importance and sensitivity of an international designation (very high), national designation (high), county or regional level (medium), district level (low) and local level (negligible). We comment: BUT this is part of the compartmentalisation issue as all on a wider basis might be part of an ecological corridor, have in that sense a greater importance than when done in isolation. In the refinement and mitigation stage of the cabling route this needs to be taken into account.</p> <p>3.10.1.3 and Table 3.14: We welcome the design measures adopted in selecting a cabling route. In particular as a Valued Ecological Receptor (VER) features such as ponds and Local Wildlife Sites</p>	Y	<p>Impacts on protected species as well as associated habitats are included within Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation. This assessment considers the interactions between the project and ecological receptors, and is informed by the relationship between hydrogeology, hydrology and water-dependant habitats which are described in the Hydrological Characterisation Note which forms Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 2.4. This approach was discussed and agreed with the onshore ecology expert working group which comprised Natural England, the Wildlife Trust, Environment Agency and the RSPB amongst others.</p> <p>Hornsea Three has committed to use HDD at all EA main rivers and a majority of tributaries. A full list of crossing, and the methodologies proposed are provided in Environmental Statement volume 4, annex 3.5: Crossing Schedule (onshore).</p> <p>It is noted that since the PEIR, refined route at landfall has been identified (western re-route around Kelling) and the area identified for landfall works has reduced. This was informed by a number of factors including community feedback in the area of Kelling and Weybourne, avoidance of the Kelling Heath SSSI/CWS and Holiday Park as well as engineering/technical considerations.</p> <p>Appropriate mitigation measures for visual disturbance are outlined in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources. This includes, for example, the restoration of habitats (including hedgerows) which cannot be avoided and landscape planting around the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation to minimise impacts. Details</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>52</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>(LWSs); these have been avoided where possible; likewise standard trees. Also as a pre-construction measure the surveys of ponds; where a trenchless installation across a water course will be undertaken where water voles, Desmoulin's whorl snail, white-clawed crayfish and/or otters have been recorded. On construction methods that the landfall cable installation may be by trenchless method beneath Weybourne Cliffs SSSI, we assume by HDD.</p> <p>Table 3.14 continued to page 38: There are two lists where measures to minimise the potential for pollution incidents, and options for trenchless installation. The first lists places where they are identified, seven in all and include the rivers Wensum, Tud and Bure, and associated water bodies. The second list of four locations are being considered and may be identified following the completion of species survey, and include Kelling Heath SSSI and River Glaven head waters and tributaries. We urge that these should be 'promoted'. The first because heather is difficult if not impossible to regenerate following an open cut and backfill; it forms part of an area where much effort has been taken to restore heathland also at nearby at Salthouse, Wiveton Downs and Holt Lowes. There is an impact on Landscape as well as species, and in addition to being much walked they are part of the North Norfolk tourism 'offer'. On the Glaven headwaters, and at the risk of repeating a mantra, we would argue for the central role in the ecological corridor, and that the numbers of protected species would out-compete the other three rivers, albeit not well recognised, 3.11.1.3/3.11.1.4: Weybourne Cliffs are mentioned again, and notes that they are designated SSSI for its geological features, and about 1.8 ha of the land falls within the Ecology and nature conservation area. We comment: this is helpful reminder of in depth on one topic but segregation of others, including landscape and tourism interests. On a specific point, the sand martin colony does need checking ahead of construction. After many years of being located under the Coastguard Cottage, some 3-4 years ago they moved to about 1 km to the east.</p> <p>3.11.1.5: Kelling Heath returns with a statement that 5.2 ha of heathland habitat falls inside the onshore cable corridor, which is 5.2% of the SSSI. Then we have: Although restoration would be put in place, restoration of heathland is not guaranteed and can take many years to succeed. In addition the maximum design scenario would involve three separate trenching operations over an 11 year period, and it is considered that heathland restoration would not succeed except potentially in the very long term given the repeat disturbance that would result in this scenario. We comment, and make some general points here: Much effort has been put in to extend precious habitat, such as heathland, and we should not be reversing this by knocking lumps off in some places. Further the EIA 'system' rightly takes a view as a safety net that the impact of a maximum dimension should be considered as a scenario. However an 11 year vacuum in many situations would be ruinous, not least by some pernicious weeds (as defined by Defra) such as thistles; but also invasive plant species such as Himalayan Balsam, which on the Glaven the RGCG spend much time seeking to eradicate. There is also a major issue on many and various individual sites of sediment run-off. Should you wish to visit and area already badly affected by Himalayan Balsam, then visit the Wensum or Bure; the same applies there for arable run-off, and near extinction of the white-clawed crayfish. The EU Habitat Regulations state that a development for a river such as the SAC Wensum should not make matters worse than the already are. The same principle should apply to our other Chalk Rivers. The Water Directive Framework seeks to improve the ecology status of all our rivers, those affected by the development are described as moderate condition, except the Bure classified as poor.</p> <p>There are other paragraphs that we have 'marked up', but to comment would become repetitive and unnecessary as regards ecology and nature conservation; and some have appeared in the N-TS section. For this and the Landscape Chapter we will respond again at the next consultation step, and in addition likely to submit further information on the Glaven for species and habitats in the context of the ecological network.</p>		<p>of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.</p>
Swannington with Alderford and Little Witchingham Parish Council	<p>Cables and pipes: although Dong should be able to easily identify public utility services, being a rural area there is a likelihood that there are privately-owned pipes near the construction area. How will Dong identify these so as to prevent rupturing these?</p>	N	<p>Hornsea Three review public records to identify existing utilities which may be affect by the project. In respect to those not on the public record, a more detailed utility search would be undertaken during the detailed phase to identify any local supplies.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>52</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Kelling Parish Council (Barbara Young)	<p><b>PEIR</b> - Arable fields have not yet recovered from the last cables buried a few years ago. The thought of spreading the work over 3 phases, and scarring the fields again and again, is horrifying.</p>	Y	<p>During the design refinement Hornsea Three has sought to minimise the duration of any disruption, and has reduced the total number of phases from three to two, and reduced the duration of the construction phase onshore from eleven to eight years. Within this, the maximum duration for construction of the onshore cable corridor is approximately 2.5 years, this therefore means that the maximum duration over which construction could occur would be 5.5 years incorporating two phases (assuming a three-year gap between the two phases). The work associated with each phase is expected to progress along the Hornsea Three onshore cable corridor with a typical active construction works duration of three months at any particular location.</p> <p>Prior to construction commencing a Schedule of Condition of the land will be taken and following the completion of the construction works all land directly impacted by the onshore works would be re-instated to their current condition .</p>
Kelling Parish Council (Barbara Young)	<p><b>Further Comments</b> - Green energy is important in protecting our planet. We should, likewise, try to protect areas of outstanding natural beauty. Our rural economy relies heavily on tourism and farming - these industries need respect and protection</p>	I	<p>An assessment of impacts on the AONB is presented in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources. To inform this process, Hornsea Three has consulted with the Norfolk Coast Partnership, as well as local authorities, in regard to the identification of suitable viewpoints within the AONB.</p> <p>The potential for impacts to interact and impact tourism is addressed in Environmental Statement Volume 3, Chapter 10: Socio-economics and concludes that there would be no significant effects on tourism as a result of Hornsea Three.</p> <p>In respect to agricultural use, during the construction phase, there would be a permanent loss of land predominantly associated with the onshore HVAC booster station and onshore HVDC converter/HVAC substation, together with the temporary loss of the "best and most versatile" agricultural land along the Hornsea Three onshore cable corridor. Following the completion of the construction phase or phases and the restoration of temporarily affected land to its former agricultural use, as far as possible. An assessment of the effects of this on both agricultural land classification as well as farming operations are presented in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 6: Land Use and Recreation.</p>
<b>Section 42: Local Authorities (prescribed under section 43 of the Act)</b>			
Norfolk County Council	<p>Public Rights of Way 5.14 The County Council have checked the Public Rights of Way and linear routes shown on Figure 6.2 and have identified two additional paths that may be affected by the cable route and that do not appear to be included in the PEIR:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Salle FP9 may intersect the search area at TH10702428; and</li> <li>• Keswick FP4 is within the search area, joining Keswick BR4 and East Carleton FP1.</li> </ul> <p>5.15 In terms of PRoW, the network that will be affected comprise:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Norfolk Trails: the England Coast Path and the Marriott's Way.</li> </ul> <p>Promoted circular walks that use PRoW and which will potentially be affected: "Explore More Coast" Weybourne Circular; Cromer and Sheringham Health Walk No.6 – Weybourne to Sheringham via Norfolk Coast Path; and Aylsham Health Walk No.10 – Reepham via Salle Church;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tas Valley Way; and</li> <li>• The remaining PRoW network.</li> </ul>	I	<p>Several PRoW and areas of land with informal public access will potentially be affected by the construction of the onshore elements of the Hornsea Three. Where a PRoW crosses the onshore cable corridor the contractor is to either: seek to maintain a pedestrian access route. This route will be maintained by fencing and the use of a gating, ensure that the users of the access route have a safe route to cross the onshore cable corridor; or · Provide a localised diversion.</p> <p>Signage will be erected to direct pedestrians when the construction traffic requires access over the designated pedestrian route, or of diversions if so implemented. Where an alternative route is reasonably available, with the agreement of the relevant PRoW Officer, a short term permissive diversion will be formed around the active construction area. Advanced warning notices will be provided to users identifying the diversion route. Following completion of construction activities, all public access within the working area will be reinstated with a standard commensurate to that existing prior to the commencement of construction works.</p> <p>Further information on impacts to PRoW and land use is provided in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 6: Land Use and Recreation.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>52</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Norfolk County Council	<p>PRoW - Comments</p> <p>5.16 Although routes of regional and national importance are noted above, the wider un-promoted PRoW network serve a number of settlements within or near to the current search areas. Un-promoted PRoW should not be considered of lesser importance; settlements such as Reepham will see disruption to its PRoW network not only from this development but cumulatively through the Vattenfall Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project, which it is understood could co-inside with this project. The closure and diversion of routes near to populated areas such as this need to be considered in the wider context of both the type of use they receive and the potential implications of other projects.</p>	I	<p>Several PRoW and areas of land with informal public access will potentially be affected by the construction of the onshore elements of the Hornsea Three. Where a PRoW crosses the onshore cable corridor the contractor is to either: seek to maintain a pedestrian access route. This route will be maintained by fencing and the use of a gating, ensure that the users of the access route have a safe route to cross the onshore cable corridor; or · Provide a localised diversion. It is noted that a number of PRoW will be crossed using HDD to avoid direct impacts e.g. Marriot's Way.</p> <p>Signage will be erected to direct pedestrians when the construction traffic requires access over the designated pedestrian route, or of diversions if so implemented. Where an alternative route is reasonably available, with the agreement of the relevant PRoW Officer, a short term permissive diversion will be formed around the active construction area. Advanced warning notices will be provided to users identifying the diversion route. Following completion of construction activities, all public access within the working area will be reinstated with a standard commensurate to that existing prior to the commencement of construction works.</p> <p>Further information on impacts to PRoW and land use is provided in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 6: Land Use and Recreation.</p>
Norfolk County Council	<p>PRoW - Comments (cont.)</p> <p>5.17 In terms of mitigation, the County Council would therefore expect that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For all PRoW affected, Temporary Traffic Regulation orders should be put in place to cover the periods of closure, with reopening as soon as possible i.e. the very minimum periods of closure. Signed and maintained alternative routes for the closures should be provided where appropriate. These alternative routes should consider cumulative effects and where possible be of equal value to the communities they affect.</li> <li>• Alternative routes on the Marriott's Way and England Coast path should be as of high a standard as practicable, should be off-road where possible, and should be identified well in advance of closures so that the information can be advertised.</li> <li>• Where phasing of works is necessary, the County Council would anticipate that reinstatement of PRoW is carried out between construction phases. This will be particularly necessary for the England Coast Path, the Marriott's Way, and other frequently used PRoW around settlements. Both the aforementioned Norfolk Trails have ecological value and designations and there may be opportunities for some holistic mitigation for both access and ecology during the potential 11 year maximum duration of construction phase.</li> <li>• Consideration will need to be given to the public car park on the Marriott's Way at TG12801760 during construction.</li> </ul>	I	<p>Several PRoW and areas of land with informal public access will potentially be affected by the construction of the onshore elements of the Hornsea Three. Where a PRoW crosses the onshore cable corridor the contractor is to either: seek to maintain a pedestrian access route. This route will be maintained by fencing and the use of a gating, ensure that the users of the access route have a safe route to cross the onshore cable corridor; or · Provide a localised diversion. It is noted that a number of PRoW will be crossed using HDD to avoid direct impacts e.g. Marriot's Way.</p> <p>Signage will be erected to direct pedestrians when the construction traffic requires access over the designated pedestrian route, or of diversions if so implemented. Where an alternative route is reasonably available, with the agreement of the relevant PRoW Officer, a short term permissive diversion will be formed around the active construction area. Advanced warning notices will be provided to users identifying the diversion route. Following completion of construction activities, all public access within the working area will be reinstated with a standard commensurate to that existing prior to the commencement of construction works.</p> <p>Further information on impacts to PRoW and land use is provided in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 6: Land Use and Recreation.</p>



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>52</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Norfolk County Council	<p>PRoW - Comments (cont.)</p> <p>5.17 Post-construction, the County Council would seek</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opportunities for enhancements, such as surfacing and connectivity enhancements to the network where appropriate.</li> <li>• That any trees or other vegetation that was removed during construction is replaced within a reasonable timeframe and that measures are put in place to ensure such reinstatement is delivered.</li> </ul> <p>Norfolk County Council Environment Team would be happy to work with DONG to find effective solutions to issues relating to the PRoW network</p>	I	<p>Several PRoW and areas of land with informal public access will potentially be affected by the construction of the onshore elements of the Hornsea Three. Where a PRoW crosses the onshore cable corridor the contractor is to either: seek to maintain a pedestrian access route. This route will be maintained by fencing and the use of a gating, ensure that the users of the access route have a safe route to cross the onshore cable corridor; or · Provide a localised diversion. It is noted that a number of PRoW will be crossed using HDD to avoid direct impacts e.g. Marriot's Way.</p> <p>Signage will be erected to direct pedestrians when the construction traffic requires access over the designated pedestrian route, or of diversions if so implemented. Where an alternative route is reasonably available, with the agreement of the relevant PRoW Officer, a short term permissive diversion will be formed around the active construction area. Advanced warning notices will be provided to users identifying the diversion route. Following completion of construction activities, all public access within the working area will be reinstated with a standard commensurate to that existing prior to the commencement of construction works.</p> <p>Further information on impacts to PRoW and land use is provided in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 6: Land Use and Recreation. It is furthermore noted that a Public Rights of Way Management Plan will be developed in consultation with Norfolk County Council.</p>
Norfolk County Council	<p>7.5.1.7 Major adverse effect on PROW's. This has been an issue particularly near the coast at Weybourne with the Dudgeon project. There is a need to maintain the coast path – temp bridges have been used previously.</p>	I	<p>Several PRoW and areas of land with informal public access will potentially be affected by the construction of the onshore elements of the Hornsea Three. Where a PRoW crosses the onshore cable corridor the contractor is to either: seek to maintain a pedestrian access route. This route will be maintained by fencing and the use of a gating, ensure that the users of the access route have a safe route to cross the onshore cable corridor; or · Provide a localised diversion.</p> <p>Signage will be erected to direct pedestrians when the construction traffic requires access over the designated pedestrian route, or of diversions if so implemented. Where an alternative route is reasonably available, with the agreement of the relevant PRoW Officer, a short term permissive diversion will be formed around the active construction area. Advanced warning notices will be provided to users identifying the diversion route. Following completion of construction activities, all public access within the working area will be reinstated with a standard commensurate to that existing prior to the commencement of construction works.</p> <p>Further information on impacts to PRoW and land use is provided in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 6: Land Use and Recreation.</p>



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>52</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Norfolk County Council	7.7.1.8 As 7.5.1.7 - Impact on PROW's particularly at the coast.	I	<p>Several PROW and areas of land with informal public access will potentially be affected by the construction of the onshore elements of the Hornsea Three. Where a PROW crosses the onshore cable corridor the contractor is to either: seek to maintain a pedestrian access route. This route will be maintained by fencing and the use of a gating, ensure that the users of the access route have a safe route to cross the onshore cable corridor; or · Provide a localised diversion.</p> <p>Signage will be erected to direct pedestrians when the construction traffic requires access over the designated pedestrian route, or of diversions if so implemented. Where an alternative route is reasonably available, with the agreement of the relevant PROW Officer, a short term permissive diversion will be formed around the active construction area. Advanced warning notices will be provided to users identifying the diversion route. Following completion of construction activities, all public access within the working area will be reinstated with a standard commensurate to that existing prior to the commencement of construction works.</p> <p>Further information on impacts to PROW and land use is provided in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 6: Land Use and Recreation.</p>
<b>Section 42: Persons with an interest in the land (prescribed under section 44 of the Act)</b>			
Dr George Carman	Permanent restrictions on future land use	N/A	<p>Potential impacts on agricultural land and land within farm holdings are considered in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 6: Land Use and Recreation (section 6.11.1). During the construction phase, top soil and sub soils will be stripped and stored in accordance with best practice and the land within the Hornsea Three onshore cable corridor will be restored to its original condition, therefore reducing the potential for sterilisation.</p> <p>Thus, although it would not be possible to place any type of construction (i.e. buildings) or trees above the cables without prior consent to avoid damage, it will be possible to continue farming crops or grazing animals above the cables once construction has completed.</p>
Stephen and Sandra Carman	Opinion of Overall Proposal OPPOSED Opposed on grounds of incomplete information and potential impact of operations of fragile North Norfolk rural landscape and direct impact on family amenity (residential (depreciation in property value), commercial, pasture, equine, arable, sporting amenity, camping and further 'unforeseen' uses in the future).	N/A	Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including landscapes, sensitive ecological receptors and land uses. Impacts which have been identified are assessed within the relevant topic chapter of the Environmental Statement (volume 3).
Christopher Bond, Bidwells, via Cozens-Hardy LLP (general comments)	Fencing Appropriate fencing of the working width will need to be agreed	I	Fencing will be discussed at pre-construction stage as it is too early to determine operational requirements at this time.
Christopher Bond, Bidwells, via Cozens-Hardy LLP (general comments)	Development uplift The proposed route crosses land where planning permission is likely to be forthcoming for future development. Consideration must be given as to how the grantors will be compensated (to reflect the potential uplift in value that they are not able to realise) if, as a result of the presence of the cables and the restrictions on land use imposed, the said planning permission is not granted or cannot be implemented.	I	Discussions regarding potential development will be held on an individual landowner basis, where relevant. Uplift may also be discussed in negotiations for option agreements.
Christopher Bond, Bidwells, via Cozens-Hardy LLP (general comments)	Sporting The working width will, in some cases, bisect areas specifically used for shooting, so measures will need to be in place both to minimise the effect of the works on any shooting and, also, to allow such shooting to continue.	I	Noted - any sporting rights are to be discussed pre-commencement of construction work and impact mitigated where possible.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>52</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Christopher Bond, Bidwells, via Cozens-Hardy LLP (general comments)	Drainage & Irrigation Existing drainage and irrigation schemes must be taken into account at an early stage in the project	I	Noted - provision of land drainage plans is requested to feed into cable microrouting and for pre & post drainage considerations.
Christopher Bond, Bidwells, on behalf of Nicholas Evans-Lombe	Nicholas Evans-Lombe — Land at Little Melton Little Melton has been identified in the emerging Greater Norwich Development Partnership options for growth for levels of growth in all options. The original route for this length of the cables passes through land submitted to the Greater Norwich Local Plan — Call for Sites Consultation Response in July 2016, being land to the west of Little Melton considered as a sustainable location for future growth, with no insurmountable constraints to development and based on an appropriate density and allowing for open space requirements, in total the site can provide the delivery of up to 350 dwellings. Please see attached Bidwells plan marked 'B' showing the land in question. The suggested route also passes close to (south) of the Church of St Mary All Saints on Mill Lane, this being a Grade II listed church, and works in close proximity to this structure would cause unnecessary disruption and possible damage. The suggested route passes close to (north) of The Grange and adjoining properties and works in close proximity to these structures would cause unnecessary disruption and possible damage.	N/A	Client details and allocation of land in Little Melton for development plan and in call for sites noted.
Christopher Bond, Bidwells, via Cozens-Hardy LLP (general comments)	Alternating Current (AC) v Direct Current (DC) Have the merits of AC v DC been fully explored and evaluated, as we understand that, if a DC scheme was adopted, the easement (land) requirements would be considerably reduced as preferred by our clients.	N	Hornsea Three will continue to apply for a DCO on both AC & DC options. The merits of AC vs. DC are still being investigated and a choice on technology will not be made until post DCO award.
Christopher Bond, Bidwells, on behalf of Nicholas Evans-Lombe	We refer to the attached map no 8, marked 'C', on which the alternative suggested route is coloured purple/hatched black. This alternative route should remain within Nicholas Evans-Lombe's land and not encroach onto land owned by [REDACTED] at the east end. We believe this route will reduce the disturbance to the village of Little Melton while avoiding land which could be used for future development in the village. The alternative route proposed passes to the west of the Church Farm Barns where it should be directionally drilled to prevent disturbance to the barn complex. It will then pass to the south of Great Melton Road, although still cross land submitted to the Greater Norwich Local Plan so the route will need to be located so as to minimise the impact on this parcel. It should be noted the following pipes cross Nicholas Evans-Lombe's land affected by the project and will need to be taken into consideration. A disused Ministry of Defence oil pipeline. A water main.	Y	The required working width in order to install the cables is wider than the field in the ownership of Nicholas Evans-Lombe in this location, as such [REDACTED] land is likely to be impacted. The information on pipelines was appreciated, and has been discussed further in subsequent correspondence to inform the route.  A further alternative route subsequently investigated and adopted avoids a route adjacent to Church Farm Barns.
Christopher Bond, Bidwells, on behalf of David & Carl Baker	David and Carl Baker — Land at Little Melton The land south of Little Melton Road is included in a Consortium Agreement with other land in Hethersett and is being promoted for development in the review of the Greater Norwich Local Plan. The same area of land is also being separately promoted as food related employment development. See site B on the attached Bidwells plan Hethersett/Little Melton features as a location for growth in all proposed Greater Norwich Development Partnership (GNDP) growth options and it is very likely that additional growth will be allocated to the village(s). We, therefore, request this route is diverted to, ideally, avoid this parcel or, if not possible, to minimise the impact on this proposed development which our clients would wish to discuss at an early opportunity. We also believe the land to the north of Little Melton Road has development potential and, therefore, request the cable route is located so as to minimise the impact on this parcel. It is possible that a gas main crosses [REDACTED] land although this cannot be confirmed.	N	Details of consortium agreement and potential for development of land noted.  Orsted are unable to avoid this area around Little Melton due to the cable needing to pass between the settlements of Little Melton and Hethersett. Developing a route around the north of Little Melton was discounted as it is built up all the way along School Land/Green Lane up to the junction with B1108 / A47. Developing a route further south was discounted to avoid the large new Taylor Wimpey housing development north of Hethersett, Little Melton Food Park and there being narrow pinch points between woodland on the boundary of Little Melton Food Park and the Taylor Wimpey development (40 metres) and to avoid the route running broadly in line with the National Grid high voltage pylons.  The pipeline information is appreciated and has been considered in the route design.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>52</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Christopher Bond, Bidwells, on behalf of Martin Kemp	<p>5. Martin P Kemp / M P Kemp Limited</p> <p>The land through which the cable route is proposed to pass has been promoted for development in previous consultations as part of the South Norfolk Local Development Framework process. Hetherset/Little Melton features as a location for growth in all proposed GNDP growth options, and it is very likely additional growth will be allocated to the village(s).</p> <p>In order to minimise the effect of the cable route on any proposed development, we request that the cables run to the west of the proposed cable corridor, shown on the attached map no. 9 marked plan 'E' hatched as it crosses Mr Kemp's land.</p> <p>At both the north and south ends of the proposed cable route on Mr Kemp's land, the route will need to cross established tree belts (ie adjacent to Colney Lane and Norwich Road) which were established under the Farm Woodland Scheme from 1995/6 to 2010/11 and, therefore, need to be maintained and not disrupted or felled. These woods form part of an integrated planting scheme surrounding Mr Kemp's property and, therefore, must not be breached. We, therefore, request the cables be directionally drilled or thrust bored under these woods in conjunction with the adjacent public roads.</p> <p>It should be noted the following pipes cross Mr Kemp's land affected by the project and will need to be taken into consideration.</p> <p>A disused Ministry of Defence oil pipeline.</p> <p>A gas main.</p>	Y	<p>Details regarding potential development of land noted. The final 80 m wide route has been located as far west as possible within the original 200 m consultation area.</p> <p>Tree belts are proposed to be crossed by HDD in conjunction with the adjacent road to avoid impact.</p> <p>The pipeline information is appreciated and has been considered in the route design.</p>
Christopher Bond, Bidwells, on behalf of C M Watt Residual Trust & The Mackintosh Trust	<p>6. C M Watt Residual Trust / The Mackintosh Trust — Land at Hetherset</p> <p>The land between the Norwich Road and the All road affected by the project is included in a Consortium Agreement with other land in Hetherset and is being promoted for development in the review of the Greater Norwich Local Plan.</p> <p>Hetherset/Little Melton features as a location for growth in all proposed GNDP growth options and it is very likely that additional growth will be allocated to the village(s).</p> <p>We request the cable route runs as shown on the attached Bidwells plan 'F' as coloured orange and hatched black, specifically at the northern end adjacent to the "Heather House" boundary, then adjacent to The Glade, but not within it, and then as shown across Hetherset Racecourse .</p> <p>The area of woodland crosshatched on the plan should be directionally drilled both to avoid damage to the trees and, also, because the deep cutting within the woodland will make open cut installation of the cables extremely difficult.</p> <p>The area of woodland immediately to the north of the All should be crossed by directional drilling or thrust boring in conjunction with the All road crossing to avoid disturbance to an established tree belt screen.</p> <p>It should be noted that the following pipes cross land affected by the project and will need to be taken into consideration.</p> <p>A disused Ministry of Defence Oil pipeline.</p> <p>A gas main.</p>	Y	<p>Details of consortium agreement and potential for development of land noted.</p> <p>The suggested route has been broadly followed, with the exception of a wider set-off from the gas pipeline.</p> <p>The areas of woodland are proposed to be crossed by HDD to avoid impact.</p> <p>The pipeline information is appreciated and has been considered in the route design.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>52</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Christopher Bond, Bidwells, on behalf of H G Back Settlement	Trustees of the H G Back Settlement — Land at Hetherset The land crossed by the proposed cable route is included in a Consortium Agreement with other land in Hetherset and is being promoted for development in the review of the Greater Norwich Local Plan. Hetherset/Little Melton features as a location for growth in all proposed GNDP growth options and it is very likely that additional growth will be allocated to the village(s). With reference to the attached Bidwells plan 'G' showing the cable route as it crosses the Settlement Land coloured orange and hatched black, we request this route runs adjacent to The Glade but not within it to minimise any loss of land between the working width and the field boundary to the east. The area of woodland crosshatched on the plan should be directionally drilled both to avoid damage to the trees and, also, because the deep cutting within the woodland will make open cut installation of the cables extremely difficult. It should be noted the following pipes cross the Settlements land affected by this project and will need to be taken into consideration. A disused Ministry of Defence oil pipeline. A gas main. An Anglian Water sewer.	Y	Details of consortium agreement and potential for development of land noted.  The suggested route has been broadly followed, with the exception of a wider set-off from the gas pipeline.  The areas of woodland are proposed to be crossed by HDD to avoid impact.  The pipeline information is appreciated and has been considered in the route design.
Christopher Bond, Bidwells, via Cozens-Hardy LLP (general comments)	Easement widths (onshore cable corridor) We believe the suggested easement width of 60m to be excessive when compared with the current Vattenfall proposal for the Norfolk Vanguard & Norfolk Boreas cable routes. We compare the two projects as follows:- Proposed generation Suggested Easement width Hornsea Project Three 2.4 gigawatts 60 metres Vattenfall 3.6 gigawatts 40 metres	N	The two projects are completely separate and being developed by separate companies. Hornsea Three has completed sufficient investigations into the electrical and protective requirements for the cables, resulting in a 60 m easement being the area considered suitable and appropriate on a worst-case scenario basis.
Christopher Bond, Bidwells, via Cozens-Hardy LLP (general comments)	Access Clear defined access routes to the working width will need to be agreed to prevent unnecessary intrusion onto our clients land.	Y	Specific access routes have been defined on the updated plans. Where these have not be defined, access will look to be taken directly off public highway onto the adjacent working corridor.
Christopher Bond, Bidwells, via Cozens-Hardy LLP (general comments)	Restrictions on land use Clarification on the restrictions to be imposed on the use of the land within the easement strip is required.	I	Restrictions imposed on the use of land within the leased area of land will form part of the Heads of Terms of the option agreement negotiated with the landowner.
Christopher Bond, Bidwells, via Cozens-Hardy LLP (general comments)	Link boxes/junctions The location of the link boxes to be advised and agreed at the earliest opportunity. These to be located in field margins only.	I	The location of link boxes will be discussed at a later date nearer commencement of the works and will, where possible, be located in areas of least impact to surrounding agricultural activities. Joint bays will not require ongoing access and will be located along the route at various locations, but are entirely below ground.
Jane Kenny, Savills (general comments)	vii. Construction Programme – at no point throughout our discussions has it been indicated that the construction programme is to be up to 11 years long with up to three phases and a maximum gap of four years. There is no detail on how this will actually be phased and impact on individual landowners. Despite this a construction period over this length of time will cause immeasurable disruption to farming businesses and the local tourist industry. This coupled with the 'maximum scenario design' will have a detrimental affect upon the environment and there is no clear detail on how this is going to be mitigated.	Y	The possible phasing of the project has now been reduced to two possible phases, and a subsequent maximum construction period of 8 years. This period includes the construction of all offshore elements of the project, with onshore work taking a maximum of 3 years per phase to complete.
Jane Kenny, Savills (general comments)	viii. Access Points – There have been no discussions with clients with regard to access points across their holdings from the road network to the On Shore Cable Route Corridor.	I	Throughout discussions with landowners to date it has been said that access to the construction corridor will be taken from the adjoining public highways where possible, the specific points of access are still to be confirmed. Where this is not possible, additional access routes will be required from the nearest public highway in order to reach the construction corridor.



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>52</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Jane Kenny, Savills (general comments)	x. There has been no discussions or detail how landowners will be able to cross the working corridor to gain access to their other land if it has been land locked due to the presence of the corridor.	I	It has been discussed with landowners to date that, where possible, access that is required across the construction corridor will be maintained during the construction period. There may be occasions where this will not be possible due to engineering reasons, however, disruption would look to be mitigated as much as possible. Specific crossing points and routes will be discussed once a construction contractor has been appointed by Ørsted.
Jane Kenny, Savills (general comments)	Soil – greater clarity is required on how are the soils to be treated? What is the weed control programme? How will the soil be stored? Under what conditions will you undertake reinstatement? How do you propose to reinstate?	I	Further information regarding soil storage will be provided in the Environmental Statement and more detail will be worked-up as the scheme progresses towards construction.
Jane Kenny, Savills (general comments)	Heat Dissipation from Cables – recent field trials have shown that cereal crops have a root depth in excess of a metre deep. What will be the impact from the cables on growing crops?	I	Hornsea Three does not envisage any heat impacts having a detrimental impact on agricultural practices, however a claim will be considered if received with sufficient supporting evidence.
Jane Kenny, Savills on behalf of Mr & Mrs Wharton	Individual Concerns  Mr & Mrs Wharton – Foxhills, Weybourne The area of land to be affected by the cable route is a camp site. The businesses USP is its beautiful location within the AONB of Weybourne with views of the sea. Whilst the scheme is under construction the business will not be able to function due to the land take. If the scheme takes up to 11 years to be completed, the business will be destroyed. If an alternative design is proposed and therefore the disruption is minimal, the business will still not be able to function whilst construction is underway due to the land take, the constant heavy traffic from Muckleburgh via the proposed access on the eastern boundary of our clients ownership. As referred to above, there are real concerns over EMF's and health bearing in mind that this is a camp site and when the land is returned it will be sterilised for the siting tents or campervans. There is concern over that the fragile coastline has been invaded twice at Weybourne, resulting in excessive damage during high tides and storms. A third cable landfall, will cause further, weakening, speeding erosion of the coastline and it is not clear how this is going to be prevented.	Y	The cable route has been amended to avoid any land owned by the Whartons
Jane Kenny, Savills, on behalf of Easton & Otley College	Easton & Otley College, Easton The College has future expansion plans around Broom Farm which will prevent the current proposed route being laid in the proposed location. This has been raised although no alteration has been made to the route within the PEIR or Onshore Statutory Consultation Plan.	Y	The refined corridor has been situated as far away from Broom Farm as possible within the PEIR consultation boundary to allow future development.
Jane Kenny, Savills (general comments)	The key components of the construction that concern our clients are: i. An easement of 60 metres wide requiring land of '3,300,000m <sup>2</sup> ' which equates to 815 acres. As the technology is available for a less intrusive construction ie. Direct Current (DC) supply, can you please explain why Alternating Current (AC) is being favoured over DC, as the overall benefits of a DC option are significant?	N	Hornsea Three is presenting both options, an AC and/or DC cable solution, and is showing the worst case scenario width of cable easement accordingly - a decision has not yet been made on technology. The construction corridor will be up to 80 m in width.
Jane Kenny, Savills (general comments)	ii. The PEIR indicates there will be a "link box" per junction bay to be sited at each junction bay. We do not believe this is correct and it will be necessary to have a number of link boxes at each joint bay to accompany each circuit. In addition there is no detail to where these link boxes will actually be sited within the fields.	I	The worse case scenario would be a link box located at every cable joint. These will be sited along the cable route, and located at or as close to field boundaries where possible.
Jane Kenny, Savills (general comments)	iii. Depth of cables - it is intended that the cables will be at a minimum of 1.2 m however there maybe occasions due to the ground that they will be as shallow as 0.7 m. Please be advised that this depth will interfere with farming operations and the growing of certain crops.	I	The minimum depth would only be required if crossing certain existing underground features, utility assets or certain geological features.
The Trustees of the Gurloque Settlement (submitted by Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co)	b. The proximity to the Hethersett North development will lend greater support to future development plans for this land when compared to other more remote areas.	I	Potential for future development in the area noted by Hornsea Three. Should there be any evidence of likely development of land that is intersected by the proposed cable corridor, this should be presented during the negotiation of Heads of Terms for the Option Agreement.



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>52</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
The Trustees of the Gurloque Settlement (submitted by Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co)	c. A 60 m easement at the lower end of the holding will push any possible development further north into an area that feels more rural and remote.	Y	The cable corridor in this area was amended following this response
The Trustees of the Gurloque Settlement (submitted by Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co)	d. By creating an open space barrier along the north side of the Hethersett North development it will be harder for future development to spread north from that settlement boundary. The cable corridor could essentially create a strategic development gap.	Y	The cable corridor in this area has been amended following this response
The Trustees of the Gurloque Settlement (submitted by Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co)	e. The pylon line runs along the northern part of the holding and this means the developable area within the holding will now be squeezed from the top and bottom. Thus, the sterilisation from the cable corridor will be more than just the 60 m of the easement width.	Y	The cable corridor in this area has been amended following this response
The Trustees of the Gurloque Settlement (submitted by Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co)	g. Given the realistic long-term development potential of this land and the resultant sterilisation that will arise from the installation of the cable route it is considered appropriate that an uplift clause be contained within any easement document.	Y	Potential for future development in area has been noted. Should there be any evidence of likely development of land that is intersected by the proposed cable corridor, this will be discussed during the negotiation of Heads of Terms for the Option Agreement.
The Trustees of the Gurloque Settlement (submitted by Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co)	h. Any such uplift clause would allow for any additional payment to be made to the freeholder if during the term of the easement the land could reasonably be expected to be able to form part of a development scheme, but that it cannot form part of such scheme due to the installation of the cables.	Y	Potential for future development in area has been noted. Should there be any evidence of likely development of land that is intersected by the proposed cable corridor, this will be discussed during the negotiation of Heads of Terms for the Option Agreement.
The Trustees of the Gurloque Settlement (submitted by Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co)	<b>1. Farming:</b> The farm land is used to grow a full arable rotation including cereals, legumes, oilseeds and high value root crops. Disturbance to soil structure will compromise productive capacity and versatility of cropping.	I	Hornsea Three confirmed a photographic record of condition will be undertaken prior to access for construction works commencing. Should there be any resulting impact to yielding or crop growth as a result of soil compaction then this should be submitted in a claim with sufficient supporting evidence. Ørsted as a developer and under the terms of the proposed Option Agreement will be liable to reinstate the land to a condition comparable to that prior to work commencing, or pay appropriate compensation where this is not possible.
The Trustees of the Gurloque Settlement (submitted by Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co)	B. Construction works can result in topsoil 'loss' due to compaction and wash. DONG will need to identify potential donor sites for soils of matching quality.	I	Soil management will be covered in more detail in the Heads of Terms to Landowners and in the Environmental Statement
The Trustees of the Gurloque Settlement (submitted by Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co)	C. Disruption to cropping will result in losses during the works and subsequent years. DONG will need to compensate for all losses, both direct and indirect, arising from the works.	I	Hornsea Three confirmed that should there be any resulting impact to yielding or crop growth as a result of soil compaction then this should be submitted in a claim with sufficient supporting evidence. Ørsted as a developer and under the terms of proposed Option Agreement will be liable to reinstate the land to a condition comparable to that prior to work commencing, or pay appropriate compensation where this is not possible.
The Trustees of the Gurloque Settlement (submitted by Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co)	D. The proposed corridor crosses through one of the larger and better-quality fields in the holding. The likely impact on the field will be very high and therefore it is requested that the cable be pushed as far to the north of the parcel as possible into the area of the field is already compromised by the National Grid pylon.	Y	The cable corridor in this area has been amended following this response
The Trustees of the Gurloque Settlement (submitted by Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co)	E. It would be desirable for the cable corridor to run parallel to the pylon line.	Y	The cable corridor in this area has been amended following this response
The Trustees of the Gurloque Settlement (submitted by Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co)	<b>2. Development:</b> All of the land to south and west of the property is part of the consented Hethersett North development area. This is a multi-owner consortium development which includes the Trustees. The following issues arise:	N/A	Hornsea Three noted the response but confirmed that the mentioned development area is not consented.
The Trustees of the Gurloque Settlement (submitted by Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co)	a. There is significant pressure to increase the provision in Norfolk. The area to the south of Norwich has been identified as having suitable infrastructure and space to accommodate a significant amount of new development. This suggests that in the next phase of planning policy review this land could be deemed suitable for development.	N/A	Hornsea Three noted the response but confirmed that the mentioned development area is not consented.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>52</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Anna Brookman, Strutt & Parker LLP (general comments)	How will soil storage and reinstatement be carried out, and will there be active weed control Our clients have worked hard to ensure that their soils are in the best condition possible in order to allow them to farm productively. It is there for essential that op and subsoil are stored separately and reinstated in the correct manner. A detail specification should be provided detailing how the soil will be moved, stored and replaced.	I	Soil storage and reinstatement are covered within the Environmental Statement, and will be refined once a construction contractor has been appointed by Ørsted.
Anna Brookman, Strutt & Parker LLP (general comments)	Our clients are long term land owners and cropping and grazing rotations are planned many years in advance. A project of this scale can be incorporated within this management schedule provided that the information required from the developers is provided as early as viably possible with as much details as is available. This will ensure that their businesses can continue to function well and would strengthen the relationship between the developers and occupiers, creating a better working relationship.	N/A	Indicative timescales of the earliest work could commence have been provided. Following an award of a DCO and CfD subsidies, more accurate timescales will be available and provided to landowners and agents accordingly.
Anna Brookman, Strutt & Parker LLP (general comments)	Details of the link box locations and their distance from the junction bays The maximum size specification of each of these has been provided in the PEIR documents, however, there is no reference to their locality to each other. These are permanent fixtures and although there is stated intention of installing them in field boundaries, there is the possibility that cable lengths will not accommodate this. More information on this would be greatly appreciated by the land occupying community to enable us to best plan how to work with the permanent infrastructure left on the surface.	I	Hornsea Three confirmed the location of the joint bays and link boxes will only be able to be confirmed once a DCO has been granted, cable design confirmed and order, and a construction contractor appointed. Link boxes will be located on field boundaries, where possible, and in line with landowner discussions in order to minimise the impact to ongoing agricultural operations.
Anna Brookman, Strutt & Parker LLP (general comments)	How will the project installation be phased A provisional indication on how many stages the project will be installed in, how long it is intended for trenches to remain open and how the commissioning work will be undertaken would enable us to better advise our clients on land management during the works.	Y	Hornsea Three confirmed the project could now be constructed in a maximum of two phases as opposed to three. Trenches themselves are likely to only remain open for a number of days whilst the cables, or ducting, is installed and then backfilled. The joint bays will be open for longer periods of time to allow jointing and commissioning work to be completed.
Anna Brookman, Strutt & Parker LLP (general comments)	How will the corridor be fenced, when will this be constructed, what access will be required to the corridor and how will occupiers cross the corridor No information regarding this is easily identifiable within the PEIR document, but this will be the first part of the construction project to directly affect the land owners and occupiers. Information relating to how early in the construction phase the fencing will be installed and how long it will remain in place would be gratefully received by the occupiers. This will assist in the ongoing land management plans, and enable our clients to alter cropping and grazing rotations to accommodate the project rather than be disrupted by it. It would be beneficial for there to be access points across the cable corridor which can be used whilst an area is not under construction. This will enable the impact of the development to be minimised.	I	Fencing requirements and specification will be determined once construction methods and contractor appointment are further developed. (NOTE: some sections of working corridor may not be fenced for access, egress or for other engineering reasons). Crossing points may be possible along the working corridor by request where these are feasible and suitable.
Anna Brookman, Strutt & Parker LLP (general comments)	When and how will the aspects of the PEIR document which are currently marked as "lack of data" and "not fully evaluated" be updated These terms are used extensively throughout the documents and leave a number of gaps in the information. Proceeding without having collected sufficient data and fully evaluated the aspects which require it will surely lead to issues further down the project timeline which could have been avoided.	N/A	These sections will be updated and included within the DCO application.
Anna Brookman, Strutt & Parker LLP (general comments)	The specific concerns of the clients we are representing are as follows: Will the cables will be ducted or not A number of our clients are concerned about the possibility that unducted cables may cause localised ground warming which would affect soil health and plant growth. Because of this, clarity on whether or not the cables which will be installed by the developer are going to be ducted would be appreciated.	I	The possibility of ducting should have minimal impact on any possible localised heat released from the cables. Confirmation on whether the cables will be ducted or not will be confirmed following granting of the DCO.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>52</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co on behalf of CJC Lee and Peter Seaman	Part of the land owned and occupied by Peter Seaman and his company CJC Lee at Great Farm , Shrubbs Farm and Land at Bodham has been identified as being on a potential cable route by DONG for the Hornsea 3 project. Land at Becketts Farm is rented by Peter Seaman on a 25 year FBT. The cable corridor, as proposed, will cut through the heart of the holdings and is likely to cause high levels of disturbance during the works. The following factors will be particularly affected: a. Farming b. Ecology c. Business operations d. HVAC Booster Station	N/A	Hornsea Three noted the comments, but no further action was required
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co on behalf of CJC Lee and Peter Seaman	At Shrubbs and Great Farm the proposed cable route sees a terrain change from 60m ASL to 30m ASL over a distance of 3km. i. There is a particularly pronounced area of terrain change at the site of the proposed Booster station. ii. The light loamy soils in the part of the corridor are very susceptible to runoff and DONG will need to put in place management strategies to deal with potential water borne soil runoff.	I	The change in terrain in this area is noted, and Hornsea Three is aware of the issue. Pre-construction drainage solutions may be implemented, as advised by an independent drainage consultant, in order to mitigate impact in relevant areas, with other potential impacts from changes in topography being mitigated where possible.
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co on behalf of CJC Lee and Peter Seaman	Business Operation: The owners operate significant commercial operations run out of Great Farm and Shrubbs Farm. These include large scale arable and root crop farming and contracting businesses; organic waste recycling and product on-sale; property rental and an HGV transport business. In addition to the points noted above regarding farming operations, the following points are of concern: a. Access to the transport yard at Shrubbs Farm must always be maintained and must be suitable for the use, otherwise an alternative site or sufficient standard must be provided.	I	Impact to access to Shrubbs & Great Farm will be mitigated where possible, with specific access for any HGV loads being discussed and arranged in advance to avoid impact.
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co on behalf of CJC Lee and Peter Seaman	Farming : The farm land is used to grow a full arable rotation including cereals, legumes, oilseeds and high value root crops, such as parsnips, potatoes and carrots. Disturbance to soil structure will compromise productive capacity and versatility of cropping. a. It is important that DONG carry out full soil surveys prior to entry to enable proper restoration to take place. Such tests should assess (as a minimum): i. Mineral and Nutrient content ii. Soil composition iii. Pathogen content	N/A	A photographic record of condition will be undertaken prior to access for construction works commencing. Should there be any resulting impact to yielding or crop growth as a result of soil composition then this should be submitted in a claim with sufficient supporting evidence. Ørsted as a developer and under the terms of proposed Option Agreement will be liable to reinstate the land to a condition comparable to that prior to work commencing, or pay appropriate compensation where this is not possible.
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co on behalf of CJC Lee and Peter Seaman	Disruption to cropping will result in losses during the works and subsequent years. DONG will need to compensate for all losses, both direct and indirect, arising from the works.	N/A	Compensation will be payable for direct loss or crop or inability to crop and subsequent losses on a proven losses basis and on receipt of a claim.
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co on behalf of CJC Lee and Peter Seaman	Arable land is drained in places with plastic pipe and shingle underdrains. DONG will need to carry out a full pre-works schedule of drainage installations and undertake to repair and alter the schemes as required.	N/A	An independent drainage consultant will be appointed by the project in order to review and design pre & post drainage solutions in conjunction with existing drainage systems currently in place.
Brown & Co on behalf of CJC Lee and Peter Seaman	Irrigation is supplied to the farm via a mains system that is fed from a reservoir located at Shrubbs Farm to the East of the proposed corridor. DONG will be required to protect the main from damage and where require provide, or cover the cost of, diverting the main to ensure cropping is not interrupted. Any losses arising from inability to effectively utilise irrigation to be compensated for by DONG.	N/A	Routes or plans of irrigation systems in place are requested in order for this to be considered accordingly. Compensation will be payable for any losses or disruption on proven loss basis and on receipt of a claim.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>52</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Simon Evans, Irelands Arnolds Keys on behalf of A & B Clarke	<p>Power transmission - HVDC / HVAC</p> <p>At present this project is focussing on using HVAC power transmission. The initial search area has now been refined to a 100m wide search area / corridor.</p> <p>My client has approximately 1.9 KM of the cable route crossing their land which based on a 100m wide corridor represents a total land area of 19 Ha (47 Acres). Whilst my client is not against the use of renewable energy sources this is a considerable land area which is not acceptable to the landowner as it will cause significant disruption to the estate and the commercial farming business which operates from it.</p> <p>My client has concerns regarding an HVAC scheme in relation to the potential risk of magnetic fields affecting GPS systems and the possible issues with soil heating generated by the cables. The issue with soil heating could be reduced if the cables were run through ducts but there does not appear to be any mention of ducting within the documents.</p> <p>We understand that a HVDC scheme could be used instead of HVAC which would require significantly less land (circa 30 metres) and does not require booster/relay stations or link boxes along the length of the corridor. Whilst it would need a large converter station at the grid connection we consider that the benefits of an HVDC scheme significantly outweigh this (especially when you consider the full length of the cable corridor).</p> <p>DONG Energy state that HVDC technology is in its infancy however there has been no reasoned justification between the two options and nothing for the landowner or consultees to consider. The documentation states that either a HVAC or HVDC transmission option will be used however no further information has been provided.</p> <p>A full response on why HVAC is being favoured over HVDC is required and a justification for the design whilst minimising the impact on the countryside.</p>	I	<p>Hornsea Three is presenting both options, an AC and/or DC cable solution, and is showing the worst case scenario width of cable easement accordingly - a decision has not yet been made on technology.</p> <p>The construction corridor will be up to 80m in width.</p> <p>Hornsea Three does not envisage any heat impacts having a detrimental impact on agricultural practices, however a claim will be considered if received with sufficient supporting evidence.</p>
Simon Evans, Irelands Arnolds Keys on behalf of A & B Clarke	<p>Disruption to farming business / estate</p> <p>The PEIR documents state that the construction programme may be up to 11 years long in up to three phases with a maximum gap of four years.</p> <p>In any situation an 11 year build programme would be totally unacceptable; to state that there may be a gap of four years between phases makes this even worse.</p> <p>During the 'gap' of four years will the land be returned to my client for them to use or will it be retained by the project and left standing idle?</p> <p>Bare, idle soils will grow weeds which will seed and blow over the retained land. Who will be responsible for regular spraying of the corridor during the periods of inactivity between phases?</p> <p>Our client is running a commercial farming business and does not want their remaining land which is in arable production being subjected to increased weed pressure which would result in higher costs of production.</p> <p>We note there will be a temporary haul road as part of the project which will be surfaced with aggregate on geotextile membrane. Will the haul road be retained throughout the 11 year programme and also throughout the periods between phases? Our client is concerned about security and the haul road being used for inappropriate purposes such as off road motorbikes and other illegal purposes such as fly tipping and travellers.</p> <p>In conclusion the project needs to be started and finished in a timely fashion. We cannot support an 11 year programme which is totally unreasonable and prevents other possible projects from being explored and developed on the estate.</p>	Y	<p>The possible phased construction of the project has now been reduced to two phases. If the project is constructed in two phases and there is a period of time between these, then it is proposed the land will be reinstated to allow agricultural operations to continue. The haul road could be maintained during this period, if suitable, and subject to landowner agreement. Should this be left in place, it shall be secured from access by third parties.</p>
Simon Evans, Irelands Arnolds Keys on behalf of A & B Clarke	<p>Width of cable corridor</p> <p>As mentioned earlier a 100 metre wide cable corridor is unsatisfactory to my client. An Easement will be required for the cables and the landowner is typically barred from carrying out any building operations over the Easement area. As mentioned at 100 metres wide, a total land area of 19Ha (47 Acres) will be required and could potentially be sterilised as a result of the proposed HVAC scheme. This restricts any future uses of this land from anything other than arable or grass which will impact on any future development / diversification projects which the estate may have.</p>	Y	<p>The final easement width, as part of a subsoil lease, will be 60m in width, not 100m.</p>



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>52</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Simon Evans, Irelands Arnolds Keys on behalf of A & B Clarke	<p>Soil Structure</p> <p>At present no details have been provided in respect of how soils are to be 'handled' during the works - care and attention must be given to soil structures;</p> <p>Depths of top soil must be recorded at regular intervals across the length of the corridor in each field. This is necessary to make sure reinstatement is completed correctly.</p> <p>Topsoil must be stripped and stored to the side of the cable corridor away from subsoils. Absolutely no topsoil to be removed from my clients land without their prior permission.</p> <p>Stored topsoil must be regularly sprayed to control weeds throughout the programme of works.</p> <p>A plan for reinstatement of the land (once the works are completed) must be agreed by my client</p> <p>From experience with other schemes we require clarification that during times of heavy rainfall that the contractors carrying out the works will cease works until ground conditions are dry enough to continue. My client reserves the right to be able to give this order should they consider conditions are too wet for works to continue.</p>	Y	<p>A pre-construction photographic record of condition will be undertaken, with reinstatement being carried out in accordance with this, and in liaison with landowners, where reinstatement is not possible compensation will be paid on a proven loss basis and on receipt of a claim.</p> <p>An Agricultural Liaison Officer will be appointed during construction to oversee the works and resolve any issues, regarding working on land following extreme weather conditions, for example.</p>
Simon Evans, Irelands Arnolds Keys on behalf of A & B Clarke	<p>Shooting</p> <p>Crabgate Farm runs a successful shoot each season and a number of drives will be affected as a result of the proposal. Compensation will need to be paid to reflect the disruption to the shoot which could be significant.</p> <p>At present there is no reference to shooting within the PEIR and no correspondence has been received as to how this will be dealt with.</p> <p>Clarification is required.</p>	I	<p>Impact to shooting will be mitigated where possible. Details on the shoot and location of the drives has been requested in order for this to be considered sufficiently. Compensation will be payable on a proven loss basis and on receipt of a claim.</p>
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co on behalf of Simon Back	<p>e. Given the realistic long-term development potential of this land and the resultant sterilisation that will arise from the installation of the cable route it is considered appropriate that an uplift clause be contained within any easement document.</p>	I	<p>A development uplift clause will be considered on receipt of sufficient evidence relating to proposed and likely development.</p>
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co on behalf of Simon Back	<p>Farming : The farm land is used to grow a full arable rotation including cereals, legumes, oilseeds and high value root crops. Disturbance to soil structure will compromise productive capacity and versatility of cropping.</p> <p>a. It is important that DONG carry out full soil surveys prior to entry to enable proper restoration to take place. Such tests should assess (as a minimum):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mineral and Nutrient content</li> <li>Soil composition</li> <li>Pathogen content</li> </ol>	I	<p>A photographic record of condition will be undertaken prior to access for construction works commencing. Should there be any resulting impact to yielding or crop growth as a result of soil composition then this should be submitted in a claim with sufficient supporting evidence. Orsted as a developer and under the terms of proposed Option Agreement will be liable to reinstate the land to a condition comparable to that prior to work commencing, or pay appropriate compensation where this is not possible.</p>
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co on behalf of Simon Back	<p>Construction works can result in topsoil 'loss' due to compaction and wash. DONG will need to identify potential donor sites for soils of matching quality.</p>	I	<p>Any additional topsoil that needs to be imported following completion of construction will be done so in liaison with the landowner and be of the appropriate type and condition.</p>
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co on behalf of Simon Back	<p>Disruption to cropping will result in losses during the works and subsequent years. DONG will need to compensate for all losses, both direct and indirect, arising from the works.</p>	I	<p>Compensation will be payable for direct loss of crop or inability to crop and subsequent losses will be compensated on a proven losses basis and on receipt of a claim.</p>
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co on behalf of Kelling Estate	<p>Arable Field Margins</p> <p>Kelling Estate has been committed to a Higher Level Stewardship Scheme for the last 6 years. Through the latest version of the scheme, they have committed to managing Grass Margins, Floristic Margins and Cultivated Margins. Some of which the proposed pipeline works will run through. Not only are these areas a UK BAP Priority habitat which provide a refuge for native wildlife from the increasingly hostile arable matrix, but also provide vital corridors between larger habitats. A wide variety of native species will use these margins on the Kelling Estate, from pollinators which are declining worldwide, to foraging farmland birds such as turtle dove and grey partridge, to smaller mammals such as shrews, mice and rabbits who are in turn prey for top predators such as Kestrel and Marsh Harrier. The effect of the proposed works on the 6 sections of well-established arable field margins will need to be considered.</p> <p>SEE FIGURE IN KELLING ENVIRONMENTAL REPORT</p>	I	<p>The Estate's involvement in a HLS scheme is noted, and will be considered in more detail once a construction contractor has been appointed. It is likely a derogation will be required for working in these areas, if the scheme is still active at the time of construction, although impact to them will be mitigated where possible and practical.</p>



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>52</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co on behalf of Kelling Estate	<p>Terrain &amp; Soil</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The northern end of the route passes through the same field as where the DOW cables were installed. Putting another set of cables through the field will cause more disturbance to the soil structure and it will be on such a scale as to potentially render a highly productive field compromised for long term agricultural use.</li> <li>The route from the coast road through to Holgate Hill sees a contour change from 15m ASL to 60m ASL – this is a 45m change in terrain over a 1,400m run.</li> <li>The soils over this route are sandy with low bonding coefficient, thus creating a very high risk of soil runoff/wash.</li> <li>Stripping a corridor of potentially more than 80m in width of its topsoil will create a large area of highly unstable and vulnerable surface that will be prone to surface runoff and wash.</li> <li>In the event of soil runoff the likely course will be along the route and down the west face of the Cromer Ridge.</li> <li>If water flows along the route it will erode at an accelerated rate due to the lack of any vegetative cover.</li> <li>Incidences of runoff down the west face of the ridge will be far higher due to the lack of natural structure and vegetation to aid infiltration over the route.</li> <li>Soil washing down to the west face will follow a course that leads directly into the domestic properties in the village that line The Street.</li> <li>Soil wash may also drain to stream that runs parallel to The Street, which in turn will lead to diffuse soil pollution in the local surface water network.</li> <li>Soil wash may also drain to the ponds to the west of the corridor and east of Kelling Hall. These ponds have high historic, amenity and ecological value and inundation with soil wash could have significant negative impacts on these factors.</li> </ul> <p>The following questions arise:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How DONG will address/manage soil damage?</li> <li>How DONG will protect soils, waterways and property from erosion and runoff?</li> <li>Why this route is less damaging to the environment than the principle route?</li> </ol>	Y	<p>The existing Dudgeon (DOW) electricity cable route is proposed to be crossed via HDD, and therefore has no direct impact on the same land.</p> <p>Regarding the specific questions proposed by Kelling Estate:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 &amp; 2. Concern for disruption due to topography is noted. This will be managed by the construction contractor, once appointed, with appropriate mitigation measures being implemented as required. The cables are proposed to be installed under the woodland via HDD.</li> <li>3. This route was not proposed or adopted solely due to environmental constraints, but due to technical concerns and issues with the initially proposed route.</li> </ol>
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co on behalf of Kelling Estate	<p>Amenity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The route is within 300m of Kelling Hall and only 100m from the formal gardens.</li> <li>The potential disruption to the occupancy of the Hall, grounds and surrounding properties during construction works is very high.</li> <li>The route will run within 50m of many dwellings along the Street in Kelling – the potential for significant visual and audio intrusion at these properties during the works is high.</li> <li>There is expected to be a significant loss of privacy at the Hall and other dwellings in the village of Kelling if the route is accepted and worked on.</li> </ul> <p>The following question arises:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How DONG will ensure the amenity of the core Estate properties and the village would be protected during any planned works?</li> </ol>	I	<p>The proposed route corridor does not directly abut any residential properties along this section, although it is in close proximity. Working times for contractors will be restricted to those set out in the DCO and considered reasonable by the local council. Any direct and specific concerns any residents have on this should be addressed with Ørsted. Nevertheless, any impact to the adjacent estate &amp; residential properties will be mitigated, where possible.</p>
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co (generic comments)	<p>Generic comments 1:</p> <p>The current proposal is for an easement width of 60m to accommodate 6 circuits each with one cable in a trench.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Can more cables be put into each trench?</li> <li>o Can there be fewer trenches?</li> <li>o Why does each cable require a 10m sterilisation strip?</li> <li>o Is the optimum economic position being favoured over the optimum environmental position?</li> </ul>	N/A	<p>Each circuit must be located in a separate trench and will require separation between each adjacent trench to allow them to operate at the required capacity. Hornsea Three will potentially install up to 6 cable circuits if it is developed to full capacity. The strip either side of the cables is required in order to protect each circuit from damage, particularly in respect of working above one circuit when digging another.. The economic position is not a relevant point of concern to the project.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>52</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co (generic comments)	Generic comments 2: The proposal is for a working width of 80m during installation works o Is possible to work across the corridor in sequence installing and reinstating one cable at a time so the whole area is not open at one? o Can DONG investigate ways of reducing the scale of the works corridor (width) o Can DONG commit to a methodology that limits the time any one section of corridor is "open".	N/A	It is likely that one cable circuit will be installed at a time, however the 80m strip, if constructed in one phase, must be accessible throughout the construction. If possible, the scale of impact to the land will be reduced, however this cannot be confirmed at this time. Each 'section' will have construction work taking place for up to 3 months.
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co (generic comments)	Generic comments 3: The proposal is for an HVAC system which needs 6 circuits whereas an HVDC system would require fewer circuits and therefore a smaller easement and working area. o What are the reasons for adopting AC over DC? o Is there a significant economic advantage to using a AC system over DC? o Has DONG quantified the differential in environmental impact between adopting AC or DC?	N/A	Hornsea Three is presenting both options, an AC and/or DC cable solution, and is showing the worst case scenario width of cable easement accordingly - a decision has not yet been made on technology.
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co on behalf of Kelling Estate	Woodland The proposed works run through one Copse and two larger blocks of woodland. All of which are classified by Natural England as UK BAP Priority Habitat Lowland Deciduous Woodland. Furthermore, although not officially designated, due to the presence of the following species: Tree Pipit Wood Warbler Spotted Flycatcher Pied Flycatcher Marsh Tit Hawfinch Lesser Redpoll All of which have been identified within 1km of the site, the Woodland around Kelling should be declared as a Woodland Bird Assemblage Priority Area.	I	Information on bird wildlife in the area has been noted and provided to the Hornsea Three Consents team for information alongside ongoing surveys and ecological data. The cables will be installed under woodland via HDD.
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co (generic comments)	Generic comments 5: Biosecurity during works period is very important for farmers with clean farms and those who have high value crop contracts o How will biosecurity be managed during the works process? o How will biosecurity be managed if the event of soil import o Will full pre-works surveys be carried out to establish disease status of land?	I	Construction on land subject to bio-security measures will follow procedures set out in the project's Code of Construction Practice, although once the construction corridor has been installed, this would be a separate work area and measures would be reduced, if appropriate. Any additional topsoil required to be imported following completion of construction will be done so in liaison with the landowner and be of the appropriate type and condition. Surveys to assess potential disease of land will not be undertaken prior to construction, this is the landowners obligation.
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co (generic comments)	Generic comments 6: Installation works will severely disrupt soil profiles with potential long-term impact o Will full soil profile surveys be carried out before works are undertaken? o What is the proposed specification of soil surveys?	N	Soils will not be tested prior to work commencing.
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co (generic comments)	Generic comments 8: Many fields have services underground including water and electricity supplied o Will full pre-works surveys be carried out to establish the infrastructure that is in place? o Can it be confirmed that any interruption to services and any associated losses incurred, if any, will be compensated at the time?	I	Full utility searches along the corridor have been undertaken, these records will be maintained and updated up to and during construction. Compensation will be paid on a proven loss basis and on receipt of a claim.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>52</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co (generic comments)	<p>Generic comments 10: The proposed corridor crosses areas that have realistic potential for development to alternative uses other than agriculture. Due to the current situation with housing supply shortage in a number of District Councils land that is outside of Settlement Boundaries is successfully being allocated for residential and commercial development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Will an uplift payment be made available where it can be shown that land has a reasonable prospect of being developed during the lifetime of the scheme but has otherwise been sterilised by the scheme?</li> <li>o Has the route of the corridor taken into consideration pre-planning option agreements and development proposals?</li> </ul>	I	Should there be any evidence of likely development of land that is intersected by the proposed cable corridor, this should be presented during the negotiation of Heads of Terms for the Option Agreement in order for a development uplift clause to be considered. The cable corridor has taken into account existing development proposals, where this information is available.
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co (generic comments)	<p>Generic comments 11: The potential working period for the scheme is 11 years.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Why is it considered by DONG to be reasonable to take this long?</li> <li>o How would a staged development look in real terms on the ground?</li> </ul>	Y	The 11 year timeframe has now been reduced to 8 years with two possible construction phases.
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co (generic comments)	<p>Generic comments 12: The proposed scheme will involve surface features for links/joints and other service media</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o What will the size and construction of these features be?</li> <li>o Can these features be constructed so that they are at field edges?</li> </ul>	I	This information is included within the Environmental Statement. These will, where possible, be located at or adjacent to field boundaries in line with landowner discussions.
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co on behalf of Kelling Estate	<p>Grassland The proposed line of works transects 4 blocks of permanent pasture, 1 of which has been in grass since 1946 and shows as grass on the first edition Ordinance Survey Maps. All of the permanent pasture grass fields are managed through the current environmental stewardship scheme under a no fertiliser input system. They are therefore classified as unimproved grassland order destroy these areas there will need to be a thorough Environmental Impact Assessment undertaken to understand the impact on the sward and surrounding area. It should be noted that under new regulations this will have to include a detailed NVC survey of all areas of permanent grass. SEE FIGURE IN KELLING ENVIRONMENTAL REPORT</p>	I	Details surrounding grassland and its quality have been noted. A derogation will likely be required prior to construction works commencing. The land will be reinstated following construction, with compensation being payable on a proven loss basis, including any reduction of subsidies due to land not being suitable for re-entry into the relevant scheme. The historic block of woodland referred to is avoided by the refined cable corridor.
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co on behalf of Kelling Estate	<p>Arable Although typically hostile to biodiversity, the arable fields of Kelling Estate support a breeding population of Lapwing. Lapwing are a UK BAP Priority species and are therefore protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981. Lapwing are ground nesting birds and prefer to site their nests in low lying arable crops such as sugar beet or in cultivated areas. Kelling Estate has committed to rotating 8.00 ha of cultivated areas across the arable land. Prioritising fields that are situated closest to grass fields which lie wet in the winter, such as field 6928, as these will be favoured by the Lapwing.</p>	I	The protection of the Lapwing is acknowledged, and the Estate's commitment to habitat conservation through cropping is noted. The ability to cultivate the required area should not be compromised by the construction work, although may need to be amended to meet the area committed to.
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co on behalf of Kelling Estate	<p>Topography As can be seen from the topographic map shown (Left), the proposed pipeline is set to cut through terrain which steeply rises from 20m above sea level to 55m above sea level within 250m. Removing this amount of soil will not only totally change the landscape itself, but also significantly increase the potential for sediment mobilisation. This will impact the lower lying residents of Kelling as well as localised watercourses and features through increased risk of flooding and pollution. The image below gives an indication of the steep topography in parcel 5339. Taken 10th September 2017. SEE FIGURE IN KELLING ENVIRONMENTAL REPORT</p>	Y	The sections of woodland where there is a larger change in topography will be crossed via HDD.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>52</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Tom Corfield (on behalf of Lady M A Prince-Smith Morton Hall Estate)	<p>i) Power transmission - HVDC / HVAC</p> <p>At present this project is focussing on using HVAC power transmission. The initial search area has now been refined to a 100m wide search area / corridor.</p> <p>My client has approximately 1.88 miles of the cable route crossing their land which based on a 100m wide corridor represents a total land area of 30.25Ha (74.75 Acres). Whilst my client is not against the use of renewable energy sources this is a considerable land area which is not acceptable to the landowner as it will cause significant disruption to the estate and the commercial farming business which operates from it.</p> <p>My client has concerns regarding an HVAC scheme in relation to the potential risk of magnetic fields and the possible issues with soil heating generated by the cables. The issue with soil heating could be reduced if the cables were run through ducts but there does not appear to be any mention of ducting within the documents.</p> <p>We understand that a HVDC scheme could be used instead of HVAC which would require significantly less land (circa 30 metres) and does not require booster/relay stations or link boxes along the length of the corridor. Whilst it would need a large converter station at the grid connection we consider that the benefits of an HVDC scheme significantly outweigh this (especially when you consider the full length of the cable corridor).</p> <p>DONG Energy state that HVDC technology is in its infancy however there has been no reasoned justification between the two options and nothing for the landowner or consultees to consider. The documentation states that either a HVAC or HVDC transmission option will be used however no further information has been provided.</p> <p>In short, a full response on why HVAC is being favoured over HVDC is required.</p>	Y	<p>Hornsea Three is presenting both options, an AC and DC cable solution, and is showing the worst case scenario width of cable easement accordingly - a decision has not yet been made on technology.</p> <p>We do not envisage any heat impacts having a detrimental impact on agricultural practices, however a claim will be considered if received with sufficient supporting evidence.</p> <p>The construction corridor will be up to 80m in width.</p>
Tom Corfield (on behalf of Lady M A Prince-Smith Morton Hall Estate)	<p>ii) Disruption to farming business / estate</p> <p>The PEIR documents state that the construction programme may be up to 11 years long in up to three phases with a maximum gap of four years.</p> <p>In any situation an 11 year build programme would be totally unacceptable; to state that there may be a gap of four years between phases makes this even worse.</p> <p>During the 'gap' of four years will the land be returned to my client for them to use or will it be retained by the project and left standing idle?</p> <p>Bare, idle soils will grow weeds which will seed and blow over the retained land. Who will be responsible for regular spraying of the corridor during the periods of inactivity between phases?</p> <p>Our client is running a commercial farming business and does not want their remaining land which is in arable production being subjected to increased weed pressure which would result in higher costs of production.</p> <p>We note there will be a temporary haul road as part of the project which will be surfaced with aggregate on geotextile membrane. Will the haul road be retained throughout the 11 year programme and also throughout the periods between phases? Our client is concerned about security and the haul road being used for inappropriate purposes such as off road motorbikes and other illegal purposes such as fly tipping and travellers.</p> <p>In conclusion the project needs to be started and finished in a timely fashion. We can not support an 11 year programme which is totally unreasonable and prevents other possible projects from being explored and developed on the estate. In essence it puts 'the property on hold' and would for example prevent any sale or disposals.</p>	I	<p>The possible phased construction of the project has now been reduced to two phases, with a maximum construction period of 8 years. If the project is constructed in two phases and there is a period of time between these, then it is proposed the land will be reinstated to allow agricultural operations to continue. The haul road could be maintained during this period, if suitable, and subject to landowner agreement. Should this be left in place, it shall be secured from access by third parties.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>52</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Tom Corfield (on behalf of Lady M A Prince-Smith Morton Hall Estate)	iii) Width of cable corridor As mentioned earlier a 100 metre wide cable corridor is unsatisfactory to my client. An Easement will be required for the cables and the landowner is typically barred from carrying out any building operations over the Easement area. As mentioned at 100 metres wide, a total land area of 30.25Ha (74.75 Acres) will be required and could potentially be sterilised as a result of the proposed HVAC scheme. This restricts any future uses of this land from anything other than arable, grass or woodland which will impact on any future development / diversification projects which the estate may have.	Y	Hornsea Three has confirmed that the working width will be 80m and the final easement width, as part of a subsoil lease, will be 60m in width.
Tom Corfield (on behalf of Lady M A Prince-Smith Morton Hall Estate)	vi) Soil Structure At present no details have been provided in respect of how soils are to be 'handled' during the works - care and attention must be given to soil structures; Depths of top soil must be recorded at regular intervals across the length of the corridor in each field. This is necessary to make sure reinstatement is completed correctly. Topsoil must be stripped and stored to the side of the cable corridor away from subsoils. Absolutely no topsoil to be removed from my clients land without their prior permission. Stored topsoil must be regularly sprayed to control weeds throughout the programme of works. A plan for reinstatement of the land (once the works are completed) must be agreed by my client From experience with other schemes we require clarification that during times of heavy rainfall that the contractors carrying out the works will cease works until ground conditions are dry enough to continue. My client reserves the right to be able to give this order should they consider conditions are too wet for works to continue.	Y	A pre-construction photographic record of condition will be undertaken, with reinstatement being carried out in accordance with this, and in liaison with landowners, where reinstatement is not possible compensation will be paid on a proven loss basis and on receipt of a claim. An agricultural Liaison Officer will be appointed during construction to oversee the works and resolve any issues, regarding working on land following extreme weather conditions for example.
Tom Corfield (on behalf of Lady M A Prince-Smith Morton Hall Estate)	vii) Shooting Morton Hall Estate runs a large, successful shoot each season and a number of drives will be affected as a result of the proposal. Compensation will need to be paid to reflect the disruption to the shoot which could be significant. At present there is no reference to shooting within the PEIR and no correspondence has been received as to how this will be dealt with. Clarification is required.	I	Impact to shooting will be mitigated where possible. Details on the shoot and location of the drives has been requested in order for this to be considered sufficiently. Compensation will be payable on a proven loss basis and on receipt of a claim.
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co on behalf of Ringland Estate/Ebony Holdings	The cable corridor will cut across the western side of the Estate and will come close to the main dwelling, thus potentially resulting in high levels of disturbance during the works. The following factors will be particularly affected: a. Farming b. Ecology c. Amenity The owners of the Estate wish to raise the following concerns and make suggestions as to how disruption from the works might be reduced.	N/A	Hornsea Three noted the potential disturbance factors, but no specific response required.
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co (generic comments)	Generic comments 6: Installation works will severely disrupt soil profiles with potential long-term impact o Will full soil profile surveys be carried out before works are undertaken? o What is the proposed specification of soil surveys?	N	Hornsea Three confirmed that soils will not be tested prior to work commencing.
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co (generic comments)	Generic comments 8: Many fields have services underground including water and electricity supplied o Will full pre-works surveys be carried out to establish the infrastructure that is in place? o Can it be confirmed that any interruption to services and any associated losses incurred, if any, will be compensated at the time?	I	Full utility searches along the corridor have been undertaken, these records will be maintained and updated up to and during construction. Compensation will be paid on a proven loss basis and on receipt of a claim.



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>52</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co (generic comments)	<p>Generic comments 10: The proposed corridor crosses areas that have realistic potential for development to alternative uses other than agriculture. Due to the current situation with housing supply shortage in a number of District Councils land that is outside of Settlement Boundaries is successfully being allocated for residential and commercial development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Will an uplift payment be made available where it can be shown that land has a reasonable prospect of being developed during the lifetime of the scheme but has otherwise been sterilised by the scheme?</li> <li>o Has the route of the corridor taken into consideration pre-planning option agreements and development proposals?</li> </ul>	I	Should there be any evidence of likely development of land that is intersected by the proposed cable corridor, this should be presented during the negotiation of Heads of Terms for the Option Agreement in order for a development uplift clause to be considered. The cable corridor has taken into account existing development proposals, where this information is available.
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co (generic comments)	<p>Generic comments 11: The potential working period for the scheme is 11 years.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Why is it considered by DONG to be reasonable to take this long?</li> <li>o How would a staged development look in real terms on the ground?</li> </ul>	Y	Hornsea Three confirmed that this construction period has now been reduced to 8 years and two possible construction phases.
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co (generic comments)	<p>Generic comments 12: The proposed scheme will involve surface features for links/joints and other service media</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o What will the size and construction of these features be?</li> <li>o Can these features be constructed so that they are at field edges?</li> </ul>	I	Hornsea Three confirmed that the relevant information is included within the Environmental Statement. These will, where possible, be located at or adjacent to field boundaries in line with landowner discussions.
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co on behalf of Ringland Estate/Ebony Holdings	<p>Farming: The farm land is used to grow a full arable rotation including cereals, legumes, oilseeds and high value root crops, such as parsnips, potatoes and carrots. Disturbance to soil structure will compromise productive capacity and versatility of cropping.</p> <p>a. It is important that DONG carry out full soil surveys prior to entry to enable proper restoration to take place. Such tests should assess (as a minimum):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Mineral and Nutrient content</li> <li>ii. Soil composition</li> <li>iii. Pathogen content</li> </ol> <p>b. Construction works can result in topsoil 'loss' due to compaction and wash. DONG will need to identify potential donor sites for soils of matching quality in advance of carrying out works.</p> <p>c. Disruption to cropping will result in losses in the works year and subsequent years. DONG will be required to compensate for all losses, both direct and indirect, arising from the works.</p> <p>d. Arable land is drained in places with plastic pipe and shingle underdrains. DONG will need to carry out a full pre-works schedule of drainage installations and undertake to repair and alter the schemes as required.</p> <p>e. Irrigation is supplied to the farm via a mains system that is fed from a reservoir located to the West of the proposed corridor. DONG will be required to protect the main from damage and where required provide, or cover the cost of, diverting the main to ensure cropping is not interrupted. Any losses arising from inability to effectively utilise irrigation to be compensated for by DONG.</p> <p>f. Areas of the farmland are occupied by a pig breeding and rearing company which operates a 2-year rotation system to keep land disease free. Unless there is careful planning ahead of proposed works the potential disruption to this enterprise will be significant. It is extremely hard to find replacement land for outdoor pig rearing units due to limited availability of the right soil types and 'clean' soils. DONG will need to liaise with the Estate at least 4 years in advance of planned works to allow for appropriate land use planning.</p> <p>g. The presence of the pig rearing enterprise and other high value root crops means that biosecurity is highly important. DONG will be required to adopt a high level of biosecurity management to ensure the soil health is not compromised.</p>	I	<p>Hornsea Three responded to the following points made by Ringland Estate:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Soil surveys are not proposed to be undertaken prior to construction.</li> <li>b. Any additional topsoil required to be imported following completion of construction will be done so in liaison with the landowner and be of the appropriate type and condition.</li> <li>c. Compensation will be payable for direct loss or crop or inability to crop and subsequent losses on a proven losses basis and on receipt of a claim.</li> <li>d. An independent land drainage consultant will be appointed in order to consider and design pre and post drainage solutions where required.</li> <li>e. Routes or plans of irrigation systems in place are requested in order for this to be considered accordingly. Compensation will be payable for any losses or disruption on proven loss basis and on receipt of a claim.</li> <li>f. The earliest time that work could commence is 2020. Following award of the DCO, Ørsted will liaise with landowners regarding any update to this programme.</li> <li>g. Bio-security measures already in place for relevant land will be adopted as required.</li> </ol>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>52</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co (generic comments)	<p>Generic comments 1: The current proposal is for an easement width of 60m to accommodate 6 circuits each with one cable in a trench.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Can more cables be put into each trench?</li> <li>o Can there be fewer trenches?</li> <li>o Why does each cable require a 10m sterilisation strip?</li> <li>o Is the optimum economic position being favoured over the optimum environmental position?</li> </ul>	N/A	Each circuit must be located in a separate trench and will require separation between each adjacent one to allow them to operate at the required capacity. Hornsea Three will potentially install up to 6 cable circuits if it is developed to full capacity. The strip either side of the cables is required in order to protect each circuit from damage, particularly in respect of working above one circuit when digging another. The economic position is not the primary concern of the project when considering the easement width.
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co (generic comments)	<p>Generic comments 2: The proposal is for a working width of 80m during installation works</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Is possible to work across the corridor in sequence installing and reinstating one cable at a time so the whole area is not open at one?</li> <li>o Can DONG investigate ways of reducing the scale of the works corridor (width)</li> <li>o Can DONG commit to a methodology that limits the time any one section of corridor is "open"</li> </ul>	N/A	It is likely that one cable circuit will be installed at a time, however the 80 m strip, if constructed in one phase, will need to be accessible throughout the construction. If possible, the scale of impact to the land will be reduced, however this cannot be confirmed at this time. Each 'section' will have construction work taking place for up to 3 months.
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co (generic comments)	<p>Generic comments 3: The proposal is for an HVAC system which needs 6 circuits whereas an HVDC system would require fewer circuits and therefore a smaller easement and working area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o What are the reasons for adopting AC over DC?</li> <li>o Is there a significant economic advantage to using a AC system over DC?</li> <li>o Has DONG quantified the differential in environmental impact between adopting AC or DC?</li> </ul>	N/A	Hornsea Three is investigating both options, an AC and DC cable solution, and is showing the worst case scenario width of cable easement accordingly - a decision has not yet been made on technology.
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co (generic comments)	<p>Generic comments 5: Biosecurity during works period is very important for farmers with clean farms and those who have high value crop contracts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o How will biosecurity be managed during the works process?</li> <li>o How will biosecurity be managed if the event of soil import</li> <li>o Will full pre-works surveys be carried out to establish disease status of land?</li> </ul>	I	Construction on land subject to bio-security measures will follow procedures set out in the project's Code of Construction Practice, although once the construction corridor has been installed, this would be a separate work area and measures would be reduced, if appropriate. Any additional topsoil that needs to be imported following completion of construction will be done so in liaison with the landowner and be of the appropriate type and condition. Surveys to assess potential disease of land will not be undertaken prior to construction, this is the landowners obligation.
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co (generic comments)	<p>Generic comments 6: Installation works will severely disrupt soil profiles with potential long-term impact</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Will full soil profile surveys be carried out before works are undertaken?</li> <li>o What is the proposed specification of soil surveys?</li> </ul>	N	Hornsea Three confirmed that soils will not be tested prior to work commencing.
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co (generic comments)	<p>Generic comments 8: Many fields have services underground including water and electricity supplied</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Will full pre-works surveys be carried out to establish the infrastructure that is in place?</li> <li>o Can it be confirmed that any interruption to services and any associated losses incurred, if any, will be compensated at the time?</li> </ul>	I	Full utility searches along the corridor have been undertaken, these records will be maintained and updated up to and during construction. Compensation will be paid on a proven loss basis and on receipt of a claim.
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co (generic comments)	<p>Generic comments 10: The proposed corridor crosses areas that have realistic potential for development to alternative uses other than agriculture. Due to the current situation with housing supply shortage in a number of District Councils land that is outside of Settlement Boundaries is successfully being allocated for residential and commercial development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Will an uplift payment be made available where it can be shown that land has a reasonable prospect of being developed during the lifetime of the scheme but has otherwise been sterilised by the scheme?</li> <li>o Has the route of the corridor taken into consideration pre-planning option agreements and development proposals?</li> </ul>	I	Hornsea Three confirmed that should there be any evidence of likely development of land that is intersected by the proposed cable corridor, this should be presented during the negotiation of Heads of Terms for the Option Agreement in order for a development uplift clause to be considered. The cable corridor has taken into account existing development proposals, where this information is available.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>52</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co (generic comments)	<p>Generic comments 11: The potential working period for the scheme is 11 years. o Why is it considered by DONG to be reasonable to take this long? o How would a staged development look in real terms on the ground?</p>	Y	The construction period has now been reduced to 8 years with two potential construction phases.
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co (generic comments)	<p>Generic comments 12: The proposed scheme will involve surface features for links/joints and other service media o What will the size and construction of these features be? o Can these features be constructed so that they are at field edges?</p>	I	Information regarding jointing bays is included within the Environmental Statement. These will, where possible, be located at or adjacent to field boundaries in line with landowner discussions.
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co on behalf of AV Youngs Ltd	<p>Farming: The farm land is used to grow a full arable rotation including cereals, legumes, oilseeds and high value root crops, such as parsnips, potatoes and carrots. Disturbance to soil structure will compromise productive capacity and versatility of crop. a. It is important that DONG carry out full soil surveys prior to entry to enable proper restoration to take place. Such tests should assess (as a minimum): i. Mineral and Nutrient content ii. Soil composition iii. Pathogen content b. Construction works can result in topsoil 'loss' due to compaction and wash. DONG will need to identify potential donor sites for soils of matching quality in advance of carrying out works. c. Disruption to cropping will result in losses in the works year and subsequent years. DONG will be required to compensate for all losses, both direct and indirect, arising from the works. d. A proposal would be to move the cable corridor to that as shown on the inserted plan marked Blue. e. The proposed cable route passes through 3 principle blocks of land. i. The Northern block is circa 16.60 hectares of arable land with a pit in the middle. The route is show as passing to the east of the pit which is a narrow part of the field and adjacent to dwellings. It is suggested that the route is moved to the west side of the pit where there is more room and greater distance from dwellings. ii. The middle block of land is comprised of circa 47 hectares of arable land in 2 enclosures and a small parcel of grassland used for a campsite. The cable route is currently running through the middle of this field and does not even follow a long-term cropping divide in the field. The cable route is also close to, and partly over, the Baconsthorpe Meadows camp site (more detail below). Is it suggested that the cable route is move to the West of the block so it tracks the route of Back Lane. This will reduce the impact the cable has on the farming of the remainder of the land and will reduce impact on the camp site. iii. The southern block of land is a field of arable land extending to 7.7 hectares. The cable route will render this field mostly unusable during the works and the long-term impacts could be disproportionately high as so much of the field will be excavated. If the cable corridor follows the western side on the middle block this parcel could be untouched, particularly if the woodland at the southern end is drilled under.</p>	Y	<p>Hornsea Three responded to the points raised as follows: a. Agricultural use of land was noted. Soil surveys are not proposed to be undertaken prior to construction. b. Any additional topsoil that needs to be imported following completion of construction will be done so in liaison with the landowner and be of the appropriate type and condition. c. Compensation will be payable for direct loss of crop or inability to crop and subsequent losses on a proven losses basis and on receipt of a claim. d. Proposed route corridor has now been moved further west in accordance with feedback received. e. Route on farm and potential impact noted, updated route should reduce this impact.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>52</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co on behalf of AV Youngs Ltd	<p>Tourism and amenity: The proposed cable route will come within 200m of the principle farmstead of Pitt Farm where there are existing dwellings, proposals for creation of more dwellings in the farm buildings and a thriving campsite.</p> <p>a. To the West of Pitt Farm is a thriving campsite known as Baconsthorpe Meadows</p> <p>i. The campsite is open 1st March to 31st October and will expect to receive more than 1000 arrivals during that time.</p> <p>ii. Average stay is 3 nights with some staying up to 14 nights</p> <p>iii. The campsite is profitable and once the current season ends will be entering a phase of considerable development, investment and expansion of service provision.</p> <p>b. The proposed works corridor includes part of the campsite and therefore even if the cables are laid in the further west extremity of the proposed corridor there will be significant disruption to the campsite.</p> <p>c. The campsite is at a vulnerable stage where it must develop a reputation as a "go to" venue in a highly competitive local marketplace.</p> <p>d. Significant disturbance from cable installation works could lead to negative reviews and the campsite gaining a poor reputation.</p> <p>e. DONG will need to take steps to minimise disturbance including, and not limited to:</p> <p>i. Ensuring vehicular access is always available</p> <p>ii. Not disrupting occupants with noise, dust, smell or lights</p> <p>iii. Investigate moving the cable corridor to the western side of the farm</p> <p>iv. Considering restricted working hours and season in this part of the project.</p>	Y	Hornsea Three acknowledged the details regarding the campsite and the potential impact the cable route adjacent to this could have. The cable corridor was amended accordingly.
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co (generic comments)	<p>Generic comments 1: The current proposal is for an easement width of 60m to accommodate 6 circuits each with one cable in a trench.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Can more cables be put into each trench?</li> <li>o Can there be fewer trenches?</li> <li>o Why does each cable require a 10m sterilisation strip?</li> <li>o Is the optimum economic position being favoured over the optimum environmental position?</li> </ul>	N/A	Each circuit must be located in a separate trench and will require separation between each adjacent trench to allow them to operate at the required capacity. Hornsea Three will potentially install up to 6 cable circuits if it is developed to full capacity. The strip either side of the cables is required in order to protect each circuit from damage, particularly in respect of working above one circuit when digging another. This approach is adopted to ensure the optimum technical solution, not the optimum economic solution.
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co (generic comments)	<p>Generic comments 2: The proposal is for a working width of 80m during installation works</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Is possible to work across the corridor in sequence installing and reinstating one cable at a time so the whole area is not open at one?</li> <li>o Can DONG investigate ways of reducing the scale of the works corridor (width)</li> <li>o Can DONG commit to a methodology that limits the time any one section of corridor is "open"</li> </ul>	N/A	It is likely that one cable circuit will be installed at a time, however the 80m strip, if constructed in one phase, will need to be accessible throughout the construction. If possible, the scale of impact to the land will be reduced, however this cannot be confirmed at this time. Each 'section' will have construction work taking place for up to 3 months.
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co (generic comments)	<p>Generic comments 3: The proposal is for an HVAC system which needs 6 circuits whereas an HVDC system would require fewer circuits and therefore a smaller easement and working area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o What are the reasons for adopting AC over DC?</li> <li>o Is there a significant economic advantage to using a AC system over DC?</li> <li>o Has DONG quantified the differential in environmental impact between adopting AC or DC?</li> </ul>	N/A	Hornsea Three is presenting both options: an AC and DC cable solution, and is showing the worst case scenario width of cable easement accordingly - a decision has not yet been made on technology.
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co (generic comments)	<p>Generic comments 5: Biosecurity during works period is very important for farmers with clean farms and those who have high value crop contracts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o How will biosecurity be managed during the works process?</li> <li>o How will biosecurity be managed if the event of soil import</li> <li>o Will full pre-works surveys be carried out to establish disease status of land?</li> </ul>	I	Construction on land subject to bio-security measures will follow procedures set out in the project's Code of Construction Practice, although once the construction corridor has been installed, this would be a separate work area and measures would be reduced, if appropriate. Any additional topsoil that needs to be imported following completion of construction will be done so in liaison with the landowner and be of the appropriate type and condition. Surveys to assess potential disease of land will not be undertaken prior to construction, this is the landowners obligation.



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>52</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co (generic comments)	<p>Generic comments 1: The current proposal is for an easement width of 60m to accommodate 6 circuits each with one cable in a trench.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Can more cables be put into each trench?</li> <li>o Can there be fewer trenches?</li> <li>o Why does each cable require a 10m sterilisation strip?</li> <li>o Is the optimum economic position being favoured over the optimum environmental position?</li> </ul>	N/A	Each circuit must be located in a separate trench and will require separation between each adjacent trench to allow them to operate at the required capacity. Hornsea Three will potentially install up to 6 cable circuits if it is developed to full capacity. The strip either side of the cables is required in order to protect each circuit from damage, particularly in respect of working above one circuit when digging another. This approach is adopted to ensure the optimum technical solution, not the optimum economic solution.
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co (generic comments)	<p>Generic comments 10: The proposed corridor crosses areas that have realistic potential for development to alternative uses other than agriculture. Due to the current situation with housing supply shortage in a number of District Councils land that is outside of Settlement Boundaries is successfully being allocated for residential and commercial development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Will an uplift payment be made available where it can be shown that land has a reasonable prospect of being developed during the lifetime of the scheme but has otherwise been sterilised by the scheme?</li> <li>o Has the route of the corridor taken into consideration pre-planning option agreements and development proposals?</li> </ul>	I	Hornsea Three confirmed that should there be any evidence of likely development of land that is intersected by the proposed cable corridor, this should be presented during the negotiation of Heads of Terms for the Option Agreement in order for a development uplift clause to be considered. The cable corridor has taken into account existing development proposals, where this information is available.
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co (generic comments)	<p>Generic comments 11: The potential working period for the scheme is 11 years.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Why is it considered by DONG to be reasonable to take this long?</li> <li>o How would a staged development look in real terms on the ground?</li> </ul>	Y	Hornsea Three confirmed that this has now been reduced to 8 years and two possible construction phases.
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co (generic comments)	<p>Generic comments 12: The proposed scheme will involve surface features for links/joints and other service media</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o What will the size and construction of these features be?</li> <li>o Can these features be constructed so that they are at field edges?</li> </ul>	I	Information regarding jointing bays is included in the Environmental Statement. These will, where possible, be located at or adjacent to field boundaries in line with landowner discussions.
Jonathan Rush, Brown and Co, on behalf of Easton Estate/Honingham Aketieselskab	<p>Farming : The farm land is used to grow a full arable rotation including cereals, legumes, oilseeds and high value root crops, such as parsnips, potatoes and carrots. Disturbance to soil structure will compromise productive capacity and versatility of cropping.</p> <p>a. It is important that DONG carry out full soil surveys prior to entry to enable proper restoration to take place. Such tests should assess (as a minimum):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Mineral and Nutrient content</li> <li>ii. Soil composition</li> <li>iii. Pathogen content</li> </ol> <p>b. Construction works can result in topsoil 'loss' due to compaction and wash. DONG will need to identify potential donor sites for soils of matching quality in advance of carrying out works.</p> <p>c. Disruption to cropping will result in losses in the works year and subsequent years. DONG will be required to compensate for all losses, both direct and indirect, arising from the works.</p> <p>d. Arable land is drained in places with plastic pipe and shingle underdrains. DONG will need to carry out a full pre-works schedule of drainage installations and undertake to repair and alter the schemes as required.</p> <p>e. Irrigation is supplied to the farm via a mains system that is fed from a reservoir located to the West of the proposed corridor. DONG will be required to protect the main from damage and where require provide, or cover the cost of, diverting the main to ensure cropping is not interrupted. Any losses arising from inability to effectively utilise irrigation to be compensated for by DONG.</p>	I	<p>Hornsea Three responded the Easton Estate's comments as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Soil surveys will not be undertaken prior to construction.</li> <li>b. Any additional topsoil that must be imported following completion of construction will be done so in liaison with the landowner and be of the appropriate type and condition.</li> <li>c. Compensation will be payable for direct loss of crop or inability to crop and subsequent losses on a proven losses basis and on receipt of a claim.</li> <li>d. An independent land drainage consultant will be appointed in order to consider and design pre and post drainage solutions where required. Copies of any available land drainage plans were requested.</li> <li>e. Routes or plans of irrigation systems in place were requested in order for this to be considered accordingly. Compensation will be payable for any losses or disruption on proven loss basis and on receipt of a claim.</li> </ol>



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>52</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Jonathan Rush, Brown and Co, on behalf of Easton Estate/Honingham Aketieselskab	<p>Sporting Activity: The Estate operates commercial sporting activities which generates revenue, creates employment and is a strong driver for the conservation works on the Estate. The following issues arise:</p> <p>a. The installation process will disrupt the infrastructure of the principle activities.</p> <p>b. Disturbance to the wildlife will compromise the effectiveness of activities.</p> <p>c. The commercial reputation of the sporting enterprises could be damaged by poorly managed works.</p> <p>d. Construction works will need to be timed and organised in such a way as to avoid sensitive seasons to avoid long disturbance of sporting activities</p> <p>DONG will need to ensure that works plans allow for these sporting activities in order to minimise disturbance and loss.</p>	I	Hornsea Three acknowledges the presence of shooting on the land over winter months. Due to weather at this time of year, work may already be restricted in some cases or areas. Hornsea Three cannot commit to working outside of the shooting season only, although will endeavour to minimise the impact to the Estate and shoot where possible. Compensation will be payable on a proven loss basis and on receipt of a claim, however we also acknowledge additional discussions may be required in advance of work commencing in order to assist with planning of the shoot.
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co (generic comments)	<p>Generic comments 2:</p> <p>The proposal is for a working width of 80m during installation works</p> <p>o Is possible to work across the corridor in sequence installing and reinstating one cable at a time so the whole area is not open at one?</p> <p>o Can DONG investigate ways of reducing the scale of the works corridor (width)</p> <p>o Can DONG commit to a methodology that limits the time any one section of corridor is "open".</p>	N/A	It is likely that one cable circuit will be installed at a time, however the 80 m strip, if constructed in one phase, will need to be accessible throughout the construction. If possible, the scale of impact to the land will be reduced, however this cannot be confirmed at this time. Each 'section' will have construction work taking place for up to 3 months.
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co (generic comments)	<p>Generic comments 3:</p> <p>The proposal is for an HVAC system which needs 6 circuits whereas an HVDC system would require fewer circuits and therefore a smaller easement and working area.</p> <p>o What are the reasons for adopting AC over DC?</p> <p>o Is there a significant economic advantage to using a AC system over DC?</p> <p>o Has DONG quantified the differential in environmental impact between adopting AC or DC?</p>	N/A	The project is investigating both options, an AC and DC cable solution, and is showing the worst case scenario width of cable easement accordingly - a decision has not yet been made on technology.
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co (generic comments)	<p>Generic comments 5:</p> <p>Biosecurity during works period is very important for farmers with clean farms and those who have high value crop contracts</p> <p>o How will biosecurity be managed during the works process?</p> <p>o How will biosecurity be managed if the event of soil import</p> <p>o Will full pre-works surveys be carried out to establish disease status of land?</p>	I	Construction on land subject to bio-security measures will follow procedures set out in the project's Code of Construction Practice, although once the construction corridor has been installed, this would be a separate work area and measures would be reduced, if appropriate. Any additional topsoil that needs to be imported following completion of construction will be done so in liaison with the landowner and be of the appropriate type and condition. Surveys to assess potential disease of land will not be undertaken prior to construction, this is the landowners obligation.
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co (generic comments)	<p>Generic comments 6:</p> <p>Installation works will severely disrupt soil profiles with potential long-term impact</p> <p>o Will full soil profile surveys be carried out before works are undertaken?</p> <p>o What is the proposed specification of soil surveys?</p>	N	Hornsea Three confirmed that soils will not be tested prior to work commencing.
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co (generic comments)	<p>Generic comments 8:</p> <p>Many fields have services underground including water and electricity supplied</p> <p>o Will full pre-works surveys be carried out to establish the infrastructure that is in place?</p> <p>o Can it be confirmed that any interruption to services and any associated losses incurred, if any, will be compensated at the time?</p>	I	Full utility searches along the corridor have been undertaken, these records will be maintained and updated up to and during construction. Compensation will be paid on a proven loss basis and on receipt of a claim.
Mr & Mrs Wharton	Text received to RICGR mobile, following consultation event at Weybourne:- Hi Richard, Further to recent conversation, I must add that soundproof fencing along the proposed new road would be of great benefit to us. I will add this to my email feedback. Kind Regards. Annemarie Wharton	Y	Hornsea Three confirmed that the proposed alternative road in question was dropped from the scheme
Mr & Mrs Wharton	Further Text received to RICGR mobile, following day:- Thank you. Steve's feedback is that the proposed roadway would be a massive security issue for us. You would expose us to thieves and our privacy would be gone. You would need 12 foot high manned locked gates on the road junction. This option would be worse than the use of Muckleburgh Lane. Kind Regards. Annemarie and Steve.	Y	Hornsea Three confirmed that the proposed alternative road in question was dropped from the scheme

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>52</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Mr & Mrs Wharton	With regard to the impact to us of latest plans for the landfall and cable route, here are the points discussed at the Holt Event on 14th September:- 1. The proposed temporary access road to the east of Foxhills would be devastating to our security and privacy. Our pitches nearby would lose their view and peaceful atmosphere. It would be a nightmare for our neighbours and Weybourne in general with huge lorries turning into the narrow A149. If the village realised it was created for our benefit, they would rightly be extremely angry with us. We most strongly object to this plan.	Y	Hornsea Three confirmed that the proposed alternative road in question was dropped from the scheme
Mr & Mrs Wharton	2. If the cable is laid across our campsite, it will prevent use of that area for tents. No one will want to sleep 1.5 metres above a major electricity cable.	Y	Hornsea Three confirmed that the cable route has been amended to avoid any land owned by the Wharton's
Mr & Mrs Wharton	6. We understand the 11 years period is a maximum, with work being carried out in phases within that limit. We may then be able to continue trading if the traffic intensity is limited to short periods.	Y	Hornsea Three confirmed that the possible phasing of the project has now been reduced to two potential phases, and a subsequent maximum construction period of 8 years. This period includes the construction of all offshore elements of the project, with onshore work taking a maximum of 3 years per phase to complete.
Mr & Mrs Wharton	All our concerns raised at the first consultation event last year also still apply. Thank you for your efforts to minimise the impact of the project on our property and business.  Note: The Wharton's also called our Agent, Dalcour Macalaren to raise these concerns on 1 August 2017 - Dalcour Maclaren noted and fed back these concerns to DONG/Orsted.	N/A	Hornsea Three acknowledged the response, no further action was required.
Taylor Wimpey	Advised parcel of land off Colney Lane is designated for Sport/Formal Recreation, Allotments and Retained Hethersett Town FC land No proposed housing in this area to be affected  1. Confirm if 80m corridor impacts land boundaries.	Y	Refined 80 m corridor now avoids this land in question, but still intersects strip of land owned by Taylor Wimpey on north-western side of Colney Lane.
<b>Section 47: Duty to consult local community</b>			
Ann Abbott	13. I am in favour of the course running west of the village at Kelling Hard providing it skirts residents homes, the museum, and Kelling Hotel, as it will not impede the Beck stream in Weybourne village which is a rare chalk stream (b) the village should not be disrupted so much (c) it should not affect the tourists coming to the beach or walkers along the coastal path, visitors to the Museum, Hotels B and Bs - although I don't know about the fishermen.	Y	Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport confirms that traffic does not need to travel through Kelling. Construction traffic associated with the proposed works will travel along A149 through to Weybourne and utilise the haul road constructed as part of the cable installation works which will extend between A149 and Holgate Hill (and ensure that construction vehicle associated with the project can travel off the public highway network).  Impacts relating to hydrology, recreational users and tourism are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapters 2: Hydrology and Flood risk; chapter 6: Land Use and Recreation and chapter 10: socio-economics respectively.
Beverley Wigg	The disruption caused by both the cable route and the booster station are unacceptable in this rural landscape, which is also happens to be an important area for tourism especially self catering cottages and B&B style accommodation.	I	Potential impacts associated with Hornsea Three, particularly the onshore cable corridor and the HVAC booster station are addressed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement.  The potential for impacts to interact and impact tourism is addressed in Environmental Statement Volume 3, Chapter 10: Socio-economics, whilst impacts on recreational resources are addressed in volume 6: Land Use and Recreation. The former concludes that there would be no significant effects on tourism as a result of Hornsea Three.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>52</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Susan Allen	<p>Following my attendance at the Reepham Drop In, the main points I would like to feed back to you regarding the Hornsea Three Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The disruption caused by both the cable route and the booster station are unacceptable in this rural landscape, in an area which is very important for tourism – including self-catering cottages and B&amp;B style accommodation – farming and community leisure.</li> </ul>	I	<p>Potential impacts associated with Hornsea Three, particularly the onshore cable corridor and the HVAC booster station are addressed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement.</p> <p>The potential for impacts to interact and impact tourism is addressed in Environmental Statement Volume 3, Chapter 10: Socio-economics, whilst impacts on recreational resources are addressed in volume 6: Land Use and Recreation. The former concludes that there would be no significant effects on tourism as a result of Hornsea Three.</p> <p>In respect to agricultural use, during the construction phase, there would be a permanent loss of land predominantly associated with the onshore HVAC booster station and onshore HVDC converter/HVAC substation, together with the temporary loss of the “best and most versatile” agricultural land along the Hornsea Three onshore cable corridor. Following the completion of the construction phase or phases and the restoration of temporarily affected land to its former agricultural use, as far as possible. An assessment of the effects of this on both agricultural land classification as well as farming operations are presented in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 6: Land Use and Recreation.</p>
David Ramsbotham	<p>You may recall our correspondence when I was the Norfolk County Councillor for the Melton Constable Division. I confirm that the various issues raised are still of concern to me as a resident of the area. In particular I feel that the onshore HVAC booster station should be avoided at all costs. This would create an unacceptable industrial blot on the landscape affecting the environment for local residents and tourism which is the life blood of the area.</p>	N	<p>Potential impacts associated with Hornsea Three, particularly the onshore cable corridor and the HVAC booster station are addressed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement.</p> <p>The potential for impacts to interact and impact tourism is addressed in Environmental Statement Volume 3, Chapter 10: Socio-economics, whilst impacts on recreational resources are addressed in volume 6: Land Use and Recreation. The former concludes that there would be no significant effects on tourism as a result of Hornsea Three.</p> <p>The need for the HVAC booster station is set out in the Environment Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>52</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Friends of North Norfolk	<p>17. PEIR Volume 3, which deals with onshore impacts. We have great concerns that the additional cables, very large offshore and onshore Reactive Compensation Installations and works which would be required if HVAC Transmission is used would have a major adverse impact on very sensitive Receptors taken cumulatively with other major developments, either recently completed or proposed. Both the Dudgeon and Sheringham Shoal Wind Farms make landfall at Weybourne; and if HVAC Transmission is utilised it will mean more and very much greater works over a prolonged period both to the East and West affecting a key part of the Norfolk Coast AONB, Norfolk Heritage Coast and the Norfolk/ English National Trail.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Chapter 4 Landscape and Visual Resources.</li> <li>- Chapter 5 Historic Environment.</li> <li>- Chapter 6 Land Use and Recreation.</li> <li>- Chapter 8 Noise and Vibration.</li> <li>- Chapter 11 Inter Related Effects.</li> </ul>	I	<p>An assessment of impacts on the AONB is presented in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources. To inform this process, Hornsea Three has consulted with the Norfolk Coast Partnership, as well as local authorities, in regard to the identification of suitable viewpoints within the AONB.</p> <p>Where the onshore cable corridor crossed public rights of way, Hornsea Three has sought to avoid impacts through the use of HDD technology. Where this has not been possible and thus open cut, or HDD with a haul road over, is proposed, the routes will be temporarily diverted along existing tracks, for a maximum of one month per cable. Following the completion of the construction works all areas of access land, recreational resources, PRoWs and other linear routes affected by the onshore works would be re-instated to their current condition and/or along their current alignments. There would be no physical effects on these resources arising from the operation or maintenance of Hornsea Three. The measures to be taken to ensure the continued use of all linear recreational resources during the construction phase of the project have been discussed with Norfolk County Council and are set out in the Outline CoCP. This dialogue will continue during the detailed design process. The assessment of impacts on individual public rights of way (where appropriate) are set out in Environmental Statement, volume 3, chapter 6: Land Use and Recreation.</p> <p>Following the completion of the construction works all areas of access land, recreational resources, PRoWs and other linear routes affected by the onshore works would be re-instated to their current condition and/or along their current alignments. There would be no physical effects on these resources arising from the operation or maintenance of Hornsea Three. The measures to be taken to ensure the continued use of all linear recreational resources during the construction phase of the project have been discussed with Norfolk County Council and are set out in the Outline CoCP. This dialogue will continue during the detailed design process.</p> <p>The potential for cumulative effects as a result Hornsea Three in combination with other major developments is assessed in each of the topic chapters of the Environmental Statement (see volume 3).</p>
Anthony Thomas	I have control over land in Weston Longville. I understand you are considering a "construction compound". I am wondering if the supply of land might be something we could help you with. Perhaps you will give this matter some thought?	Y	This alternative was considered by the project, but the Main Construction Compound proposed near Weston Longville has not been taken forward to the application. The Main Construction Compound for the project will be located at Oulton Airfield, accessed off the B1149.
Robert and Jane Scarfe	We object to these cables passing very close to our homes and those of our neighbours on the Great Melton Road. In our view Little Melton has absolutely nothing to gain and potentially everything to lose. We attended a meeting hosted by Dong for affected parish councils where we asked questions. The six spaced trenches on the Parochial Charity field seem likely to take up the entire width of the field between the Crusaders Rugby Club and Great Melton Road.	N	Noted and yes, the cables do take up the majority of the field between Great Melton Road and the rugby club. The difficulty of routing through this area is described further below.
Robert and Jane Scarfe	Parochial charity land beside Great Melton Road And we would ask the Parochial Charity to consider whether they have the right, given their duty to do good for Little Melton parishioners, to subject village residents to potential health risk and audiological nuisance. It would also constrain future use of the land, which may breach their duty and obligations as Trustees. We would also like to know what Dong are proposing to pay for wayleave and what they would do with the money. In this instance we consider the Trustees of the charity owe full transparency to the village in general and the residents of Great Melton Road in particular.	N	The Parochial Charity will be approached for a voluntary landowner agreement between Orsted and themselves on standard terms, which are confidential. However, the project will also seek compulsory acquisition powers to use the land in the event that an agreement cannot be reached.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>52</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Rt Hon Norman Lamb MP	Most people I speak to support the idea of offshore wind energy but are concerned about the industrial sites that will be created if the company uses an AC current along the cable.	I	Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts to local residential receptors, either through site selection/route refinement or through the identification of suitable mitigation measures. Where there are impacts to residential receptors, these are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3), for example noise during the operation of the HVDC converter/HVAC substation is addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 8: Noise and Vibration.
Rt Hon Norman Lamb MP	They also have misgivings, which I share, about the plans for a phased delivery of the project that could last for nearly a decade. Were that to happen it would have a major adverse effect on residents' lives, livelihoods- especially fishing and tourism- and environment and a lasting impact on transport infrastructure, wider tourism, flora and fauna.	Y	During the design refinement Hornsea Three has sought to minimise the duration of any disruption, and has reduced the total number of phases from three to two, and reduced the duration of the construction phase onshore from eleven to eight years.  Potential impacts from Hornsea Three on socio-economic and tourism are identified and assessed in Environmental Statement Volume 3, Chapter 10: Socio-Economics. Taking into consideration the mitigation designed into Hornsea Three, no significant adverse effects are predicted.  Impacts from Hornsea Three on transport and ecological receptors are assessed in Environment Statement volume 3, chapters 7: Traffic and Transport and chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation. Inter-related effects on local residents, as a result of impact interactions, are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 11: Inter-related Effects.
Anna Brookman, Strutt & Parker LLP (general comments)	How will soil storage and reinstatement be carried out, and will there be active weed control Our clients have worked hard to ensure that their soils are in the best condition possible in order to allow them to farm productively. It is there for essential that op and subsoil are stored separately and reinstated in the correct manner. A detail specification should be provided detailing how the soil will be moved, stored and replaced.	I	Soil storage and reinstatement are covered within the Environmental Statement, and will be refined once a construction contractor has been appointed by Ørsted.
Anna Brookman, Strutt & Parker LLP (general comments)	Our clients are long term land owners and cropping and grazing rotations are planned many years in advance. A project of this scale can be incorporated within this management schedule provided that the information required from the developers is provided as early as viably possible with as much details as is available. This will ensure that their businesses can continue to function well and would strengthen the relationship between the developers and occupiers, creating a better working relationship.	N/A	Indicative timescales of the earliest work could commence have been provided. Following an award of a DCO and CfD subsidies, more accurate timescales will be available and provided to landowners and agents accordingly.
Anna Brookman, Strutt & Parker LLP (general comments)	Details of the link box locations and their distance from the junction bays The maximum size specification of each of these has been provided in the PEIR documents, however, there is no reference to their locality to each other. These are permanent fixtures and although there is stated intention of installing them in field boundaries, there is the possibility that cable lengths will not accommodate this. More information on this would be greatly appreciated by the land occupying community to enable us to best plan how to work with the permanent infrastructure left on the surface.	I	Hornsea Three confirmed the location of the joint bays and link boxes will only be able to be confirmed once a DCO has been granted, cable design confirmed and order, and a construction contractor appointed. Link boxes will be located on field boundaries, where possible, and in line with landowner discussions in order to minimise the impact to ongoing agricultural operations.
Anna Brookman, Strutt & Parker LLP (general comments)	How will the project installation be phased A provisional indication on how many stages the project will be installed in, how long it is intended for trenches to remain open and how the commissioning work will be undertaken would enable us to better advise our clients on land management during the works.	Y	Hornsea Three confirmed the project could now be constructed in a maximum of two phases as opposed to three. Trenches themselves are likely to only remain open for a number of days whilst the cables, or ducting, is installed and then backfilled. The joint bays will be open for longer periods of time to allow jointing and commissioning work to be completed.



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>52</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Anna Brookman, Strutt & Parker LLP (general comments)	How will the corridor be fenced, when will this be constructed, what access will be required to the corridor and how will occupiers cross the corridor No information regarding this is easily identifiable within the PEIR document, but this will be the first part of the construction project to directly affect the land owners and occupiers. Information relating to how early in the construction phase the fencing will be installed and how long it will remain in place would be gratefully received by the occupiers. This will assist in the ongoing land management plans, and enable our clients to alter cropping and grazing rotations to accommodate the project rather than be disrupted by it. It would be beneficial for there to be access points across the cable corridor which can be used whilst an area is not under construction. This will enable the impact of the development to be minimised.	I	Fencing requirements and specification will be determined once construction methods and contractor appointment are further developed. (NOTE: some sections of working corridor may not be fenced for access, egress or for other engineering reasons). Crossing points may be possible along the working corridor by request where these are feasible and suitable.
Anna Brookman, Strutt & Parker LLP (general comments)	When and how will the aspects of the PEIR document which are currently marked as "lack of data" and "not fully evaluated" be updated These terms are used extensively throughout the documents and leave a number of gaps in the information. Proceeding without having collected sufficient data and fully evaluated the aspects which require it will surely lead to issues further down the project timeline which could have been avoided.	N/A	These sections will be updated and included within the DCO application.
Anna Brookman, Strutt & Parker LLP (general comments)	The specific concerns of the clients we are representing are as follows: Will the cables will be ducted or not A number of our clients are concerned about the possibility that unducted cables may cause localised ground warming which would affect soil health and plant growth. Because of this, clarity on whether or not the cables which will be installed by the developer are going to be ducted would be appreciated.	I	The possibility of ducting should have minimal impact on any possible localised heat released from the cables. Confirmation on whether the cables will be ducted or not will be confirmed following granting of the DCO.
National Farmers Union (NFU)	The National Farmers Union represents over 47,000 farmers and growers across England and Wales. NFU members will be affected in Norfolk from the proposed onshore cables which will connect the offshore wind farm to either an high voltage direct current (HVDC) converter station or a high voltage alternating current (HVAC) substation. This will then connect in to the National Grid substation. Our members have a number of concerns and issues with the proposals of the onshore cables which are highlighted below:	N/A	Hornsea Three noted the comments, but no further action was required
National Farmers Union (NFU)	Conclusion Due to the lack of information and consultation the NFU requests that further specific one to one meetings are held for landowners, farmers and their agents to provide the information required. The NFU would also like to have a meeting direct with Dong Energy and their agents to discuss all of the issues/concerns highlighted above.	Y	Hornsea Three confirmed that individual landowner discussions will continue throughout the process and the NFU will be invited to general meetings/updates throughout the process as well.
National Farmers Union (NFU)	AC v DC Cables: It is our understanding that the cables will come inland at Weybourne on the north Norfolk Coast and the cable corridor will run to the National Grid substation at Norwich Main (just south of Norwich). It has been highlighted that the cables could be either HVDC, HVAC or a combination of both. This will involve building a booster station and converter substation. The NFU would like to receive further information as to why the cables cannot be HVDC as it is understood that less land will be required to lay the cables, the easement width required will be less and so have less impact on agricultural businesses and no link boxes are required with HVDC. This further reduces the disturbance and impact on agricultural operations. It is being said that the only reason for not laying HVDC cables is the cost. The NFU would like for this to be qualified. It is not acceptable for a greater easement with restrictions to be taken for HVAC cables due to the cost of the cables and laying the cables	N	Hornsea Three confirmed it is investigating both options, an AC and/or DC cable solution, and is showing the worst case scenario width of cable easement accordingly - a decision has not yet been made on technology. The construction corridor will be up to 80 m in width.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>52</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
National Farmers Union (NFU)	<p>Booster Station</p> <p>The NFU would like further clarification as to why the proposed Booster station is not being built on a brown field site? Whilst the cost of this may be greater for Dong Energy, there would be significantly less impact on farmers and their agricultural businesses.</p>	N	The HVAC Booster Station must be located along the route of the cables, which are routed through rural areas in order to avoid impacting built up and urban areas. Brownfield sites were investigated but were ruled out an early stage for this reason.
National Farmers Union (NFU)	<p>Construction</p> <p>The project involves laying 6 large cable ducts over a width of 60 metres along some of the most productive Grade 1, 2 and 3a land classification farmland in Norfolk. The ducts will be buried so most farming operations can take place on top of them, but as set out below, farmers are extremely concerned about the depth that cables will be buried. Further clarification and detail is requested on the depth of the cables?</p> <p>There is concern over how the cables will be laid, the actual construction technique used. Details are requested on open cut and directional drilling? Will the cables be ducted and if not why not?</p>	I	Hornsea Three confirmed that some of the construction decisions mentioned will not be made until a later date, however the Environmental Statement will set out the worst-case project proposals for each technique, so that landowners will be fully informed.
National Farmers Union (NFU)	<p>Jointing bays</p> <p>It is understood from other projects that 'Jointing Bays' should be all underground and will not interfere with agricultural operations. Confirmation of this would be gratefully received.</p>	N/A	Hornsea Three confirmed that jointing bays will all be located underground.
National Farmers Union (NFU)	<p>Link boxes.</p> <p>It is understood that link boxes will be needed if the cables are HVAC cables and they are normally placed at least every 600 to 800 metres on a cable run. Clarification is needed on how many link boxes will be needed at the end of every run? Link boxes do stand proud above ground level and so greatly interfere with agricultural operations and are a hazard to farm machinery. It is requested that link boxes where possible are located in field boundaries or field corners to reduce the interference on farming operations. However, we suspect that they will be placed where the cable runs out, i.e. literally every 600 to 800 metres along the route. This will inevitably mean that most of the link boxes will be in fields and subject to damage and extra costs for farmers in avoiding them and not cropping areas of land around the obstruction. It is extremely important to have further design information on link boxes and the siting of them. This includes will any link boxes be located in a cluster and how will they be marked/identified/fenced.</p>	I	The location of the joint bays and link boxes will only be able to be confirmed once a DCO has been granted, cable design has been confirmed, and a construction contractor appointed. Link boxes will be located on field boundaries, where possible, and in line with landowner discussions in order to minimise the impact to ongoing agricultural operations.
National Farmers Union (NFU)	<p>Time to Construct</p> <p>The underground infrastructure of these cables and the construction required to lay these cables will be some of the largest infrastructure some farmers will experience through their land and others are now only to aware from farmers who have been affected by other schemes of how big these developments are and the interference caused. Projects of this size normally take around four and a half years to complete but it is stated that this development may take eleven years to fully construct. A construction timetable needs to be clarified as it is not acceptable for a farm to lose a large strip of land from agricultural production for eleven years. It is likely that some farm businesses will not be able to sustain losing land for that length of time</p>	Y	Hornsea Three could now be constructed in a maximum of two phases as opposed to three. Trenches themselves are likely to only remain open for a number of days whilst the cables, or ducting, is installed with these then being backfilled. The joint bays will be open for longer periods of time to allow jointing and commissioning work to be completed.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>52</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
National Farmers Union (NFU)	<p>Land (Field) Drainage and Soils</p> <p>The major potential lasting damage is to land drainage systems and soils structure. One of the main reasons for the productive land the cable duct route is going through is that the farms are very well drained by a network of clay or plastic land drains laid in parallel every 20 metres or so across the field at depths of up to 1.8 metres draining into a field edge ditch or dyke. These drainage systems prevent water pooling in fields and increase the productive capacity of the agriculture in the area. Good land drainage increases farm productivity by keeping waterlogging to a minimum, increasing soil strength by reducing water content, gives higher soil temperatures and leads to more efficient use of applied fertilisers. According to the Agricultural Notebook the yield advantage for most crops when comparing drained and undrained treatments is typically 10 to 25 per cent.</p> <p>Assuming land drains are laid every 20 metres in farmland (they are laid more closely in some cases) and assuming the whole route is farmland, which it is not, but it mainly is, the cable ducts/trenches will cut thousands of land drains in six places for each land drain.</p> <p>Major pipeline constructors will cut a trench and the land drains then place the pipeline in the trench and re-connect the land drains above the pipe. It is a drainage rule of thumb that with a major pipeline one in every six land drains does not work after the soil is replaced around the pipe. This will not just affect the 60 metre working width but could potentially affect the whole field where the cable duct goes through and therefore every arable field along the route.</p>	I	An independent land drainage consultant will be appointed in order to consider and design pre and post drainage solutions where required.
National Farmers Union (NFU)	<p>Clarification is needed as to whether Dong Energy will lay the cable duct below or above field drainage systems. In some cases this implies laying the cable duct at a depth of 2 metres or more.</p> <p>The NFU would like to agree standard terms of how field drainage will be treated in principle on every farm and for this wording to be taken forward and included in the Development Consent Order. The wording normally covers before, during and after construction. It will be important in places for field drainage to take place outside of the order limits and this will need to be agreed along with a local drainage consultant being taken on by Dong Energy.</p>	I	An independent land drainage consultant will be appointed in order to consider and design pre and post drainage solutions where required.
Hugh Guyatt	<p><b>Temporary Construction</b> - Beach Road car park at Weybourne cannot be used. This would hit local people and the holiday businesses on which depend for our income.</p>	Y	The beach road car park is not under consideration as a construction compound. Furthermore it is noted that, since the PEIR, a refined landfall location has been identified (western re-route around Kelling) and the area identified for landfall works has reduced. This was informed by a number of factors including community feedback in the area of Kelling and Weybourne, avoidance of the Kelling Heath SSSI/CWS and Holiday Park as well as engineering/technical considerations.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>52</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Pat Floyd	<p><b>Local Matters Landfall</b> - The coastal path is an important tourist attraction. The car park does sometimes flood but steps are being taken to avoid that. However, if the car park is to be used for excavation equipment and heavy lorries nobody including local fisherman will be able to use it in any way.</p>	I	<p>The Peddar's Way and North Norfolk Coast Path which joins the England Coast Path to the east of Weybourne will be maintained along its existing alignment should HDD be used in the Hornsea Three landfall area. If open trenching is used the route will be temporarily diverted along existing tracks to the immediate south, for a maximum of three months, on up to two occasions. This dedicated route would be robustly fenced and gated in accordance with the Outline CoCP and PRoW Management Plan and the specific measures set out in a Coastal and Beach Access Management Plan to be developed in consultation with, and agreed with Norfolk County Council.</p> <p>Following the completion of the construction works all areas of access land, recreational resources, PRoWs and other linear routes affected by the onshore works would be re-instated to their current condition and/or along their current alignments. There would be no physical effects on these resources arising from the operation or maintenance of Hornsea Three. The measures to be taken to ensure the continued use of all linear recreational resources during the construction phase of the project have been discussed with Norfolk County Council and are set out in the Outline CoCP. This dialogue will continue during the detailed design process.</p> <p>Impacts on the PRoW are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 6: Land Use and Recreation, whilst the corresponding impact on tourism is assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 10: Socio-Economics.</p> <p>In respect to the beach road car park, this is not under consideration as a construction compound and as such would not be directly impacted by Hornsea Three.</p>
Peter Halls	<p><b>Onshore Cable Corridor</b> - I notice that you are using maps over 30 years old. There is now a caravan site at Station Road Attlebridge not marked.</p>	I	<p>Hornsea Three has sought to use recent maps, where they are available at the required scale. In respect to the caravan site at Station Road Attlebridge, this is shown on the plans which accompany the DCO application and the onshore cable corridor route passes to the west of the site.</p>
Roger Hughes	<p><b>Temporary Construction</b> - It must be restored to its original land use and condition.</p>	I	<p>Prior to construction commencing a Schedule of Condition of the land will be taken and following the completion of the construction works all land directly impacted by the onshore works would be re-instated to their current condition. Details on impacts to existing land use, and commitments relating to their restoration, are set out Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 6: Land Use and Recreation.</p>
Ray Bennett	<p><b>HVAC</b> - As the North Norfolk coast is an AONB will it be possible to bury the stations and return the landscape back to here if was with a small access point?</p>	I	<p>Impacts relating to landscape and visual resources are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual resources. Particular consideration has been given to the AONB as a sensitive receptor, and it is noted that Hornsea Three has consulted with the Norfolk Coast Partnership to agree viewpoints to inform the assessment of impacts on the AONB.</p> <p>Consideration was given to a wide range of potential mitigation in respect to landscape and visual effects of Hornsea Three. The lowering of the HVDC converter/HVAC substation below current ground level was one option which was considered; however, given that multiple underground cables need to connect into this infrastructure, this option would have had significant implications for the depth of cable trenches and thus earthworks needed along a length of the onshore cable corridor. Based on this, Hornsea Three has implemented a range of other mitigation measures which are set out in Environmental Statement Volume 3, Chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Effects. For example, it is recognised that the onshore HVAC booster station and onshore HVDC converter/HVAC substation would not be screened entirely by existing landform or vegetation in some views. As such, an indicative landscape strategy has been developed to assist in mitigating visual and landscape impacts. This is presented in the outline Landscape Management Plan which accompanies the DCO application.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>52</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Ray Bennett	<b>Temporary Construction</b> - None - as long as they are returned to how it was before	I	Prior to construction commencing a Schedule of Condition of the land will be taken and following the completion of the construction works all land directly impacted by the onshore works would be re-instated to their current condition. Details on impacts to existing land use, and commitments relating to their restoration, are set out Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 6: Land Use and Recreation.
George Francis - Swardeston Village Hall	<b>Mitigation Measures</b> - Strong measure for screening, please	Y	Appropriate mitigation measures for visual disturbance are outlined in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources. This includes, for example, the restoration of habitats (including hedgerows) which cannot be avoided and landscape planting around the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application. In addition, areas for potential screening have been included around both the HVAC booster station and HVDC converter/HVAC substation.
Elaine Parkinson	<b>HVAC</b> - Very concerned about potential noise from the transformers once they are commissioned and active. All possible noise/vibration reduction should be employed from the outset (i.e. not considered too difficult once the substation has been built. evert system for noise mitigation must be employed. Public footpaths and farm access (for walkers) must be reinstated and think about creating new ones. Donation to Swardeston and Swainsthorpe community development buildings would be nice	I	<p>Impacts relating to noise from the construction and operation of Hornsea Three, including at the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation sites, are reported in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 8: Noise and Vibration. As part of a suite of mitigation measures (see chapter 8: Noise and Vibration), an operational noise management plan will be prepared and agreed with the local environmental health officer.</p> <p>Following the completion of the construction works all areas of access land, recreational resources, PRoWs and other linear routes affected by the onshore works would be re-instated to their current condition and/or along their current alignments. There would be no physical effects on these resources arising from the operation or maintenance of Hornsea Three. The measures to be taken to ensure the continued use of all linear recreational resources during the construction phase of the project have been discussed with Norfolk County Council and are set out in the Outline CoCP which forms part of the DCO application. This dialogue will continue during the detailed design process.</p> <p>We have established voluntary Community Benefit Funds (CBFs) for a number of our projects, which are currently under construction. These funds can make a valuable contribution to the local area, by supporting projects such as community building improvements and recreation facilities, conservation and wildlife projects etc. Hornsea Project Three will review the interactions of the project, as the proposal is refined and consider an appropriate way to feed benefits back into the local community. However, any decision to establish a community benefit fund for Hornsea Three would be made post financial investment decision (FID).</p>
Sue Lowther	<b>Local Matters Landfall Zone</b> - Peddlars Way and the Norfolk coastal path are very important and should be protected at all costs	I	<p>The Peddar's Way and North Norfolk Coast Path which joins the England Coast Path to the east of Weybourne will be maintained along its existing alignment should HDD be used in the Hornsea Three landfall area. If open trenching is used the route will be temporarily diverted along existing tracks to the immediate south, for a maximum of three months, on up to two occasions. This dedicated route would be robustly fenced and gated in accordance with the Outline CoCP and PRoW Management Plan and the specific measures set out in a Coastal and Beach Access Management Plan to be developed in consultation with, and agreed with Norfolk County Council.</p> <p>Following the completion of the construction works all areas of access land, recreational resources, PRoWs and other linear routes affected by the onshore works would be re-instated to their current condition and/or along their current alignments. There would be no physical effects on these resources arising from the operation or maintenance of Hornsea Three. The measures to be taken to ensure the continued use of all linear recreational resources during the construction phase of the project have been discussed with Norfolk County Council and are set out in the Outline CoCP. This dialogue will continue during the detailed design process.</p>



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>52</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Louisa Peaver	<b>PEIR Surveys</b> - PEIR volume 3 chapter 6 land use and recreation does not consider the indefinite impact of the Booster Station. It only discusses the cable corridor. The booster station's visual/noise presence will permanently reduce recreational use of the nearby PROWs. The height of the flood light lamp-posts does not seem to have been considered in the visual assessments	I	<p>Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 6: Land Use and Recreation provides an assessment of potential impacts from Hornsea Three during construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning. It considers impacts from all onshore infrastructure, including the onshore cable corridor, the HVAC booster station, the HVDC converter/HVAC substation, compounds, storage areas and access roads.</p> <p>Any effects on the amenity of visitor resources, including PRoW arising from changes to the visual and acoustic environment are addressed in Environmental Statement, volume 3 chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources and chapter 8: Noise and Vibration respectively.</p> <p>At the HVAC booster station site lighting will only operate when required and will be directional to avoid unnecessary illumination. Given the rochdale envelope approach to assessment within the EIA, the landscape and visual effects assessment considers the maximum design parameters, which the height of any lamp-posts would sit within. This approach is discussed in more detail in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 5: EIA Methodology and Assessment as well as volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources.</p>
Maureen Durrant	<b>Local Matters Landfall Zone</b> - As I walk the heath most days how are we to gain access to public footpaths this does not seem to be taken into consideration have indicated this on my enclosed map	I	<p>Impacts to PRoW at the landfall have been reduced through the design refinement process which has resulted in a smaller area experiencing direct impacts from Hornsea Three. However, where the onshore cable corridor does cross public rights of way, Hornsea Three has sought to avoid impacts through the use of HDD technology. Where this has not been possible and thus open cut, or HDD with a haul road over, is proposed, the routes will be temporarily diverted along existing tracks, for a maximum of one month per cable.</p> <p>Following the completion of the construction works all areas of access land, recreational resources, PRoWs and other linear routes affected by the onshore works would be re-instated to their current condition and/or along their current alignments. There would be no physical effects on these resources arising from the operation or maintenance of Hornsea Three. The measures to be taken to ensure the continued use of all linear recreational resources during the construction phase of the project have been discussed with Norfolk County Council and are set out in the Outline CoCP. This dialogue will continue during the detailed design process.</p> <p>The assessment of impacts on individual public rights of way (where appropriate) are set out in Environmental Statement, volume 3, chapter 6: Land Use and Recreation.</p>
Maureen Durrant	<b>80m Refinement</b> - This should definitely be considered, I understand there will be a tunnel underneath the path along the back of Pineheath properties. Could this not be considered underneath the public footpath?	I	<p>Where the onshore cable corridor crossed public rights of way, Hornsea Three has sought to avoid impacts through the use of HDD technology. Where this has not been possible and thus open cut, or HDD with a haul road over, is proposed, the routes will be temporarily diverted along existing tracks, for a maximum of one month per cable.</p> <p>Following the completion of the construction works all areas of access land, recreational resources, PRoWs and other linear routes affected by the onshore works would be re-instated to their current condition and/or along their current alignments. There would be no physical effects on these resources arising from the operation or maintenance of Hornsea Three. The measures to be taken to ensure the continued use of all linear recreational resources during the construction phase of the project have been discussed with Norfolk County Council and are set out in the Outline CoCP. This dialogue will continue during the detailed design process.</p> <p>The assessment of impacts on individual public rights of way (where appropriate) are set out in Environmental Statement, volume 3, chapter 6: Land Use and Recreation.</p>
Maureen Durrant	<b>EIA</b> - Not enough information regarding access to public footpaths	I	<p>Further information on public rights of way which may be impacted by Hornsea Three is set out in Environmental Statement, volume 3, chapter 6: Land Use and Recreation.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>52</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Sarah Griggs-Smith	<p><b>Temporary Construction</b> - Tree planting around substation work for noise/fencing. Timescale for this. Access on local lanes. Footpath access. Substation behind the existing trees and hedges which are very old</p>	I	<p>The landscapes within the study areas of the onshore HVAC booster station and onshore HVDC converter/HVAC substation are characterised by fields and local roads enclosed by dense hedgerows, hedgerow trees, tree blocks and woodlands. This provides layers of vegetation that would help to screen and filter views of Hornsea Three, and integrate the onshore HVAC booster station and onshore HVDC converter/HVAC substation into the landscape. As such, Hornsea Three has sought to avoid directly impacting existing features (including trees and hedgerows) through cable routing or the use of trenchless technologies. Any hedgerows which cannot be avoided will be replaced at the end of the construction phase. Furthermore, restoration of hedgerows, currently in poor condition, provides an opportunity to achieve long term benefits for the biodiversity associated with this habitat type as well as gap up hedgerows providing landscape and visual mitigation. Further details on hedgerow removal, retention and replacement can be found in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation as well as the Outline Ecological Management Plan and the Outline Landscape Management Plan which form part of the DCO application.</p> <p>To supplement this existing landscape screening, proposals for mitigation planting have been identified to provide further screening. Landscape proposals are detailed in the Outline LMP which forms part of the DCO application.</p> <p>Hornsea Three has committed to using trenchless technologies to cross all roads, to minimise impacts on the local road network. Similarly, where the onshore cable corridor crossed public rights of way, Hornsea Three has sought to avoid impacts through the use of HDD technology. Where this has not been possible and thus open cut, or HDD with a haul road over, is proposed, the routes will be temporarily diverted along existing tracks, for a maximum of one month per cable. Following the completion of the construction works all PRoWs and other linear routes affected by the onshore works would be re-instated to their current condition and/or along their current alignments. The assessment of impacts on individual public rights of way (where appropriate) are set out in Environmental Statement, volume 3, chapter 6: Land Use and Recreation.</p>
Karl Feistner	<p><b>Onshore Cable</b> - The corridor should utilise agricultural land that can be readily reinstated. It should not affect broadleaf woodland, heath or other fragile habitats that would take many years to recover. Depending upon the time of year of construction, consideration should be given to such things as toad migrations to breeding ponds etc.</p>	I	<p>Hornsea Three has sought to avoid sensitive ecological receptors (including designated sites and sensitive habitats) through cable routing or the use of trenchless technologies (e.g. HDD). Where impacts cannot be avoided, mitigation has been proposed, as set out in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3; Ecology and Nature Conservation.</p>
<b>Section 48: Duty to publicise</b>			
Simon Walpole	<p>Further to your advertisement in the Norwich Evening News would you please send me a copy of the documents on a USB card. I am a member of the Norfolk Ramblers Rights of Way Sub-Committee and am particularly interested in being able to scope the potential impact of your proposals on public rights of way. This would cover impacts both during the construction/installation phase and in the longer term.</p>	N	<p>Ørsted issued a USB containing the full PEIR and supporting consultation materials to the consultee and the consultee confirmed receipt.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>52</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Douglas Walters (Norfolk Geographical Association)	<b>Local Matters Landfall zone</b> - Just that it doesn't interfere with recreational use - like the Norfolk Coastal path and is built to be flood resistant	Y	<p>Potential impacts from Hornsea Three on recreational receptors, including coastal paths and PRoW are identified and assessed in Environmental Statement chapter 6: Land Use and Recreation. Where the onshore cable corridor crosses public rights of way, Hornsea Three has sought to avoid impacts through the use of HDD technology. However, where open cut, or HDD with a haul road over, is proposed, the routes will be temporarily diverted along existing tracks, for a maximum of one month per cable. In particular, at the landfall, a diversion has been allowed for within the Order Limits.</p> <p>In respect to flooding, appropriate mitigation measures have been design-in to Hornsea Three to minimise impacts on drainage and flooding. Details are provided in volume 3, chapter 2: Hydrology and Flood Risk (see Table 2.17). The Flood Risk Assessment which has been undertaken for the Project concludes that Hornsea Three meets the requirements of NPS EN-1 and the NPPF.</p>
Richard Perry	<b>80m Refinement</b> - Heavy traffic re HVAC Booster Station location. This effects bridleways which are used every day of the year especially Shrub Farm entrance road to the proposed station. Horses and traffic of a heavy nature do not mix. Also bridleway from Pimlico Cottage towards Plumstead area.	I	Principles for construction traffic management, including interaction with other road or recreational users (e.g. bridleways and pedestrians) are set out in the outline construction traffic management plan (CTMP) which forms part of the DCO application. The CTMP will be developed in consultation with the local authorities during the detailed design stage, in order to identify site specific measures, with separation of users prioritised wherever possible.
Richard Perry	<b>HVAC</b> - Heavy traffic to booster station at New Covert, Old Covert, route from Shrub Farm. This is a bridleway not a road. We use this path every day all year round with our horses. Horses and heavy traffic do not mix. The path is narrow with no get off points if horses and traffic meet. This would be a health and safety issue.	I	Principles for construction traffic management, including interaction with other road or recreational users (e.g. bridleways and pedestrians) are set out in the outline construction traffic management plan (CTMP) which forms part of the DCO application. The CTMP will be developed in consultation with the local authorities during the detailed design stage, in order to identify site specific measures, with separation of users prioritised wherever possible.
Richard Perry	<b>Mitigation Methods</b> - Bridleways: not supporting access for horses if the plans go ahead. Narrow roads needed to access bridleways. No heavy traffic please on road. Edgefield to Little Barningham via Norwich - Holt Road. No access for heavy traffic to this road past Fuel Farm, this is the horse location	I	Principles for construction traffic management, including interaction with other road or recreational users (e.g. bridleways and pedestrians) are set out in the outline construction traffic management plan (CTMP) which forms part of the DCO application. The CTMP will be developed in consultation with the local authorities during the detailed design stage, in order to identify site specific measures, with separation of users prioritised wherever possible.
Richard Perry	<b>Proposal</b> - The disturbance to wildlife and bridleways in the area of Edgefield. Heavy traffic access to rural areas of Norfolk causing disruption to our every day riding of our horses	I	<p>Principles for construction traffic management, including interaction with other road or recreational users (e.g. bridleways and pedestrians) are set out in the outline construction traffic management plan (CTMP) which forms part of the DCO application. The CTMP will be developed in consultation with the local authorities during the detailed design stage, in order to identify site specific measures, with separation of users prioritised wherever possible.</p> <p>Impacts on ecological receptors are addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation.</p>

Table 3.19: Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Further Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.B) relating to land use and recreation

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>53</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 42: Prescribed consultees (The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009: Schedule 1))</b>			
LEEP Electricity Networks Ltd	Leep Utilities have nothing in this area	N/A	Ørsted noted that LEEP Electricity Networks Ltd had no assets affected by Hornsea Three and no further action was taken.
Estelle Hook, Norfolk Coast Partnership	The Norfolk Coast Path National Trail and other circular routes, public rights of way and permissive paths in the area are well used by visitors and locals and any disruption and closure of paths should be minimised.	Y	<p>Where the onshore cable corridor crossed public rights of way, Hornsea Three has sought to avoid impacts through the use of HDD technology. Where this has not been possible and thus open cut, or HDD with a haul road over, is proposed, the routes will be temporarily diverted along existing tracks, for a maximum of one month per cable. Following the completion of the construction works all areas of access land, recreational resources, PRoWs and other linear routes affected by the onshore works would be re-instated to their current condition and/or along their current alignments. There would be no physical effects on these resources arising from the operation or maintenance of Hornsea Three. The measures to be taken to ensure the continued use of all linear recreational resources during the construction phase of the project have been discussed with Norfolk County Council and are set out in the Outline CoCP. This dialogue will continue during the detailed design process. The assessment of impacts on individual public rights of way (where appropriate) are set out in Environmental Statement, volume 3, chapter 6: Land Use and Recreation.</p> <p>Following the completion of the construction works all areas of access land, recreational resources, PRoWs and other linear routes affected by the onshore works would be re-instated to their current condition and/or along their current alignments. There would be no physical effects on these resources arising from the operation or maintenance of Hornsea Three. The measures to be taken to ensure the continued use of all linear recreational resources during the construction phase of the project have been discussed with Norfolk County Council and are set out in the Outline CoCP. This dialogue will continue during the detailed design process.</p>
Estelle Hook, Norfolk Coast Partnership	This area is important for tourism, with visitors valuing its natural wilderness and tranquillity, and all efforts should be made to minimise the visual impact and disruption of construction and operation.	I	Through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive ecological receptors. Impacts to socio-economics and tourism are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 10: Socio-Economics.
Edgefield and Corpusty & Saxthorpe Parish Councils	Also, it is noted that one of the accessways to the booster station is running along a footpath through the woods. This is an especially beautiful walk, which will be detrimentally affected should you tarmac it for a roadway. Is it possible to re-route it?	I	The assessment of impacts on individual public rights of way (where appropriate) are set out in Environmental Statement, volume 3, chapter 6: Land Use and Recreation.
<b>Section 42: Local Authorities (prescribed under section 43 of the Act)</b>			
<i>No comments were received from the local authorities relating to land use and recreation under Phase 2.B.</i>			
<b>Section 42: Persons with an interest in the land (prescribed under section 44 of the Act)</b>			

<sup>53</sup> Y = Yes change made; N = No change made; I = Incorporated into or considered when producing the assessment or landowner voluntary agreement offer; N/A = Not applicable.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>53</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
CJC Lee (via agent, Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co)	<p>Part of the land owned and occupied by CJC Lee (Saxthorpe) Ltd at Bodham has been identified as being on a potential revised cable route by Orsted for the Hornsea 3 project. During previous consultations CJC Lee (Saxthorpe) Ltd, hereafter referred to as "the Company" did not raise specific objections to the inclusion of land at Bodham in the proposed cable route. These proposed interactions are shown on the left-hand image below, which is an extract from the Orsted consultation document. Areas where the company's land and the original corridor interact are shown with red edging. The area affected under the proposed alternate route are shown on the right-hand image as edged red with the blue route passing through.</p> <p>Original Route</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cut the corners off two fields and potentially interacted with a pit hole</li> <li>• Limited impact on farming business – inconvenient but deemed to be manageable as no one field would be overly impacted.</li> </ul> <p>Proposed Route</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Still impacts field north of road, but to no greater extent</li> <li>• Missed the corner of the eastern field and the pit hole in the south field</li> <li>• Cuts diagonally through the middle of Stone Lodge field</li> <li>• Expected corridor areas is 2.35 ha from a 6.21 ha field – this is 39% of the field</li> <li>• The company strongly opposes the proposed alternative route.</li> <li>• Route cuts off areas either side of the corridor making them unusable during works year</li> <li>• The impact on this field is very high and failure to restore soil and drainage could reduce efficacy and value of the entire field</li> <li>• Given the very high impact on the land affected by the new route there is a need to understand the exact reasons why the original route cannot be adopted, and why this new route is preferred.</li> </ul>	N	<p>Hornsea Three responded as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It is acknowledged that the alternative route will impact different areas of land than previously. The opposition to this is noted and was fed into the route design consideration.</li> <li>2. If areas of land are segregated by the construction corridor and become unfarmable, then compensation will be payable for any reasonable losses on a proven loss basis. However, landowners are expected to mitigate their losses, where possible.</li> <li>3. The land will be fully reinstated following the work to a comparable condition of that recorded in the schedule of condition, with compensation being payable on a proven loss basis for any ongoing losses or where reinstatement is not possible. Drainage will also be reinstated, or installed as required, with compensation being payable on the same terms as above.</li> <li>4. The alternative route that was previously proposed had difficulties including: poor visibility on the highways crossings, proximity to two listed buildings, proximity to some ponds with ecological merit and restricted space adjacent to an established tree belt and hedgerow. The alternative route avoids these, whilst also crossing fewer roads and being shorter, therefore having a lesser environmental impact.</li> </ol>
WJF Ross Ltd (via agent, Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co)	<p>Part of the land owned and occupied by WJF Ross Ltd at Hurricane Farm, Bodham has been identified as being on a potential revised cable route by Orsted for the Hornsea 3 project. These proposed interactions are shown on the image below left, which is an extract from the Orsted consultation document, with the company's land being edged red. The original cable corridor is shown as a yellow polygon. The proposed alternate route is shown as the blue route passing down the eastern side of the field. The image on the right (taken from Google Earth) shows the impact of the cables on the property.</p> <p>Original Route</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cut the corner off one field</li> <li>• Limited impact on farming business – inconvenient but deemed to be manageable as no one field would be overly impacted.</li> </ul> <p>Proposed Route</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Expected corridor areas is 3.68 ha from a 31 ha field – this is 12% of the field</li> <li>• Route cuts off an area to the east of the corridor making it unusable during works year</li> <li>• The company strongly opposes the proposed alternative route.</li> <li>• The impact on this field is high and failure to restore soil and drainage could reduce efficacy and value of the entire field</li> <li>• Given the very high impact on the land affected by the new route there is a need to understand the exact reasons why the original route cannot be adopted, and why this new route is preferred.</li> </ul>	N	<p>Hornsea Three responded as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It is acknowledged that the alternative route will impact different areas of the landowner's field compared with the previous proposal. The opposition to this is noted and was fed into the route design considerations.</li> <li>2. The land will be fully reinstated following the work to a comparable condition of that recorded in the schedule of condition, with compensation being payable on a proven loss basis for any ongoing losses or where reinstatement is not possible. Drainage will also be reinstated, or installed as required, with compensation being payable on the same terms as above.</li> <li>3. The alternative route that was previously proposed had difficulties including: poor visibility on the highways crossings, proximity to two listed buildings, proximity to some ponds with ecological merit and restricted space adjacent to an established tree belt and hedgerow. The alternative route avoids these, whilst also crossing fewer roads and being shorter, therefore having a lesser environmental impact.</li> </ol>



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>53</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
<p>AV Youngs Ltd (via agent, Jonathan Rush, Brown &amp; Co)</p>	<p>Part of Pitt Farm has been identified as part of a potential cable route by Orsted for the Hornsea 3 project. The original proposal for the cable corridor cut through the middle of the farm and came close to the farmstead and campsite, thus potentially resulting in high levels of disturbance during the works. Following submission of responses to the PEIR an alternative route has been suggested by Orsted, which is shown below. AV Youngs Ltd thanks Orsted for considering the representations made to the PEIR, however the proposed route change does not go far enough to alleviate the concerns raised in the previous response, and it is believed that greater variation to the cable route is possible. Evidence of the ability to significantly alter the route is shown on Statutory Consultation Plan Map 2 of 9 and Map 5 of 9. These examples are shown below. AV Youngs Ltd wishes to make suggestions detailed below as to how the disruption from the works might be reduced. Reference is made to the plan titled AV Youngs Ltd – Alternative Route, which is taken from Google earth. Field A. Orsted Alteration: Top of field the route is moved west of the pit. AV Youngs Ltd comments: Supports the changes down to the point where the cable leaves the pit. Field A. Orsted Alteration: Cable has moved west but straightens back to a north south drop into field B. AV Youngs Ltd comments: The cable should move to the far south west corner of Field A and prepare to drop into Field C.  Field B. Orsted Alteration: Cable has moved west but remains in Field B. AV Youngs Ltd comments: Field B is circa 4.19ha and the corridor at 1.65ha accounts for 40% of the field. Thus, the field will be totally compromised by the works and the proposed route cuts off the south-western corner of the field. This location is adjacent to the campsite.  Field C. Orsted Alteration: Orsted Cable Route avoids this field. AV Youngs Ltd comments: Field C is circa 24.10 ha and the corridor at 7.31 ha would account for 30% of the field. The AV Youngs proposed routing of the cable down the eastern side of the field leaves a regular, easier to work area of 16.79 ha. This is preferable as the corridor has a more proportionate impact on the field and simply acts to narrow it. There is a small copse at the top of Field C where the cable would cross from Field A. This copse is due to be felled within the next 24 months for firewood. The owner would agree to offer the same area of land to match woodland lost to the cable for replanting.  Field D. Orsted Alteration: Cable has moved west in the top half of the field then re-joins the original corridor. AV Youngs Ltd comments: Field D is large enough to accommodate the cable route in the same way as Field C is, however the top part of the field is still close to the campsite and will cause disruption.  Field E. Orsted Alteration: Cable has moved back onto original line to cross the public highway into Field E. It is assumed that the road will be closed and trenched the trees south of Field E will be felled to allow the cable through. AV Youngs Ltd comments: Moving the cable back into Field E will mean disruption to another field that could be avoided. Field E is only 7.63 ha and the corridor will account for 1.15 ha, which is 15%. If it is vital for engineering reasons to cross the woodland block F where shown, then the proposed route could follow the course in Field C and then cross into E at the lower end. This is shown as Exit B. A preference would be to exit Field C at Exit A. If the cable is to be installed by HDD under the road and woodland then launching at Exit A is preferred.  The proposed changes do not go far enough to alleviate the concerns of the land owner. It is</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Hornsea Three responded to AV Youngs Ltd. concerns as follows:  Concern regarding the route and the wish for it to be further amended is noted,  Regarding point A, the revised route corridor is located to the west of the pit described.  Regarding point B, the revised route corridor now follows this suggested route and crosses the road at the south-west corner of field A.  Regarding points C and D, the revised route corridor now avoids field B &amp; D, and has moved west into field C. The offer of the area of land for potential replanting is appreciated and noted.  Comments on field E are noted, therevised route now exits the field to the south with the proposed installation method under the road and woodland being via Horizontal Directional Drill.  Hornsea Three has now altered the proposed route in response to the landowner feedback.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>53</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>clear from other alterations shown on the route that the Owners proposed alterations should be feasible, especially as all the changes occur within the same title. A V Youngs Ltd seeks reasons for why their proposed alternative route cannot be adopted. Google Earth Image is next and final page of this document.</p>		
<p>Jane Kenny, Savills, on behalf of Mrs C Barratt – Church Farm (Booton)</p>	<p>POTENTIAL ONSHORE CABLE CORRIDOR RE-ROUTES There are a number of requested route changes which have not been considered. In particular: • Mrs C Barratt – Church Farm (Booton) – an alternative route for the cable has been provided for consideration to avoid all the sensitivities of the current proposed route including a SSSI, newly built grainstore with associated infrastructure, land drains and unforgiving heavy land. The alternative access route is noted and is not suitable for any construction type vehicles and no approval will be granted. The proposed route is inaccessible by normal farm machinery. Furthermore it is not acceptable for the route to pass south from Marriott's Way to Moor Farm due to the impact upon the occupiers of Moor Farm. It may be possible to negotiate a more acceptable route by negotiation with the Landowner.</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>The requested alterations to the route crossing land owned by Mrs Barratt is subject to ongoing discussions. The alternative route request was however adopted.</p>
<p>John Innes Centre</p>	<p>We have been working with Dong for a large part of 2017 in connection with our land at Bawburgh. We had thought that the new trench had been agreed due to the number of site meetings and their understanding of how important it is to our institute that the land through our research area is left undisturbed. If this proposal was to go ahead it would be catastrophic to our crop trials, and future possibility's that if access was required to the land for maintenance or repair you may find we would not be able to accommodate access until the soil and crop have been sterilised causing you in some cases weeks before access would be granted. Part of our consultation period with Dong it was agreed that we would work with you, an agreement by both parties was that we would only agree to the enclosed trench as marked on the attached drawing.</p> <p>I am sure all the visits to our site and institute have been well documented and still on file within your organisation. However, can you please update your files for future communication as your recent correspondence went to the old landowners, and in doing so delayed this information coming to our attention to only this week.</p> <p>John Innes agreed this year to accommodate the section that has been marked in Red, Dong had agreed that due to our land being designated for science research, any disturbance to our fields would and will cause future problems due to soil disturbance. Also as this land is not used for food production it would be difficult to allow future maintenance on to the site during trial periods, as this could interrupt years of trails and findings, putting some work back by over a year due to the seasons but also the risk of your vehicles transferring crop seed or matter off site which could cause contamination to other areas of the county side. The Government have recently invested £7 million in preparing this area for crop trials and it would be catastrophic to cut through the main heart of our trial area. Again we will work with you to run in the area marked in red.</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Hornsea Three responded to the John Innes Centre as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The refined route corridor takes into account the proposed alternative to the west in order to minimise impact to crop trials in line with discussions to date and feedback received.</li> <li>2. Records have been updated to ensure documentation is sent to the correct contact at JIC going forward.</li> <li>3. The revised route now adopts the use of this field as requested. However, it does cross the corner of the adjacent field slightly still, due to the angle and route required as it heads north. This has been discussed with Dalcour Maclaren recently and will be done so in more detail during negotiation of Heads of Terms for an option agreement.</li> </ol>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>53</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Christopher Bond, Bidwells on behalf of Martin Kemp	<p>3. Martin P Kemp / M P Kemp Limited, [REDACTED] (Map 8 of 9)</p> <p>Potential onshore cable corridor re-routes</p> <p>We note the potential cable re-route (alternative route) which is totally unacceptable to our client. As stressed in the earlier representation of 19 September 2017, the future development of the Kemp's land is of primary importance and, hence, all measures suggested in the earlier representation must be made to reduce the impact of the cable route proposed on their land. The proposed re-route in no way complies with this request and would, if anything, sterilise a greater area of the Kemp's farm.</p> <p>Potential access routes</p> <p>We note the potential access corridor to the cable route. This is unacceptable and must be kept closed for security purposes. There is a potential access available directly to the preferred route from the Norwich Road which should be used (see attached plan A).</p>	Y	<p>Hornsea Three addressed the landowner's response as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Concern regarding the alternative route option is noted. This has since been discounted following accurate identification of the route of the disused MOD pipeline on this land.</li> <li>2. The alternative access route suggested has now been added to proposals, with the other option also being maintained in case this is required as a back-up option.</li> </ol>
Christopher Bond, Bidwells on behalf of Charles Watt	<p>Charles Jonathan Watt [REDACTED] (Map 8 of 9)</p> <p>Potential onshore cable corridor re-routes</p> <p>We note the potential re-route and associated proposed storage areas to the east of the preferred route which is totally unacceptable to our client for the following reasons:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- It is too close to Wychwood House, a substantial property standing in a parkland setting.</li> <li>- It will cross historic parkland of ancient grass (unimproved for many years) known as The Old Hethersett Racecourse where it is proposed to open cut which cannot be readily reinstated.</li> <li>- The alternative route will cross (by HDD) areas of substantial woodland including Wychwood adjoining the Norwich Road. Under no circumstances should the roots of these substantial trees be disturbed which would occur if HDD takes place</li> <li>- The alternative route will be in close vicinity to The Lodge at the entrance to Wychwood House drive.</li> <li>- We cannot understand why the preferred route cannot be adopted, bearing in mind it is a disused MOD pipeline that appears to be blocking the route.</li> <li>- The preferred route crosses open farmland with the exception of the wood (The Glade)</li> </ul> <p>Proposed access route</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- We note a proposed access from the Norwich Road southwards to the preferred route which is acceptable.</li> <li>- We note the proposed access to Mr Kemp's land leads off the Norwich Road directly opposite the Lodge- clearly, a traffic hazard which would lead to traffic using the Lodge drive as a run off area which is totally unacceptable.</li> <li>- We note a proposed access route to the south of the All on this land — could you please confirm the construction and reinstatement details</li> </ul>	Y	<p>Hornsea Three addressed the landowner's response as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Concern regarding the alternative route option is noted. This has since been discounted following accurate identification of the route of the discused MOD pipeline on this land.</li> <li>2.a. An alternative access route into land north of Norwich Road has now been incorporated following feedback received.</li> <li>b. The access to the south of the A11 will be required in relation to the proposed HDD under the A11 and railway. This will likely be constructed to facilitate vehicle access and will be fully reinstated following completion of the work.</li> </ol>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>53</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Michael and Louise Savory The Muckleburgh Military Collection	<p>There is currently a public access agreement in place with the Council for the use of the public coastal footpath on the beach-side of the fence. Currently in the process of renewing the said fence, and would want this reinstated to the same condition if damaged or temporarily removed by Orsted's work. There is an informal agreement in place with a number of fisherman to park on Muckleburgh Collection land just to the east of the MOD radar station and take access through a gate to the beach. This is done so on an ad-hoc basis. Public vehicle rides take place during Spring &amp; Summer months using military vehicles on the internal and boundary tracks of the Muckleburgh Collection. Tank driving also takes place on these tracks at any time of the year, but predominantly Spring &amp; Summer, for people who pay to drive tanks themselves. Due to these afore mentioned reasons, and other security concerns, any temporary footpath diversion into the Muckleburgh Collection would be very inconvenient, and therefore unwanted. Any footpath diversion on the beach would be much preferred and agreeable in principle.</p>	Y	<p>The fence, and any other areas damaged or removed by engineering work, will be reinstated or replaced on completion to a condition comparable to a photographic schedule of condition prior to access being taken.</p> <p>Concerns regarding the potential temporary diversion of the footpath through private land are noted from this and previous correspondence. This is currently an option should this be required for engineering and safety reasons, and not yet a definite requirement. Should this be required, more detailed discussions will be held nearer the time, with a diversion or solution on the beach being pursued in the first instance.</p>
Michael and Louise Savory The Muckleburgh Military Collection	<p>With regard to the cable route on the land: Access to the landfall area would be considered via either the existing site entrance, or across the arable field to the east Reaffirm the request for the airfield to not be open cut, if the route is taken in this direction A waterproof membrane or similar may need to be considered to reinstate the scrape adjacent to where the borehole were drilled.</p>	Y	<p>The main proposed access route to the point of cable landfall is via the existing entrance to the Muckleburgh Collection in order to utilise the existing track. The cables are proposed to be installed under the airfield via Horizontal Direction Drill (HDD) as opposed to open cut. Reinstatement will be undertaken in line with the proposed schedule of condition, with a waterproof membrane, or similar, being considered here if required.</p>
Ray & Diane Pearce	<p>16. As evidenced above, there is no transparency between the Vanguard and Hornsea Three projects and no details for the Public to scrutinise due to the imposition of a commercial NDA. The lack of detail regarding the cable crossing point is a failure of the Hornsea Three Project Team's duty of care and we would therefore expect a further statutory consultation process to be agreed to fill in the details prior to the EIA, or indeed DCO. We contest that the project is in a rush to meet the next CFD auction before the cost for the project becomes commercially unviable. We assert that it is cost alone which is driving the project with a consequential disregard for the detrimental impact the project will have on the Norfolk countryside and the people who currently enjoy its peaceful nature. The further consultation has done nothing to allay our concerns and has increased the uncertainty for our future.</p> <p>Attachments: - See FULL response on DECA 1. Maps of proposed cable crossing point. 2. DONG Energy Letter dated 12 October 2017. 3. Hornsea Three PEIR Figure 3.22.</p>	I	<p>Noted, responses provided in individual comments in relation to EMF, disruption impacts and cumulative impacts with Vanguard.</p>
<b>Section 47: Duty to consult local community</b>			
Diana Jenkinson	<p>I am writing to protest against the wind farm at High Kelling. I keep my horse at Kelling Heath stables, this simply isn't suitable to be near horses. There would only be one field in between the wind farm and the field where my horse is kept, she is a very nervous horse and is 20 years old, such a construction would cause her a massive amount of stress. In addition we would lose a huge amount of our hacking as we will be unable to ride our horses past the wind farm to get onto Kelling Heath as they will be too frightened. During the winter months, the Heath is our best option for riding as the Bodham woods get too muddy. Riding across Kelling Heath gives us so many options to go further afield whereas through Bodham woods there is no safe access to Weybourne and Salthouse etc. We pay a lot of money to keep our horses here and spend a lot of time, they are a huge part of our lives.</p>	Y	<p>Since the PEIR, a refined landfall location has been identified (western re-route around Kelling) and the area identified for landfall works has reduced. This was informed by a number of factors including engineering/technical considerations, community feedback in the area of Kelling and Weybourne, avoidance of the Kelling Heath SSSI/CWS and Holiday Park.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>53</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Councillor Greg Peck, Broadland District Council	Concerns have been raised by local landowners/farmers about the impact on their productive farm land so I would request that you work closely with them to avoid crossing their most productive fields. As you are aware they have concerns about compacting after the replacement of the topsoil which effects yields for many years to come. It makes sense to avoid the most productive areas. This is particularly important around the area of Salle, Heydon and Reephams where there is some highly productive farmland. I would expect you to take into consideration the concerns of the residents, landowners and businesses in the area and make sure they are fully addressed.	I	<p>Potential impacts on other land uses (including farm holdings) are considered in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 6: Land Use and Recreation. During the construction phase, top soil and sub soils will be stripped and stored in accordance with best practice and the land within the Hornsea Three onshore cable corridor will be restored to its original condition, therefore reducing the potential for sterilisation.</p> <p>We understand the importance of assessing soil structure before, during and after construction to ensure that the field drainage is maintained and will appoint a Drainage Consultant who will assess and design the mitigation scheme. Additional measures relating to construction methodology are set out in the outline CoCP which forms part of the DCO application.</p>
Richard and Susan Perry	No mention has been made of bridleways or diverting them on your application. We ride every day in your detailed Map 3 area, especially from Shrubs Farm to Underwood area. Will you verify how you wish to access a substation build from Shrubs Farm area, as this is a designated bridle path. How do you hope to resolve this when bringing materials on site? Horses and vehicles of a heavy nature do not mix.	I	<p>Where the onshore cable corridor crossed public rights of way, Hornsea Three has sought to avoid impacts through the use of HDD technology. Where this has not been possible and thus open cut, or HDD with a haul road over, is proposed, the routes will be temporarily diverted along existing tracks, for a maximum of one month per cable. Following the completion of the construction works all areas of access land, recreational resources, PRoWs and other linear routes affected by the onshore works would be re-instated to their current condition and/or along their current alignments. There would be no physical effects on these resources arising from the operation or maintenance of Hornsea Three. The measures to be taken to ensure the continued use of all linear recreational resources during the construction phase of the project have been discussed with Norfolk County Council and are set out in the Outline CoCP. This dialogue will continue during the detailed design process. The assessment of impacts on individual public rights of way (where appropriate) are set out in Environmental Statement, volume 3, chapter 6: Land Use and Recreation.</p> <p>Following the completion of the construction works all areas of access land, recreational resources, PRoWs and other linear routes affected by the onshore works would be re-instated to their current condition and/or along their current alignments. There would be no physical effects on these resources arising from the operation or maintenance of Hornsea Three. The measures to be taken to ensure the continued use of all linear recreational resources during the construction phase of the project have been discussed with Norfolk County Council and are set out in the Outline CoCP. This dialogue will continue during the detailed design process.</p>
Dale Heaton	As somebody who lives in Mulbarton (which is near to the on shore grid connection) my comments are; 1 Many who come to Norfolk are looking for an isolated country idyll. As someone breed and born here, this does not exist. Norfolk is a busy active industrialised area whether that be manufacturing industry, service companies or farming.	N	Through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive ecological receptors. Additional mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project are outlined in topic specific chapters, and include the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts on local road networks, ecological receptors (e.g. hedgerows) and hydrological features (e.g. main rivers). Where impacts remain, these are reported in the relevant topic chapters of the Environmental Statement volume 3.
<b>Section 48: Duty to publicise</b>			
No comments were received in response to the Public Notice relating to land use and recreation under Phase 2.B.			



Table 3.20: Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Focused Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.C) relating to land use and recreation

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>54</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 42: Prescribed consultees (The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009: Schedule 1))</b>			
No comments were received from the prescribed consultees relating to land use and recreation under Phase 2.C.			
<b>Section 42: Local Authorities (prescribed under section 43 of the Act)</b>			
No comments were received from the local authorities relating to land use and recreation under Phase 2.C.			
<b>Section 42: Persons with an interest in the land (prescribed under section 44 of the Act)</b>			
Jane Kenny (Savills) - On behalf of Salle Estate	I am writing on behalf of our client, Salle Estate, who are Landowners affected by the third consultation "Focused Statutory Consultation" There has been no discussion with our client or myself, as agent, with regard to access point across the holding from the road to the onshore cable route corridor. In addition the appropriate notification of this change via s.42 has not been received by our client or myself as agent. It has always been understood that access to the cable route would be obtained from the compounds/mobilization zones which in turn would be sited with suitable access to them so avoiding using the narrow country roads and access gained along the working corridor. Our client understands that the requirement for this access is required to access the southern part of the corridor as Marriott's Way is being HDD. This route is not acceptable as there is not an uninterrupted access to the corridor due to the Christmas Tree plantation to the North of the access across Marriott's Way. Please see attached snapshot with the area of concern circled in red. An alternative access has been offered from the Booton Road which would be a much better location in terms of better highways and away from the village Reepham. Furthermore it will remove unavoidable safety issues relating to the crossing of Marriott's Way by Construction traffic and users of the footpath.	N	Throughout discussions with landowners to date it has been stated that access to the construction corridor will be taken from the adjoining public highways where possible. Where this is not possible, additional access routes will be required from the nearest public highway in order to reach the construction corridor. Any interaction with the landowner's access to their Christmas tree business would be suitably managed in conjunction with them in order to avoid any unnecessary impact or disruption. The access across Marriott's Way is required in order to allow suitable access to either side, and the adjacent Horizontal Direction Drills (HDDs) without creating unnecessary impact of increased traffic on the haul road either side, and additional traffic through Reepham itself. The crossing of any vehicles or plant across Marriott's Way will be properly and safely managed with regard to other private and public users of this area.

<sup>54</sup> Y = Yes change made; N = No change made; I = Incorporated into or considered when producing the assessment or landowner voluntary agreement offer; N/A = Not applicable.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>54</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Savills - (Jane Kenny) on behalf of Church Farm (Booton)	<p>I am writing on behalf of our client, Church Farm (Booton) who are landowners affected by the third consultation "Focused Statutory Consultation". There has been no discussion with our client or us as agents, with regards to access point across the holding from the road to the onshore cable route corridor. In addition the appropriate notification of this change via a S.42 has not been received by our client or us as agent. Our client notes the route that you have selected across Church Farm (Booton). This is not acceptable. Our clients preferred route is the original proposal with it extending further south before coming east so that it runs as close as possible to the boundaries to minimise the impact on the croppable area of the fields. I have attached a plan showing this route hatched red. The reasons for this are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It is likely the area of woodland the route would pass through will be felled by the time you commence works.</li> <li>2. It will affect less land drains.</li> <li>3. It will avoid the grain store, the associated infrastructure and underground cabling.</li> <li>4. There will be less disruption to farming as it will only affect two arable fields rather than four.</li> <li>5. It will avoid Moor Farm and the associated impact on the occupants.</li> </ol> <p>The proposed access route is also not acceptable. Our client would like to propose the route that I have marked on the plan colored blue, subject to the proposed access to the north of Marriott's Way being acceptable to the Salle Estate. Please note the track you have selected as an access route is actually a permissive path provided by our client, for the villagers of Reepham to access Marriott's Way.</p> <p>It is also not clear that the road between our clients land to the north and the woodland to the south will be directionally drilled however, this is a requirement and mitigate the disturbance to the area. I have shown yellow on the attached plan.</p> <p>Our client would consider the use of their new access road from Booton by the contractors, if deemed helpful, and on the appropriate terms. I have marked this in brown on the attached plan. It is also proposed a compound has been designated on our clients land. Again this has been down with no consultation / discussions with our client or us as the agent. Our client is not against the compound however before making any commitments needs to understand what it is required for, the visual impact and the length of time required.</p> <p>A meeting to discuss these changes has been requested but we have heard no further. I trust you find this self - explanatory but should you have any queries please do not hesitate to contact me otherwise we look forward to having the opportunity to meet and discuss these changes at your earliest convenience. In the meantime please can you acknowledge safe receipt of this email.</p>	N	<p>The notices issued to your respective clients, as consultation on the access and cable route amendments referred to, were done so via contact addresses on record and to which earlier correspondence has been sent with no issues raised. Should these contact addresses be incorrect, we would be grateful if these could be confirmed by providing completed LIQ forms. Copies of S42 notices issued for your clients have since been provided upon request.</p> <p>The objection to the two proposed routes across the landowner's land are noted, despite the eastern option being added to proposals following earlier feedback from the landowner to recent consultation. The new requested alternative route option to the west would run adjacent to residential receptors and listed buildings, in addition to Booton Common SSSI. The existing eastern route option would not have any direct impact on access to Moor Farm, whereas a western alternative route could impact the road to Moor Farm if the cables were installed here by direct burial. This route would also avoid the landowner's new barn development and would not impact the associated infrastructure.</p> <p>The suggested possible use of the landowner's new access road off Church Road is noted and appreciated. The temporary compound mentioned would be required for the temporary storage of materials and equipment to assist with the cable route construction and also the two proposed adjacent Horizontal Directional Drills (HDDs).</p>
<b>Section 47: Duty to consult local community</b>			
<i>No comments were received from the local community relating to land use and recreation under Phase 2.C.</i>			
<b>Section 48: Duty to publicise</b>			
<i>No comments were received in response to the Public Notice relating to land use and recreation under Phase 2.C.</i>			

### 3.8 Noise and Vibration

Table 3.21: Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.A) relating to noise and vibration

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>55</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 42: Prescribed consultees (The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009: Schedule 1))</b>			
Plumstead Parish Council	Concerns have been raised over noise during construction. Will this be 9.00 am to 5.00 pm only?	I	Proposed working hours are set out in the outline CoCP which forms part of the DCO application. The outline CoCP is a 'living' document that will be updated as required post submission of the DCO application, during the Examination Period following more detailed engagement with stakeholders and post examination by way of instruction of the Examining Authority and Secretary of State.  In terms of the duration of the construction phase for the whole scheme, Hornsea Project Three could be built out in up to two phases. There are various possible reasons for phasing including constraints in the supply chain or requirements of the government's Contract for Difference subsidy regime which offshore wind farms currently rely on to secure a price for the electricity produced by a project. It is currently anticipated that the total duration of onshore construction works could be up to eight years, which has reduced from eleven years previously proposed.
Plumstead Parish Council	If the sub-station is necessary much more detail is required concerning visual impact, noise and lighting. What planting is to take place?	I	Impacts associated with visual amenity and noise are addressed in volume 3, chapters 4 and 8 respectively. Based on the principles of the lighting strategy for Hornsea Three, no significant effects in relation to lighting is anticipated.  An indicative planting scheme for the HVDC converter/HVAC substation is provided in volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources. The measures for managing such provisions is outlined in the outline Landscape Management Plan which accompanies the DCO application.
Plumstead Parish Council	The working width of the scheme passes close to the occupants of Heath Farm and Range Farm – nuisance and disturbance should be kept to a minimum.	I	Where sensitive receptors are in close proximity to onshore works, the Project will ensure that sensitive construction management measures, such as noise, dust and traffic control are considered. These are documented in an outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), which accompanies the DCO application. Impacts on residential receptors are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement.
Oulton Parish Council	Noise assessments need to be rigorous, especially in light of the fact that Cawston has issues regarding 'hum' from Salle substation which is small in comparison.	I	An assessment of the potential noise impacts from the construction and operation of Hornsea Three is provided in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 8: Noise and Vibration and its supporting technical annexes.

<sup>55</sup> Y = Yes change made; N = No change made; I = Incorporated into or considered when producing the assessment or landowner voluntary agreement offer; N/A = Not applicable.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>55</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Swardeston Parish Council	7. How does Dong Energy intend to alleviate any noise and light pollution consequent upon the construction and operation of the substation?	I	<p>During construction noise and light pollution would be controlled through appropriate design and construction management measures documented in the outline Code of Construction Practice which forms part of the DCO application.</p> <p>For operation, it is noted that a number of measures which represent best practicable means have been designed-in to the project to reduce impacts where reasonable. In respect to lighting, this would be designed in accordance with best practice guidance and would be directional to avoid light pollution.</p> <p>Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 8: Noise and Vibration provides an assessment of impacts arising from Hornsea Three in relation to noise and vibration. The assessment considers impacts during construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning and concludes that taking into consideration the mitigation proposed by Hornsea Three, no significant effects would occur.</p>
River Glaven Conservation Group	The PIER describes screening assessments for a booster station, but I think doesn't comment on any need for tree planting to screen it from nearby visual impact. Again background noise assessment is made. At what point can it be possible to judge the incremental effect of a booster station on noise and indeed light pollution? This information may be hidden within the depths of the PIER- or be produced later. We will attend the consultation dates and be able to ask more but answers to the above would be appreciated.	I	<p>During design refinement, visual screening has been proposed for the HVAC booster station to minimise impacts. Indicative proposals are shown within the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.</p> <p>An assessment of both construction and operational noise impacts associated with the onshore infrastructure (including the HVAC booster station) is provided within Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 8: Noise and Vibration. Details of the baseline noise surveys which have been undertaken to inform the noise assessment are presented within Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 8.1: Baseline Noise Survey.</p> <p>During construction noise and light pollution would be controlled through appropriate design and construction management measures documented in the outline Code of Construction Practice which forms part of the DCO application. In respect to lighting, site lighting at the HVAC booster station will only operate when required and will be directional to avoid unnecessary illumination.</p>
Norfolk County Council	<p>Local Member Views</p> <p>2.39 The Local County Councillor for Melton Constable has made the following comments:</p> <p>2.40 There is generally little opposition to these proposals in absolute terms and local residents appreciate the importance of national infrastructure and securing future energy supply;</p> <p>2.41 There are concerns about the lack of mitigating measures planned in respect of the onshore HVAC Booster Station; and</p> <p>2.42 The Local Member strongly urges the County Council to insist that the developers provide detailed mitigating measures as part of their submission in respect of: height, visibility and noise – relating to the HVAC booster station at Little Barningham.</p>	I	<p>Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts to local residential receptors, either through site selection/route refinement (see Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives) or through the identification of suitable mitigation measures. Where there are impacts to residential receptors, these are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3).</p> <p>Appropriate mitigation measures relating to the onshore HVAC booster station are also identified in the relevant topic specific chapters. For example, visual disturbance impacts and associated mitigation are outlined in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources. This includes, for example, the restoration of habitats (including hedgerows) which cannot be avoided and landscape planting around the HVAC booster station to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.</p>
Planning, South Norfolk Council	<p>The Council's response to your consultation was agreed at the Development Management Committee meeting on 13 September 2017 and I enclose a copy of the committee report for your information.</p> <p>Our response to the consultation refers to three key considerations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Heritage Assets</li> <li>• Landscape</li> <li>• Noise and Pollution</li> </ul>	N	Noted, specific comments on these considerations are considered in the following points.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>55</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Planning, South Norfolk Council	<p>Noise and Vibration</p> <p>Noise from the construction phase has the potential to have an impact on the residents of the surrounding area. The PEIR outlines measures that will be taken to address this issue which are considered acceptable but the detail will need to be agreed at the appropriate time.</p> <p>Noise from the infrastructure is Low Frequency Noise (particularly in the 50Hz third octave band) which tends to be associated with electrical equipment (e.g. transformers). The PEIR outlines measures that will be taken to address this issue which are considered acceptable but the detail will need to be agreed at the appropriate time.</p>	I	<p>An Outline CoCP forms part of the DCO application and contains management measures that the Undertaker and its construction contractors will be required to adopt and implement for all construction activities associated with Hornsea Three. This includes measures to minimise construction noise, such as using plant conforming with the relevant legislation relating to noise and vibration; ensure plant machinery is turned off when not in use and undertaking construction works in accordance with the best practicable means.</p> <p>Mitigation measures in relation to noise during the operational phase of Hornsea Three are detailed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 8: Noise and Vibration. The objective of the measures are to control and limit noise levels, so far as is reasonably practicable, to minimise disturbance to sensitive receptors. The measures which Hornsea Three have committed to include the preparation of an Operational Noise Management Plan (NMP) for the onshore HVAC booster station and onshore HVDC converter/HVAC substation, to be agreed with the relevant local planning authority, prior to the start of noise generating works. Hornsea Three has also committed to developing acoustic mitigation during the detailed design stage for the onshore HVDC converter/HVAC substation to minimise noise impacts at surrounding residential NSRs. Given the location of the HVAC booster station relevant to the nearest residential receptor, and the commitment of Hornsea Three to internalise the noisiest equipment, similar acoustic mitigation is not required for the HVAC booster station.</p>
Broadland District Council	<p>The impact on local communities and residential amenities as a result of the increased vehicular activity including heavy plant associated with the construction phases of the onshore export cable route including the removal of excavated material, the delivery of large sections of cables and the traffic movements associated with delivering backfill material. In addition the impact of the traffic movements being centred around the identified temporary construction compounds and the additional construction compounds that the PEIR states 'will be required to facilitate the construction process will be identified in the Environmental Statement' and the resulting noise disturbance/light pollution in these locations and traffic routes that are in close proximity to residential properties. Figure 8.1 on pg. 8 of Chapter 8 - Noise and vibration does not include the temporary construction compound identified at Oulton Street or the alternative cable route west of Salle Park within the 1 km noise and vibration study area buffer as shown in the 'Phase 2 Statutory Consultation Plan'. The district Council expects the imposition of conditions to set out the permitted hours of working, permitted activities at the temporary construction compounds and maximum permitted noise levels to reduce the impact on the nearby local communities.</p>	I	<p>Impacts on the local road network is assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport. Associated disruption in respect to noise and vibration and dust are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapters 8 and 9: Noise and Vibration and Air Quality respectively.</p>
Holt County Division	<p>Night time access has been suggested by some, but that then has further implications for residents – with noise and vibration from such vehicles causing disturbance where some properties adjoin the highway.</p>	I	<p>Working hours are set out in the outline CoCP which forms part of the DCO application. The need for any night-time working would be subject to agreement with the local planning authority. Associated impacts relating to noise and vibration are set out in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 8: Noise and Vibration.</p>
Edgefield, Bodham, Corpusty & Saxthorpe, Hempstead and Plumstead Parish Councils (and others)	<p>3. Mitigations of impact of HVAC booster station</p> <p>At present, based on the drawings, descriptions and 3D models we have seen, there are no mitigating measures planned around the construction of the HVAC booster station at Little Barningham and this is simply unacceptable. The potential height on its own would create an eyesore that could significantly undermine the quality of life of people living in, and passing through, the area. Not to mention the noise.</p> <p>There are very few rural services in North Norfolk and precious little economic activity beyond tourism. The quality of life and the beautiful natural environment we enjoy are what people get instead and this could be significantly eroded by the developers' plans if mitigation steps are not put in place. 97% of residents said that improving the natural habitat after construction was finished was "important" or "very important" - the strongest response of all the issues covered and the answer that had the greatest consensus (standard deviation: 0.56). 95% furthermore said that the</p>	I	<p>Information pertaining to the site selection for the HVAC booster station is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives, whilst maximum dimensions are provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description.</p> <p>Through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive ecological receptors. For example, the orientation of the HVAC booster station has been optimised to minimise impacts on nearby field boundaries (hedgerows and trees) as well as maximise natural screening. Additional mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project are outlined in topic specific chapters, and include the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts on local road networks, ecological receptors (e.g. hedgerows) and hydrological features (e.g. main rivers); and landscape planting around the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC</p>



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>55</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>natural environment has a lot to do with their quality of life.</p> <p>Visual</p> <p>The proposed 12.5m structure will be visible over hundreds of hectares, including from all neighbouring villages, and a significant length of the Holt road. We do not recognize the visualisations we have been shown by the developer based on our local knowledge, and we will undertake experiments ourselves to see the true distance over which the structure as currently planned would be seen. Significant height mitigations should be volunteered by the developer or required as a condition of the order, to reduce substantially the relative height to the extent that it would be similar in size to other aesthetically limited constructions in the local area: only churches remotely approach the height currently proposed. We urge the developers to consider ideas for this – a very small selection of which include: digging out the foundations so the building starts at a lower level; using the soil to create a bank around the construction and planting the scheme with trees.</p> <p>We note the lengthy disclaimers attached to the developer’s visualisations and feel they are therefore an ineffective tool to understand the visual impact of the booster station from different viewpoints. Physical demonstrations would be required in order to understand the true visibility of the proposed construction.</p> <p>77% of residents said that ensuring the height of the booster station was kept to a minimum was “very important” and this is an area we hope the developers will consider seriously before making their application - at present no mitigations whatsoever are proposed and this is clearly unacceptable.</p> <p>We have been informed that flood lighting will be needed on site to provide safe working conditions at night in the event of emergency. We accept this, but do not understand why this lighting needs to be motion-sensitive. For the purposes of security we understand remote monitored, motion-sensitive, infrared cameras would be equally effective and request that any flood lighting be manually triggered either remotely or from on-site so as to prevent any eventuality where the night sky in this remote and rural area is illuminated unnecessarily.</p> <p>Noise and vibration</p> <p>Currently the developer proposes noise and vibration mitigation that reduces the noise impact of the booster station to “acceptable levels”. We have seen no evidence that these levels are respectful of the fact that, at night in North Norfolk, the environment is virtually absent of any background noise or vibration interference whatsoever. Nor are we confident that background studies have been carried out at sites close to the proposed construction.</p> <p>We insist that the required noise and vibration levels within 500m of the proposed booster station are set at the current background levels at those locations on a clear night.</p> <p>We strongly urge the developers to provide detailed noise and vibration mitigation steps as part of their application, rather than leave any doubt whatsoever that the targets will be adequate. If local people are being dragged into a national infrastructure project with no way of knowing what the impact will be, and with no formal powers of recourse, then the enforcement of rights will only be able to be fought for post hoc by residents through protest and inconvenience once the DCO has been granted. It benefits everyone for the precise specification of “acceptable levels” to be disclosed upfront – and at a level that is agreeable.</p> <p>We believe that the available mitigation options should be able to reduce noise and vibration well below statutory levels – and that the extraordinary nature of this development means it is quite appropriate for entirely subjective levels to be set.</p> <p>96% of residents said that ensuring the booster station couldn’t be heard nearby was “important” or “very important”, making it the highest rated issue relating to the</p>		<p>substation to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>55</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>booster station, and the booster-station related issue whose response had the greatest consensus (standard deviation: 0.67). As it stands, it is still unclear whether the current background noise levels were sampled in appropriate places, or by suitably independent third parties.</p> <p>Decommissioning We seek reassurance from the developers that any potential booster station will be adequately demolished and removed at the end of its working life and the land restored.</p> <p>The HVAC booster station will be of significant and long-term detriment to our area, and our area alone – and the best in class mitigation practices should be deployed, however costly. For the avoidance of doubt, our proposal in point two above should require the cost comparison to be inclusive of the cost of mitigations to the booster station in the case of HVAC.</p>		
Swainsthorpe Parish Council	<p>Councillors are also extremely concerned about the potential for noise pollution. The site is planned for a very rural area where there is very little noise, especially at night. The parish council understands it is possible that a whine or a hum may emit from the site and councillors would request in the strongest terms that any steps possible to reduce this as a result of additional steps which could be taken during the construction, should be taken.</p>	I	<p>Potential noise impacts during the operation of the HVDC converter/HVAC substation is addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 8: Noise and Vibration, along with proposed mitigation where appropriate.</p>
Swannington with Alderford and Little Witchingham Parish Council	<p>I am writing to provide input into the consultation process, regarding the proposed route for the cables.</p> <p>Alderford and Hall Road, Alderford The proposed route passes close to several residential properties in Alderford. You have explained through parish councillors' meetings the timescales and digging processes. Parishioners' concerns in particular relate to;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noise and dust/dirt attenuation</li> <li>• Disruption to Hall road and the Reepham Road</li> <li>• The possibility of significant extension of the construction timescales if the project has to be delivered in phases.</li> <li>• Dong identifying all utility cables and pipes, including live privately-owned water pipes</li> <li>• Accessing the construction area from compounds</li> <li>• Local compensation - benefit</li> </ul>	I	<p>Where possible and practicable the cable corridor route selected seeks to avoid passing adjacent to properties. This is to reduce impacts associated with construction disturbance and to seek to minimise conflicts such as Heavy Goods Vehicle (HGV) traffic movements. However, it is not possible to avoid passing in close proximity to all properties on the route. Where properties are located in close proximity, the Project will ensure that sensitive construction management measures, such as noise, dust and traffic control are considered. These are documented in an outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), which accompanies the DCO application.</p> <p>Potential impacts on residential receptors are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapter (as well as the inter-related effects chapter) contained within Environmental Statement volume 3.</p>
Swannington with Alderford and Little Witchingham Parish Council	<p>Noise attenuation: more detail is needed on how residents are not to be burdened by loud and persistent noise and dust/ dirt</p>	I	<p>Where properties are located in close proximity, the Project will ensure that sensitive construction management measures, such as noise, dust and traffic control are considered. These are documented in an outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), which accompanies the DCO application.</p> <p>Potential noise impacts during the operation of the HVDC converter/HVAC substation is addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 8: Noise and Vibration, along with proposed mitigation where appropriate.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>55</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 42: Local Authorities (prescribed under section 43 of the Act)</b>			
Norfolk County Council	<p>Local Member Views</p> <p>2.39 The Local County Councillor for Melton Constable has made the following comments:</p> <p>2.40 There is generally little opposition to these proposals in absolute terms and local residents appreciate the importance of national infrastructure and securing future energy supply;</p> <p>2.41 There are concerns about the lack of mitigating measures planned in respect of the onshore HVAC Booster Station; and</p> <p>2.42 The Local Member strongly urges the County Council to insist that the developers provide detailed mitigating measures as part of their submission in respect of: height, visibility and noise – relating to the HVAC booster station at Little Barningham.</p>	I	<p>Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts to local residential receptors, either through site selection/route refinement (see Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives) or through the identification of suitable mitigation measures. Where there are impacts to residential receptors, these are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3).</p> <p>Appropriate mitigation measures relating to the onshore HVAC booster station are also identified in the relevant topic specific chapters. For example, visual disturbance impacts and associated mitigation are outlined in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources. This includes, for example, the restoration of habitats (including hedgerows) which cannot be avoided and landscape planting around the HVAC booster station to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.</p>
Planning, South Norfolk Council	<p>The Council's response to your consultation was agreed at the Development Management Committee meeting on 13 September 2017 and I enclose a copy of the committee report for your information.</p> <p>Our response to the consultation refers to three key considerations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Heritage Assets</li> <li>• Landscape</li> <li>• Noise and Pollution</li> </ul>	N	Noted, specific comments on these considerations are considered in the following points.
Planning, South Norfolk Council	<p>Noise and Vibration</p> <p>Noise from the construction phase has the potential to have an impact on the residents of the surrounding area. The PEIR outlines measures that will be taken to address this issue which are considered acceptable but the detail will need to be agreed at the appropriate time.</p> <p>Noise from the infrastructure is Low Frequency Noise (particularly in the 50Hz third octave band) which tends to be associated with electrical equipment (e.g. transformers). The PEIR outlines measures that will be taken to address this issue which are considered acceptable but the detail will need to be agreed at the appropriate time.</p>	I	<p>An Outline CoCP forms part of the DCO application and contains management measures that the Undertaker and its construction contractors will be required to adopt and implement for all construction activities associated with Hornsea Three. This includes measures to minimise construction noise, such as using plant conforming with the relevant legislation relating to noise and vibration; ensure plant machinery is turned off when not in use and undertaking construction works in accordance with the best practicable means.</p> <p>Mitigation measures in relation to noise during the operational phase of Hornsea Three are detailed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 8: Noise and Vibration. The objective of the measures are to control and limit noise levels, so far as is reasonably practicable, to minimise disturbance to sensitive receptors. The measures which Hornsea Three have committed to include the preparation of an Operational Noise Management Plan (NMP) for the onshore HVAC booster station and onshore HVDC converter/HVAC substation, to be agreed with the relevant local planning authority, prior to the start of noise generating works.</p> <p>Hornsea Three has also committed to developing acoustic mitigation during the detailed design stage for the onshore HVDC converter/HVAC substation to minimise noise impacts at surrounding residential NSRs. Given the location of the HVAC booster station relevant to the nearest residential receptor, and the commitment of Hornsea Three to internalise the noisiest equipment, similar acoustic mitigation is not required for the HVAC booster station.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>55</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Broadland District Council	The impact on local communities and residential amenities as a result of the increased vehicular activity including heavy plant associated with the construction phases of the onshore export cable route including the removal of excavated material, the delivery of large sections of cables and the traffic movements associated with delivering backfill material. In addition the impact of the traffic movements being centred around the identified temporary construction compounds and the additional construction compounds that the PEIR states 'will be required to facilitate the construction process will be identified in the Environmental Statement' and the resulting noise disturbance/light pollution in these locations and traffic routes that are in close proximity to residential properties. Figure 8.1 on pg. 8 of Chapter 8 - Noise and vibration does not include the temporary construction compound identified at Oulton Street or the alternative cable route west of Salle Park within the 1 km noise and vibration study area buffer as shown in the 'Phase 2 Statutory Consultation Plan'. The district Council expects the imposition of conditions to set out the permitted hours of working, permitted activities at the temporary construction compounds and maximum permitted noise levels to reduce the impact on the nearby local communities.	I	Impacts on the local road network is assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport. Associated disruption in respect to noise and vibration and dust are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapters 8 and 9: Noise and Vibration and Air Quality respectively.
<b>Section 42: Persons with an interest in the land (prescribed under section 44 of the Act)</b>			
Natasha and Steve Hall	Having received all the paperwork with reference to the above project I just wondered how you expect non engineering people to understand any of it. We have been very accommodating with DONG wanting to put up wind /noise monitors in our garden but with no information on why or what consequences this will have on our property.	I	Response noted. Sufficient technical detail must be included within the Environmental Statement to ensure sufficient transparency in method and assessment, as well as to inform responses from statutory consultees. To assist in the communication of those more technical aspects to members of the public, a non-technical summary has been provided as part of the DCO Application.
Natasha and Steve Hall	After receiving a few calls from concerned people asking if I was happy with what was said on radio Norwich I thought I had better email to check facts. It appears that everyone is happy and there are no concerns about the Hornsea wind farm project everybody has been kept informed (which we had not up to when we went to Swardeston village hall event) and found out information for ourselves. I don't think at this stage before planning that an assumption should be made that everyone is in agreement with this project- obviously they are talking to people who live miles from the site and who have no visual or noise impact. Our concerns still remain unanswered and have had no response since event 4th September	N	Ørsted clarified that no assumption had been made that local communities were fully supportive of the proposal at that stage. Ørsted explained that it had taken part in the radio interviews to encourage wider participation in the consultation. Ørsted reassured that consultee that Hornsea Three was still in the planning pre-application stage and noted that further refinements to Hornsea Three were anticipated following receipt of comments as part of the statutory consultation.
Natasha and Steve Hall	<b>PEIR surveys</b> - My property excluded from visual sound survey - major impact	I	Where there are impacts to residential receptors, these are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3).
Natasha and Steve Hall	<b>Proposal</b> - Cannot answer above as still awaiting communication with reference to compensation as we seem to be the only private residents affected - visual - noise - devaluation of our property. We feel we have been overlooked	I	Where there are impacts to residential receptors, these are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3). Hornsea Three has met with this stakeholder following PEIR to further discuss their concerns.
<b>Section 47: Duty to consult local community</b>			
Nigel Rogers	<b>5. Comments on the Impact on Warren House Farm:</b> 5.1 We confirm that, as previously advised to DONG Energy and Dalcour Maclaren, it is essential that the cable corridor does not damage our septic tank drain. This drain runs under Warren Road and into the field through which the corridor is planned, with the inspection pit for the tank at GPS N 525520.2260 E 1 7 38.016 (the tank drain cover is marked by a traffic cone.) We ask that the final 80m corridor is as far to the east of Warren Road as practicable, to avoid damage to this tank as well as reduce noise and disturbance to ourselves and our neighbours during corridor construction. 5.2 We, our neighbours and users of Squirrelwood Livery Stables, require access at all times along Warren Road (the only access track for ourselves and emergency vehicles.) This narrow and poorly kept track is unsuitable for use by traffic for the cable corridor. We understand that the Highways Agency has previously advised, as part of another planning application, that junction of Warren Road with Bridge Road is only suitable for very light traffic movements. It is not suitable for cable corridor traffic.	I	Impacts on drainage and private assets/supplies are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 2: Hydrology and Flood Risk.  Impacts relating to access are addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport. It is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this forms part of the DCO application.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>55</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Robert and Jane Scarfe	<p><b>Low Frequency Vibration:</b> Low Frequency vibration at 50hz is another issue which will concern the residents of Great Melton Road - and anyone else on the route whose homes are close to this buried cable. You seem to have done your best to disguise this impact with gobbledegook and references to receptors rather than residents or householders. (See 8.3.11 which says there's potential for adverse impacts and effects on nearby people, which can affect the use of their residential property and outside areas). You refer to measured baseline sound levels in document 8.7.1 so therefore that an admission that there will be an issue.</p>	I	<p>Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 8: Noise and Vibration provides an assessment of impacts arising from Hornsea Three in relation to noise and vibration. The assessment will consider impacts during construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning will be presented.</p> <p>In respect to the baseline noise and vibration levels, this has been established through a combination of desk studies, baseline surveys and consultation. The baseline is established in order to provide a background level against which to assess any impacts from Hornsea Three.</p> <p>It is noted that the onshore cables, which will be buried, will not generate any perceptible noise or vibration.</p>
Jeremy Fielding	<p>My name is Jeremy Fielding and I live in one of two homes closest to where you are proposing to run underground electric cables in [REDACTED]. I would like you to address my concerns regarding this, which are as follows: Health. Disruption. Noise. Future property values. As you well know we already have a high voltage pylon wires to the side of our property, with the risk of health issues that brings and now you want to increase that risk.</p> <p>We will face inevitable disruption and noise and would like to know what safeguards are in place with regard to this and whether work is carried out at night</p> <p>The uncertainty with regard to property values will need to be addressed as should some sort of compensation to those most affected. I hope there will not be a total disregard for people who are affected, as so often happens and we will expect our well being to be priority.</p>	I	<p>Where possible and practicable the cable corridor route selected seeks to avoid passing adjacent to properties. This is to reduce impacts associated with construction disturbance and to seek to minimise conflicts such as Heavy Goods Vehicle (HGV) traffic movements. However, it is not possible to avoid passing in close proximity to all properties on the route. Where properties are located in close proximity, the Project will ensure that sensitive construction management measures, such as noise, dust and traffic control are considered. These are documented in an outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), which accompanies the DCO application. Night works will be minimised as far as reasonably practicable.</p> <p>In respect to compensation, we will compensate landowners who are directly affected by the cable through their land. Compensation is paid for the freehold depreciation of the land affected by the easement and for all reasonable and substantiated losses arising from construction of the project.</p>
Beverley Wigg	<p>Of particular concern is the booster station which is a major industrial installation in a totally rural setting. The images provided so far at the drop-ins (Reepham 8th September) are not sufficiently detailed to allow members of the public, or stakeholders to get a real sense of how it will look – and it is difficult for people to begin to understand what the noise implications are.</p>	I	<p>Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 4.5: Photograph Panels, Wirelines and Photomontages presents indicative visualisations which show a potential appearance of the proposed HVAC booster station. In short, the equipment for the onshore substation could be up to 25 metres in height and could be housed within a single or multiple buildings, in an open yard or a combination of these. The maximum design scenario is detailed more fully in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description.</p> <p>It is noted that the assessment contained within Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual resources, which is informed by annex 4.5, considers a worst-case scenario, so in this instance the maximum dimensions of the proposed HVAC booster station. Based on the findings of the impact assessment, mitigation measure have been identified to reduce any significant landscape and visual effects to an acceptable level. Measures include strategic landscape planting .</p> <p>It is important to note that although annex 4.5 includes visualisations which show an indicative design, the final design will be subject to change. However, this final design will need to be within the confines of what has been assessed, i.e. it couldn't be any larger than the maximum dimensions presented.</p> <p>In respect to noise, a full assessment of potential impacts associated with the HVAC booster station is provided in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 8: Noise and Vibration. It concludes that with mitigation, no significant effects are anticipated.</p>



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>55</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Paul Craske	<p>Weybourne is set in a Conservation area of natural outstanding beauty, and YOU want to come along and disrupt our lives again for up to eleven years!</p> <p>What does the village gain from this.... nothing, we loose the income from holiday makers, which in turn means a loss of income to our already struggling pub and shop, that alone those residents trying to make an income from letting accommodation.?</p>	Y	<p>Since the PEIR, a refined landfall location has been identified (western re-route around Kelling) and the area identified for landfall works has reduced. This was informed by a number of factors including community feedback in the area of Kelling and Weybourne, avoidance of the Kelling Heath SSSI/CWS and Holiday Park as well as engineering/technical considerations. Impacts associated with works at the landfall are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3).</p> <p>Notwithstanding this it is noted that where sensitive receptors are in close proximity to onshore works, the Project will ensure that sensitive construction management measures, such as noise, dust and traffic control are considered. These are documented in an outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), which accompanies the DCO application.</p> <p>Impacts on tourism are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 10: Socio-Economics.</p>
Susan Allen	<p>The Booster Station. Of particular concern is the booster station which is a major industrial installation in a totally rural setting. The images provided so far at the drop-ins (Reephams 8th September) are not sufficiently detailed to allow members of the public, or stakeholders to get a real sense of how it will look – and it is difficult for people to begin to understand what the noise implications are. These are a very real and very important consideration along with the impact on the landscape.</p>	I	<p>Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 4.5: Photograph Panels, Wirelines and Photomontages presents indicative visualisations which show a potential appearance of the proposed HVAC booster station. In short, the equipment for the onshore substation could be up to 25 metres in height and could be housed within a single or multiple buildings, in an open yard or a combination of these. The maximum design scenario is detailed more fully in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description.</p> <p>It is noted that the assessment contained within Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual resources, which is informed by annex 4.5, considers a worst-case scenario, so in this instance the maximum dimensions of the proposed HVAC booster station. Based on the findings of the impact assessment, mitigation measures have been identified to reduce any significant landscape and visual effects to an acceptable level. Measures include strategic landscape planting.</p> <p>It is important to note that although annex 4.5 includes visualisations which show an indicative design, the final design will be subject to change. However, this final design will need to be within the confines of what has been assessed, i.e. it couldn't be any larger than the maximum dimensions presented.</p> <p>In respect to noise, a full assessment of potential impacts associated with the HVAC booster station is provided in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 8: Noise and Vibration. It concludes that with mitigation, no significant effects are anticipated.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>55</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Friends of North Norfolk	<p>17. PEIR Volume 3, which deals with onshore impacts. We have great concerns that the additional cables, very large offshore and onshore Reactive Compensation Installations and works which would be required if HVAC Transmission is used would have a major adverse impact on very sensitive Receptors taken cumulatively with other major developments, either recently completed or proposed. Both the Dudgeon and Sheringham Shoal Wind Farms make landfall at Weybourne; and if HVAC Transmission is utilised it will mean more and very much greater works over a prolonged period both to the East and West affecting a key part of the Norfolk Coast AONB, Norfolk Heritage Coast and the Norfolk/ English National Trail.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Chapter 4 Landscape and Visual Resources.</li> <li>- Chapter 5 Historic Environment.</li> <li>- Chapter 6 Land Use and Recreation.</li> <li>- Chapter 8 Noise and Vibration.</li> <li>- Chapter 11 Inter Related Effects.</li> </ul>	I	<p>An assessment of impacts on the AONB is presented in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources. To inform this process, Hornsea Three has consulted with the Norfolk Coast Partnership, as well as local authorities, in regard to the identification of suitable viewpoints within the AONB.</p> <p>Where the onshore cable corridor crossed public rights of way, Hornsea Three has sought to avoid impacts through the use of HDD technology. Where this has not been possible and thus open cut, or HDD with a haul road over, is proposed, the routes will be temporarily diverted along existing tracks, for a maximum of one month per cable. Following the completion of the construction works all areas of access land, recreational resources, PRoWs and other linear routes affected by the onshore works would be re-instated to their current condition and/or along their current alignments. There would be no physical effects on these resources arising from the operation or maintenance of Hornsea Three. The measures to be taken to ensure the continued use of all linear recreational resources during the construction phase of the project have been discussed with Norfolk County Council and are set out in the Outline CoCP. This dialogue will continue during the detailed design process. The assessment of impacts on individual public rights of way (where appropriate) are set out in Environmental Statement, volume 3, chapter 6: Land Use and Recreation.</p> <p>Following the completion of the construction works all areas of access land, recreational resources, PRoWs and other linear routes affected by the onshore works would be re-instated to their current condition and/or along their current alignments. There would be no physical effects on these resources arising from the operation or maintenance of Hornsea Three. The measures to be taken to ensure the continued use of all linear recreational resources during the construction phase of the project have been discussed with Norfolk County Council and are set out in the Outline CoCP. This dialogue will continue during the detailed design process.</p> <p>The potential for cumulative effects as a result Hornsea Three in combination with other major developments is assessed in each of the topic chapters of the Environmental Statement (see volume 3).</p>
David and Julie Brooks	<p>The proposed onshore cable corridor route (Section 1B) to the east of Weybourne would create major disruption as at 80 metres width it will take up all of the car park and the field area at the top of the cliffs. Also if the area is fenced off while construction takes place it will close off any access to this area and the lane from the Windmill to the Coastguard cottages for about 6 months based on Annex 7.4 which states a rate of construction at 3 months per location per 750 metres. (However, this figure is based on 2 trenches stated in Annex 7.4 whereas there will be 6 trenches in the 80 metre width). So presumably it will take a great deal longer. The cable corridor is also shown very close to the end of Pine Walk which would seriously impact on residents in the adjacent bungalows.</p>	Y	<p>Through design development, the area which will be directly impacted by the landfall works associated with construction of Hornsea Three has been reduced. Where practicable, Hornsea Three has sought to avoid or minimise impacts on nearby residential receptors.</p> <p>The potential impacts of the construction works at landfall are addressed in topic specific chapters, with impacts on traffic and access considered in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>55</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Robert and Jane Scarfe	<p>Low frequency vibration We are also concerned about low frequency vibration transmitted through the soil if AC transmission is used – which will be the case if our recollection of what was said at Dong's recent presentation to parish councils is correct. They struck us as evasive when asked if the current would be AC or DC.</p> <p>The six multi-phased cables are likely to create an additive or subtractive magnetic field effect, especially at points where the route changes direction. Veering off towards Burnthouse Lane is a good example. In my opinion that renders the predictions of rapid fall-off of the magnetic field generated by these shallow buried underground cables as purely speculative on Dong's part.</p> <p>There was talk at the meeting about measuring sound levels and their effects on "receptors", which is their word for local residents, after the project had been commissioned – i.e. once it's too late to do anything about it. We fear this low level 50Hz vibration 24/7 will be audible to Great Melton Road residents and intrude upon their lives.</p>	I	<p>Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 8: Noise and Vibration will provide an assessment of impacts arising from Hornsea Three in relation to noise and vibration. The assessment will consider impacts during construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning will be presented.</p> <p>In respect to the baseline noise and vibration levels, this has been established through a combination of desk studies, baseline surveys and consultation. The baseline is established in order to provide a background level against which to assess any impacts from Hornsea Three.</p> <p>It is noted that the onshore cables, which will be buried, will not generate any perceptible noise or vibration.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>55</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Dr. William Brian Ankers (on behalf of Yvette Gibson)	<p>(c) Volume 3 - Onshore Chapters, Chapter 8: Noise and Vibration, page 28, Section 8.12 assesses the significance of noise on residential noise sensitive receptors (NSRs). For the sake of consistency, if we adopt the same approach as DONG Energy to rating the sensitivity of receptors and the magnitude of impact to determine the 'significance of effect' of noise from cable installation and construction of the HVAC booster station on the residential property within Pond Hills Woodland approximately 250 metres north of the previously proposed HVAC booster station – Option A, then it is abundantly clear that the serious concerns regarding the adverse impact of noise at the Pond Hills site in my representation of March 2017 in Section 15 were fully justified. Thus:</p> <p>For trenched cable route works: Page 34, Para 8.12.1.7 states that for trenched cable route works: "From Table 8.22, it can be seen that residential Noise and Vibration Sensitive Receptors (NSRs) within approximately 41 m of the cable route would experience a medium (or high within 16 m) impact during daytime works. If evening or night-time works take place, then any NSRs within a greater distance would potentially be affected" (a medium impact within 259m or high impact within 103m). Para 8.12.1.1 states that: "Residential receptors within the distances above are considered to be medium sensitivity". Para 8.12.1.2 addresses the significance of the effect and concludes that for receptors within 41m the magnitude will be moderate, so the effect will, therefore, be of moderate adverse significance, which is significant in Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) terms. Cable installed by (Horizontal Directional Drilling) HDD: Para 8.12.1.6 states that: "Cable installed by HDD will involve potentially more noisy works than for most of the cable laying. At these locations, whilst most works will be limited to the daytime, works may also occur during the evening or night-time periods". Para 8.12.1.8 reports that for HDD where night-time works take place, then the magnitude of impact is considered to be major for any NSRs within 245m of the cable route. Para 8.12.1.13 addresses the significance of the effect and concludes that for receptors of medium sensitivity within 245m of the cable route at night-time the magnitude will be major, so the effect will, therefore, be of major adverse significance, which is significant in EIA terms. Construction Noise at HVAC Booster Station: Page 30, para 8.12.1.27 states that construction of the "HVAC booster station will involve potentially more noisy works than for most of the cable laying.....whilst most works will be limited to the daytime, works may also occur during the evening or night-time periods". Para 8.12.1.29 reports that "Where night-time works take place, then any NSRs within a greater distance would potentially be affected, to a distance of approximately 282 m of the HVAC booster station for a medium impact during night time." Para 8.12.1.33 addresses the significance of the effect and reports that the sensitivity of the receptor is considered to be medium and the magnitude is deemed to be moderate. The effect will, therefore, be of moderate adverse significance, which is significant in EIA terms.</p>	I	<p>The Pond Hills HVAC booster site is no longer proposed, the chosen HVAC booster station site is located close to Little Barningham. Further details on site selection are provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives.</p> <p>The potential noise impacts arising from the construction, operation and decommissioning of the onshore HVAC booster station are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 8: Noise and Vibration.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>55</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Ray and Diane Pearce	<p>Construction Yard: A 'Construction Compound' is proposed to be located adjacent to our property in accordance with the PEIR's Onshore Key Plan Map 5. This was not communicated to us until the issuance of the PEIR. Coupled with the location of the cable crossing point, the additional disruption of locating a construction compound adjacent to our property will have a severe and negative impact upon us. The cumulative effects of the location of construction compounds on private residents and members of the public is not discussed in the PEIR. The disruption we will experience if the planned construction compound is located thus will be untenable and could be for a prolonged period not detailed in the PEIR. Clearly, there will also be an environmental impact on the location of construction yards and the PEIR is deficient in discussing this impact on the population.</p> <p>The proposed construction yards, in general, will also have an impact on the appearance and character of the planned areas with implications in respect of agriculture during a prolonged construction phase which is not evident in the PEIR. A prolonged period of disruption could ensue as the construction phase for the project is not time limited.</p>	Y	<p>The main construction compound for the project will be located at Oulton Airfield, accessed off the B1149. Since the PEIR, Hornsea Three has refined the proposals for the secondary compounds, with five compounds located along the onshore cable corridor. The locations of the proposed secondary compounds are shown in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description.</p> <p>Impacts on sensitive receptors are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3). Impacts on agricultural land use in particular is assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 6: Land Use and Recreation.</p> <p>The construction programme for Hornsea Three is set out in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Projects Description and confirms a maximum duration of the onshore construction works of eight years, within this, the maximum duration for construction of the onshore cable corridor is approximately 2.5 years, this therefore means that the maximum duration over which construction could occur would be 5.5 years incorporating two phases (assuming a three-year gap between the two phases). The work associated with each phase is expected to progress along the Hornsea Three onshore cable corridor with a typical active construction works duration of three months at any particular location. Secondary construction compounds and storage areas would only remain in place while works were being undertaken in the nearby area, after which they would be restored back to the baseline conditions (as set out in the outline CoCP which accompanies the DCO application).</p>
Joanna and Anshuman Mondal	<p>We are concerned about the alternative route that is being considered, which is purple on your map. This route would be closer to our property than the original, yellow route, and would have considerable impact on our property and our neighbours. Could you please let us know why this alternative and more disruptive route is being considered?</p> <p>Also, can you please tell us how long the excavations will be in place? That is, from the commencement of the work around Church Farm Barns, to the restoration of the terrain.</p>	I	<p>Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts to local residential receptors, either through site selection/route refinement or through the identification of suitable mitigation measures. Where there are impacts to residential receptors, these are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3). Justification for the route refinement changes during the pre-application phase are set out in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives.</p>
Sarah Bristow	<p><b>Onshore Substation</b> - A bit close to my house, worried about noise, and limited access for building works</p>	I	<p>Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts to local residential receptors, either through site selection/route refinement or through the identification of suitable mitigation measures. Where there are impacts to residential receptors, these are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3), for example noise is addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 8: Noise and Vibration.</p>
Janet Curtis	<p><b>Landfall Zone</b> - The eastern landfall site is a few metres from 7 houses. The noise, disruption to the residents would be intolerable. Vibration was experienced in these houses when the test sites were bored.</p>	Y	<p>Since the PEIR, a refined landfall location has been identified (western re-route around Kelling) and the area identified for landfall works has reduced. This was informed by a number of factors including community feedback in the area of Kelling and Weybourne, avoidance of the Kelling Heath SSSI/CWS and Holiday Park as well as engineering/technical considerations. Impacts associated with works at the landfall are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3).</p> <p>Notwithstanding this it is noted that where sensitive receptors are in close proximity to onshore works, the Project will ensure that sensitive construction management measures, such as noise, dust and traffic control are considered. These are documented in an outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), which accompanies the DCO application.</p>
Patricia Dodge (Weybourne Village Hall)	<p><b>80m Corridor</b> - Please avoid areas that impact on the peaceful enjoyment of local residents</p>	I	<p>Where sensitive receptors are in close proximity to onshore works, the Project will ensure that sensitive construction management measures, such as noise, dust and traffic control are considered. These are documented in an outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), which accompanies the DCO application. Impacts on residential receptors are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement.</p>



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>55</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Patricia Dodge (Weybourne Village Hall)	<b>Proposal</b> - We have had Sheringham shoal of Dudgeon already. The impact over 18 months duration was huge. Heavy vehicles in the village increased noise and pollution. Plus the damage to the special view along the coastline which was in no way enhanced by the working compound constructed and the landfall site	I	Through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive ecological receptors. For example, Weybourne Cliffs and Kelling Heath SSSI have been avoided and no direct impacts are predicted on these designated sites from Hornsea Three. As a result of this refined landfall location, the area identified for landfall works has also reduced. Additional mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project are outlined in topic specific chapters, and include the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts on local road networks, ecological receptors (e.g. hedgerows) and hydrological features (e.g. main rivers).
Stephen Huntley	<b>PEIR construction methods</b> - Assessment of potential noise at the substation (once completed) is inadequate	I	Impacts in relation to operational noise generated at the HVDC converter/HVAC substation are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 8: Noise and Vibration. Where relevant, Hornsea Three has identified mitigation measures to minimise impacts.
Stephen Huntley	<b>Mitigation Methods</b> - Mitigation of noise must be developed. Screening measures must be developed - the graphic video used at the consultation meeting gave no realistic impression of the screening or the extent of visibility from the surrounding area	I	Impacts in relation to operational noise generated at the HVDC converter/HVAC substation are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 8: Noise and Vibration. Where relevant, Hornsea Three has identified mitigation measures to minimise impacts.  Appropriate mitigation measures for visual disturbance are outlined in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources. This includes, for example, the restoration of habitats (including hedgerows) which cannot be avoided and landscape planting around the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application. Photographic panels along the cable corridor, as well as indicative visualisations have been prepared to inform the assessment of impacts and are provided in Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 4.5: Photographic Panels, Wireframes and Photomontages.
Stephen Huntley	<b>PEIR</b> - I recognise the substation must go somewhere and do not wish to be a 'NIMBY', but it is vital that every effort is made to reduce the impact on the surrounding villages	I	Where possible and practicable the cable corridor route selected seeks to avoid passing adjacent to properties. This is to reduce impacts associated with construction disturbance and to seek to minimise conflicts such as Heavy Goods Vehicle (HGV) traffic movements. However, it is not possible to avoid passing in close proximity to all properties on the route. Where properties are located in close proximity, the Project will ensure that sensitive construction management measures, such as noise, dust and traffic control are considered. These are documented in an outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), which accompanies the DCO application.
Peter Youart	<b>EIA</b> - DONG's assessment of noise from HVAC Booster station was that it would have 'significant impact' on surrounding area. This was not quantified nor were any mitigation issues identified	I	Impacts in relation to operational noise generated at the HVAC booster station are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 8: Noise and Vibration. Where relevant, Hornsea Three has identified mitigation measures to minimise impacts.
Peter Youart	<b>Proposal</b> - Proposal does not address sufficient mitigation factors for impact of permanent onshore booster station	I	Through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive ecological receptors. For example, the orientation of the HVAC booster station has been optimised to minimise impacts on nearby field boundaries (hedgerows and trees) as well as maximise natural screening. Additional mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project are outlined in topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3), and include the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts on local road networks, ecological receptors (e.g. hedgerows) and hydrological features (e.g. main rivers).

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>55</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Peter Youart	<b>HVAC</b> - The location is very rural with negligible background ambient noise (e.g. bird song and occasional tractor). It is this which attracts tourists and residents alike. Any noise from booster station would be extremely detrimental to local residents, local businesses and the tourists using their facilities. Mitigation should be planned and effective from the outset ensuring no sound transference. This is entirely achievable and should be implemented before commission. 365 days of noise, 24 hours a day would devastate the rural community. A strategy of providing minimum mitigation and waiting to see who complains is not appropriate and will result in very strained relationships and significant poor publicity.	I	Where there are impacts to sensitive receptors associated with the HVDC converter/HVAC substation and/or HVAC booster station, these are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3), for example noise during the operation of the permanent infrastructure is assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 8: Noise and Vibration, with mitigation measures also identified in this chapter where relevant.  In respect to construction, where properties are located in close proximity, the Project will ensure that sensitive construction management measures, such as noise, dust and traffic control are considered. These are documented in an outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), which accompanies the DCO application.  Impacts on socio-economics and tourism are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 10: Socio-Economics.
Peter Youart	<b>PEIR Surveys</b> - Insufficient information on the Little Barningham booster station. Negligible noise information provided. Use of vague terminology e.g. 'appropriate measures'	I	Where there are impacts to sensitive receptors associated with the HVDC converter/HVAC substation and/or HVAC booster station, these are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3), for example noise during the operation of the permanent infrastructure is assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 8: Noise and Vibration, with mitigation measures also identified in this chapter where relevant.  In respect to construction, where properties are located in close proximity, the Project will ensure that sensitive construction management measures, such as noise, dust and traffic control are considered. These are documented in an outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), which accompanies the DCO application.
Peter Youart	<b>EIA</b> -Sound proofing of booster station at Little Barningham. Absolutely essential no noise.	I	Hornsea Three has, through site selection and route refinement sought to minimise impacts on environmental and social receptors as a result of the HVAC booster station. Where there are impacts associated with Hornsea Three, these are assessed within the relevant topic chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3), along with mitigation identified to minimise them.  Impacts in relation to operational noise generated at the HVAC booster station are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 8: Noise and Vibration. Where relevant, Hornsea Three has identified mitigation measures to minimise impacts.
Peter Youart	<b>Information</b> - Noise levels from Little Barningham and full details of all costs of all mitigation along with effective steps to ensure no householder impacted by sound of any frequency (hum)	I	Where there are impacts to sensitive receptors associated with the HVDC converter/HVAC substation and/or HVAC booster station, these are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3), for example noise during the operation of the permanent infrastructure is assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 8: Noise and Vibration, with mitigation measures also identified in this chapter where relevant.  In respect to construction, where properties are located in close proximity, the Project will ensure that sensitive construction management measures, such as noise, dust and traffic control are considered. These are documented in an outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), which accompanies the DCO application.
Claire Hopkins	<b>HVAC</b> - I have concerns about the B1113 will not be able to handle the additional traffic caused by the substation and that where this road meets the A140 would be significantly impacted as the traffic light system is not very well designed. I am also concerned that the value of the property in Swardeston will fall if there is additional noise generated by the substation.	I	Impacts relating to access are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport, whilst impacts relating to noise are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 8: Noise and Vibration.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>55</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Matthew Martin	<b>HVAC</b> - This should be as low as possible so as to be an inobstrusive as possible in what is a largely rural area. Measures should be put to place to keep noise levels as low as possible	I	<p>The dimensions of the HVDC converter/HVAC substation is set out in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description. The maximum height would be up to 25 m.</p> <p>Where there are impacts to sensitive receptors associated with the HVDC converter/HVAC substation and/or HVAC booster station, these are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3), for example noise during the operation of the permanent infrastructure is assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 8: Noise and Vibration, with mitigation measures also identified in this chapter where relevant.</p> <p>Appropriate mitigation measures for visual disturbance are outlined in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources. This includes, for example, the restoration of habitats (including hedgerows) which cannot be avoided and landscape planting around the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.</p>
Christine Walton	<b>Mitigation Measures</b> - It has to consider using more of the infrastructure there already/ from previous projects. Reduce noise/disruption and destruction of the countryside/coastline	I	<p>Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on sensitive receptors including landscapes, designated sites and residential receptors both through design (e.g. refinement of the onshore cable corridor route to avoid sensitive sites) as well through commitments to be implemented during construction and operation. Mitigation measures are identified in each topic chapter of the Environmental Statement, as well as in the outline Code of Construction Practise which forms part of the DCO application.</p>
Christine Walton	<b>Landfall</b> - At present this is near and a spectacular beautiful countryside and coast line. Noise, disruption and dirt for 11 years with the outcome to local residents - definitely not.	Y	<p>During the design refinement Hornsea Three has sought to minimise the duration of any disruption, and has reduced the total number of phases to two and the total duration of the construction phase onshore to eight years. Within this, the maximum duration for construction of the onshore cable corridor is approximately 2.5 years, this therefore means that the maximum duration over which construction could occur would be 5.5 years incorporating two phases (assuming a three-year gap between the two phases). The work associated with each phase is expected to progress along the Hornsea Three onshore cable corridor with a typical active construction works duration of three months at any particular location.</p> <p>Hornsea Three has identified appropriate mitigation measures to minimise visual, noise and dust impacts which are set out in the relevant topic chapters of the Environmental Statement.</p>
Christine Walton	<b>HVAC</b> - I do not believe that as this is the 3rd project that you cannot use the infrastructure you already have or at least significantly reduce the amount of new building work necessary. 25m high building - really? Serious green screening and noise reduction needs to be sorted out being dealing with the building of it. I do not believe there has been enough consideration given to the reality of the disruption, noise and destruction of the countryside	I	<p>Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts to local residential receptors, either through site selection/route refinement or through the identification of suitable mitigation measures. Where there are impacts to receptors, these are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3), for example visual impacts associated with the HVDC converter/HVAC substation is addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources. This chapter also identifies appropriate mitigation measures. This includes, for example, the restoration of habitats (including hedgerows) which cannot be avoided and landscape planting around the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application. Impacts relating to noise during the operational phase is assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 8: Noise and Vibration.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>55</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Christine Walton	<b>Substation</b> - There has already been considerable land destruction/disruption/noise in East Anglia due to unthought through building against local residents wishes and through the building of the Northern bypass around Norwich and through Norfolk. Consideration to routes put in place for this would also apply to other building projects. More thinking needs to take place re minimising this destruction and also honest feedback re how long it will take and how much disruption there would be. I do not think the occurrence of this project is worth losing our beautiful countryside.	I	Further information on the site selection and refinement process for the HVDC converter/HVAC substation is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Alternatives. Hornsea Three has sought to minimise disturbance through the identification of relevant mitigation measures which are outlined in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3).
Gervase Walton	<b>HVAC</b> - I am concerned about 2 things. Firstly, the look of it and secondly the humming noise that it will make. I hope everything possible will be done to mitigate the noise. Also, that the substation will be landscaped so it can be hidden as much as possible and blend into the landscape, I believe placing it as close to the A47 and away from the village of Swardeston as far as possible would be preferable	I	Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts to local residential receptors, either through site selection/route refinement or through the identification of suitable mitigation measures. Where there are impacts to residential receptors, these are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3), for example noise during the operation of the HVDC converter/HVAC substation is addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 8: Noise and Vibration.  Appropriate mitigation measures for visual disturbance are outlined in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources. This includes, for example, the restoration of habitats (including hedgerows) which cannot be avoided and landscape planting around the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.
Ruth Bullard	<b>HVAC</b> - Already huge pressure on area around Swardeston and a variety of planning applications. I am concerned about noise, landscaping, additional traffic	I	Impacts relating to landscape, traffic and noise are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapters 4, 7 and 8 respectively. Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts through site selection/route refinement, or the identification of suitable mitigation measures, this is also documented in the relevant topic specific chapters as well as in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives.
Ruth Bullard	<b>Substation</b> - See above (10). What will happen to access roads once the construction has finished? Could these then be used by future developments as access to housing? There is already danger that Swardeston becomes another suburb of Norwich and loses its rural identity. I am very concerned about noise during construction and then during operation	I	All temporary access roads construction to enable the delivery of Hornsea Three would be removed following the completion of construction, and the land restored to the baseline condition. Further information regarding restoration of temporary access roads is provided in the outline CoCP which forms part of the DCO application.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>55</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Elaine Parkinson	<p><b>HVAC</b>- Very concerned about potential noise from the transformers once they are commissioned and active. All possible noise/vibration reduction should be employed from the outset (i.e. not considered too difficult once the substation has been built). Every system for noise mitigation must be employed. Public footpaths and farm access (for walkers) must be reinstated and think about creating new ones. Donation to Swardeston and Swainsthorpe community development buildings would be nice</p>	I	<p>Impacts relating to noise from the construction and operation of Hornsea Three, including at the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation sites, are reported in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 8: Noise and Vibration. As part of a suite of mitigation measures (see chapter 8: Noise and Vibration), an operational noise management plan will be prepared and agreed with the local environmental health officer.</p> <p>Following the completion of the construction works all areas of access land, recreational resources, PRowS and other linear routes affected by the onshore works would be re-instated to their current condition and/or along their current alignments. There would be no physical effects on these resources arising from the operation or maintenance of Hornsea Three. The measures to be taken to ensure the continued use of all linear recreational resources during the construction phase of the project have been discussed with Norfolk County Council and are set out in the Outline CoCP which forms part of the DCO application. This dialogue will continue during the detailed design process.</p> <p>We have established voluntary Community Benefit Funds (CBFs) for a number of our projects, which are currently under construction. These funds can make a valuable contribution to the local area, by supporting projects such as community building improvements and recreation facilities, conservation and wildlife projects etc. Hornsea Project Three will review the interactions of the project, as the proposal is refined and consider an appropriate way to feed benefits back into the local community. However, any decision to establish a community benefit fund for Hornsea Three would be made post financial investment decision (FID).</p>
Elaine Parkinson	<p><b>Temporary Construction</b> - Minimal impact. Noise reduction. Remove all debris.</p>	I	<p>Through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive ecological receptors. For example, Weybourne Cliffs and Kelling Heath SSSI have been avoided and no direct impacts are predicted on these designated sites from Hornsea Three. Additional mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project are outlined in topic specific chapters, and include the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts on local road networks, ecological receptors (e.g. hedgerows) and hydrological features (e.g. main rivers).</p> <p>A site waste management plan forms part of the DCO application and sets out Hornsea Three's approach to waste management.</p> <p>Where there are impacts to residential receptors, these are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3), for example noise during the operation of the HVDC converter/HVAC substation is addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 8: Noise and Vibration.</p>
Mark Cook	<p><b>Proposal</b> - I think this whole proposal is flawed, it will have an untold effect on a rural area. North Norfolk relies heavily on tourism and this project in my opinion will damage this. People just will not visit the area, it will effect pubs, hotels. There won't be the visitors to Holt and Sheringham and many of the small shops will struggle. The building of the onshore booster station will create a noise issue to Edgefield and Little Barningham and Plumstead also. House prices will be knocked and the quality of life in these rural areas just won't be the same, at the moment it is a very peaceful area.</p>	I	<p>During the design refinement Hornsea Three has sought to minimise the duration of any disruption, and has reduced the total number of phases from three to two, and reduced the duration of the construction phase onshore from eleven to eight years.</p> <p>Potential impacts from Hornsea Three on socio-economic and tourism are identified and assessed in Environmental Statement Volume 3, Chapter 10: Socio-Economics. Taking into consideration the mitigation designed into Hornsea Three, no significant adverse effects are predicted.</p>



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>55</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Sue Lowther	<p><b>Substation</b> - Does this affect our water supply? There are ancient hedges around here (at least 400 years old) that must be preserved, plus ancient trees. It will affect the view from this house. Can the substation be sunk into the ground? The consultation said there would be considerable noise levels from substation - this is not acceptable. The consultation also said the visual impact would be considerable. It should therefore be situated as far away from residents as is possible. Therefore locate next to the national grid station.</p>	I	<p>Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives sets out the process undertaken during the pre-application phase of Hornsea Three to identify the location of the HVDC converter/HVAC substation. The proposed site for the HVDC converter / HVAC substation, just south of the A47, has been identified following extensive environmental surveys, technical and feasibility studies and ongoing consultation. Due to the size of the land area required for the onshore substation, there are very limited options available and the location indicated in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Project Description was determined to be the most suitable following our site selection process.</p> <p>Impacts from Hornsea Three on ecological features, including hedgerows and trees has been avoided where possible through commitments to use trenchless technologies such as Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD). We recognise that protection and sensitive restoration of hedgerows is important to minimise any negative impact on biodiversity or landscape resulting from loss or reduction in hedgerows and in the few instances where sections of the hedgerow needs to be temporarily removed, it will of course be handled sensitively. The replacement of hedgerows at the end of the construction phase to be undertaken will ensure there is no net loss of hedgerow habitat as a result of Hornsea Project Three. Furthermore, restoration of hedgerows, currently in poor condition, provides an opportunity to achieve long term benefits for the biodiversity associated with this habitat type. The impacts of Hornsea Three on hedgerows and trees is presented in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation.</p> <p>Consideration was given to a wide range of potential mitigation in respect to landscape and visual effects of Hornsea Three. The lowering of the HVDC converter/HVAC substation below current ground level was one option which was considered; however, given that multiple underground cables need to connect into this infrastructure, this option would have had significant implications for the depth of cable trenches and thus earthworks needed along a length of the onshore cable corridor. Based on this, Hornsea Three has implemented a range of other mitigation measures which are set out in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Effects. For example, it is recognised that the onshore HVAC booster station and onshore HVDC converter/HVAC substation would not be screened entirely by existing landform or vegetation in some views. As such, an indicative landscape strategy has been developed to assist in mitigating visual and landscape impacts. This is presented in the outline Landscape Management Plan which accompanies the DCO application.</p> <p>In respect to noise, the noise generated by the HVDC converter/HVAC substation is considered within Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 8: Noise and Vibration. Furthermore, an operational noise management plan will be prepared and agreed with the local environmental health officer.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>55</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Sue Lowther	<p><b>Proposal</b> - The beauty of Mangreen has already been damaged by the national grid station, the pylons and the gravel extraction. The proposed site will damage the beauty of the Mangreen countryside even more. The site should be situated next to the National Grid Station to minimise the damage and avoid the danger of Mangreen being surrounded by sites which are visually detrimental and also add to noise pollution</p>	I	<p>Information pertaining to the site selection for the HVDC converter/HVAC substation station is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives, whilst maximum dimensions are provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description.</p> <p>Through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive ecological receptors. Additional mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project are outlined in topic specific chapters, and include the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts on local road networks, ecological receptors (e.g. hedgerows) and hydrological features (e.g. main rivers); and landscape planting around the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.</p>
Louisa Peaver	<p><b>HVAC</b> - The size of the proposed Booster Station is enormous. It will be in the middle of a very rural area, of which residents are rightly proud. This project will result in a significant, permanent impact on my local environment as a result of the booster station - you are industrialising our countryside. A brownfield site would be far more preferable. Holt industrial estate is currently up for sale, as is a next-door field. I appreciate underground existing utilities would be challenging. The necessary noise insulation/mitigation expensive and local access disruption during construction significant but it would not be impossible and would put our countrysides protection rightfully at the top of your priorities</p>	I	<p>Information pertaining to the site selection for the HVAC booster station is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives.</p> <p>Through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive ecological receptors. For example, the orientation of the HVAC booster station has been optimised to minimise impacts on nearby field boundaries (hedgerows and trees) as well as maximise natural screening. Additional mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project are outlined in topic specific chapters, and include the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts on local road networks, ecological receptors (e.g. hedgerows) and hydrological features (e.g. main rivers).</p>
Louisa Peaver	<p><b>Mitigation Methods</b> - Please consider significant noise and vibration reduction strategies for the Booster Station. Please consider significant visual improvements at the Booster Station, Insulation, digging into the ground to reduce total building height and planting of trees</p>	I	<p>Through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts from the HVAC booster station on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive ecological receptors. This has been informed by the results of the Environmental Impact Assessment which are reported in Environmental Statement (volume 3).</p> <p>Impacts relating to noise from the permanent infrastructure, including the HVAC booster station, are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 8: Noise and Vibration. A number of mitigation measures are designed-in to the project, and where significant effects may occur, additional mitigation measures have been identified (see chapter 8).</p> <p>Additional mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project to minimise impacts of the HVAC booster station are outlined in topic specific chapters, and include landscape planting around the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>55</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
John Aisthorpe	<p>As the owners of Merryhill Country Park NR9 5AT, I spoke with Stuart Livesey and your land agents at Weston Longville about our concerns.</p> <p>1) About the construction noise between Easter and the end of September, our main season, although we are open 12 months of the year and will ask you to minimise noise all year round, without having a serious adverse effect on our business.</p>	I	<p>Firstly, it is noted that the Main construction compound proposed near Weston Longville has not been taken forward to the application. The main construction compound for the project will be located at Oulton Airfield, accessed off the B1149.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, where sensitive receptors are located in close proximity, the Project will ensure that sensitive construction management measures, such as noise, dust and traffic control are considered. These are documented in an outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), which accompanies the DCO application.</p> <p>Impacts on socio-economics and tourism are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 10: Socio-economics.</p>
Karl Feistner	<p><b>EIA</b> - Impossible to judge the Environmental impact of the HVAC booster station when at consultation there was no information as to exactly how big it would be, how noisy, how screened etc.</p>	I	<p>Information pertaining to the site selection for the HVAC booster station is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives, whilst maximum dimensions are provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description.</p> <p>Through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts from the HVAC booster station on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive receptors. For example, the orientation of the HVAC booster station has been optimised to minimise impacts on nearby field boundaries (hedgerows and trees) as well as maximise natural screening. Additional mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project are outlined in topic specific chapters, and include the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts on local road networks, ecological receptors (e.g. hedgerows) and hydrological features (e.g. main rivers); and landscape planting around the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>55</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Karl Feistner	<p><b>HVAC</b> - There would be no requirement of this booster station if HVDC was implemented as the transmission technology. HVDC has the advantage of being more efficient and would negate the need to build a large noisy industrial installation (the booster station) in the middle of unspoilt countryside. Contrary to some things that were said at the consultation, HVDC has been successfully used for other North Sea wind farms (<a href="http://new.abb.com/news/detail/1689/ABB-delivers-DolWin2-wind-connection">http://new.abb.com/news/detail/1689/ABB-delivers-DolWin2-wind-connection</a>) and should be seen as the technology of the future. I believe every effort should be made to use HVDC transmission. IF there is a compelling case for HVAC (none was suggested at the consultation) then every effort should be made to conceal the booster station from sight (high earth bunds, tree planting etc., and to make sure that it does not cause any sound or light pollution by enclosing machinery in soundproofed buildings as required.</p>	I	<p>Due to current uncertainty (see previous responses), a decision on which transmission system (HVDC or HVAC) to adopt will not be made until post consent after extensive engagement with potential systems suppliers has taken place. As a result of this, we have conducted our assessments based on a realistic worst-case scenario, which could be either HVDC or HVDC technology depending on the receptor.</p> <p>In this regard, an assessment of potential impacts of the HVDC converter/HVAC substation is provided in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement, volume 3. In respect to the three points mentioned in the response, appropriate mitigation measures for visual disturbance are outlined in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources. This includes, for example, the restoration of habitats (including hedgerows) which cannot be avoided and landscape planting around the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.</p> <p>Noise during the operation of the HVDC converter/HVAC substation is addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 8: Noise and Vibration, where mitigation is also proposed to minimise the potential for significant effects.</p> <p>Lighting during the operational phase is likely to be required at the HVDC converter/HVAC substation (as security lighting may be required during operation to ensure a safe working environment). Notwithstanding this, light spill from these permanent elements would be minimised through design, in particular the use of directional lighting. Based on the mitigation and management measures in place, no significant light spill is anticipated.</p>
Karl Feistner	<p><b>Booster Station</b> - Similar comments as above with regard to mitigating the visual and auditory impact of the substation.</p>	I	<p>An assessment of potential impacts of the HVAC booster station is provided in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement, volume 3. In respect to the two points mentioned in the response, noise during the operation of the HVAC booster station is addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 8: Noise and Vibration, where mitigation is also proposed to minimise impacts where required.</p> <p>Lighting during the operational phase is likely to be required at the HVDC converter/HVAC substation (as security lighting may be required during operation to ensure a safe working environment). Notwithstanding this, light spill from these permanent elements would be minimised through design, in particular the use of directional lighting. Based on the mitigation and management measures in place, no significant light spill is anticipated.</p> <p>Appropriate mitigation measures for visual disturbance are outlined in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources. This includes, for example, the restoration of habitats (including hedgerows) which cannot be avoided and landscape planting around the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>55</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
John Seymour	<b>PEIR surveys</b> - The visualisations of the proposed booster station do not provide an adequate means of assessing how they will interfere with the landscape and individual properties. The decibel ratings of day and night do not appear to be the experience of local people.	I	Impacts relating to landscape and visual resources are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual resources. Photographic panels along the cable corridor, as well as indicative visualisations have been prepared to inform the assessment of impacts and are provided in Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 4.5: Photographic Panels, Wireframes and Photomontages.  Impacts relating to the operational noise of the HVAC booster station and HVDC converter/HVAC substation are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 8: Noise and Vibration. Where appropriate, mitigation measures have been identified in this chapter to minimise impacts.
Karen Saunders	<b>Export Cable</b> - My property will be one of the closest to the booster station. I am extremely concerned about visual blight, and more importantly, noise pollution. The property is run as a furnished holiday let, the hvac will be visible from the front of the property impacting on the open, rural view. Any noise could seriously impact on my business; people go on holiday for peace and quiet. I'm also concerned about the potential impact on the value of the property if it is considered 'blighted' by this construction.	I	Through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts from the HVAC booster station and cable corridor on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive ecological receptors. For example, the orientation of the HVAC booster station has been optimised to minimise impacts on nearby field boundaries (hedgerows and trees) as well as maximise natural screening. Additional mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project are outlined in topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3), and include the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts on local road networks, ecological receptors (e.g. hedgerows) and hydrological features (e.g. main rivers). Impacts on tourism and socio-economics are specifically assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 10: Socio-Economics.
Robert Speck	Yes, disguise it. Make it quiet. Do not take ambient noise readings from next to roads which is what you have done. This is one of the quietest counties in the SE. Keep it so.	I	Through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts from permanent infrastructure on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive ecological receptors. Mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project are outlined in topic specific chapters, and include the use of trenchless technologies to maintain natural screening and ecological receptors (e.g. hedgerows) as well as landscape planting around the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.  The results of the baseline noise surveys are presented in Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 8.1: Baseline Noise Surveys, and sets out how the project has ensured that a realistic worst case assessment has been undertaken.
Robert Speck	Skewed. Your ambient noise readings have been taken from roadside. Not representative of the true noise levels	I	The results of the baseline noise surveys are presented in Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 8.1: Baseline Noise Surveys, and sets out how the project has ensured that a realistic worst case assessment has been undertaken.
Simon Clarke	<b>Local matters at landfall</b> - Again, wildlife disruption is a concern and noise pollution will certainly be an issue	I	Through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive ecological receptors. For example, the orientation of the HVAC booster station has been optimised to minimise impacts on nearby field boundaries (hedgerows and trees) as well as maximise natural screening. Additional mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project are outlined in topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3), and include the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts on local road networks, ecological receptors (e.g. hedgerows) and hydrological features (e.g. main rivers). Impacts on ecological receptors and noise sensitive receptors are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation and chapter 8: Noise and Vibration respectively.



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>55</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Graham and Susan Mette	<b>Mitigation measures</b> - The compound at Weybourne MUST NOT be in the car park at the end of Beach Lane. Working hours need to be adhered to and weekends kept free from noise, light and disruption. Shingle Bank must be protected.	Y	Following design refinement, the area identified for landfall works has reduced and the beach lane car park is not under consideration as a construction compound. Further details on the proposed landfall, including access are set out in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description and volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport.
Graham and Susan Mette	<b>Support</b> - However Weybourne village will be seriously affected. Walkers, holiday makers, retired residents will all have to live with the long period of works, noise, traffic, etc etc. The village needs to be compensated, and residents immediately affected need to be compensated, and businesses need to be compensated. In particular the important crab/lobster industry. Personally, I need some assurances about protection from flood and maybe a combination of installing flood protection would be helpful.	I	Potential impacts from Hornsea Three on socio-economic and recreational receptors are identified and assessed in Environmental Statement Volume 3, Chapter 10: Socio-Economics and chapter 6: Land Use and Recreation respectively. Hornsea Project Three will review the interactions of the project, as the proposal is refined and consider an appropriate way to feed benefits back into the local community. However, any decision to establish a community benefit fund for Hornsea Three would be made post financial investment decision (FID).  In respect to flooding, appropriate mitigation measures have been designed-in to Hornsea Three to minimise impacts on drainage and flooding. Details are provided in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 2: Hydrology and Flood Risk (see Table 2.17). The Flood Risk Assessment which has been undertaken for the Project concludes that Hornsea Three meets the requirements of NPS EN-1 and the NPPF.
Graham and Susan Mette	<b>PEIR</b> - The area indicated immediately affects my home, along with my immediate neighbours. But my house will be exposed the most to noise, light and disruption the most of all village residents.	I	Where possible and practicable the onshore cable corridor route selected seeks to avoid passing adjacent to properties. This is to reduce impacts associated with construction disturbance and to seek to minimise conflicts such as Heavy Goods Vehicle (HGV) traffic movements. However, it is not possible to avoid passing in close proximity to all properties on the route. Where properties are located in close proximity, the Project will ensure that sensitive construction management measures, such as noise, dust and traffic control are considered. These are documented in an outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), which accompanies the DCO application.
<b>Section 48: Duty to publicise</b>			
No comments were received in response to the Public Notice relating to noise and vibration under Phase 2.A.			

Table 3.22: Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Further Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.B) relating to noise and vibration

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>56</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 42: Prescribed consultees (The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009: Schedule 1))</b>			
<i>No comments were received from the prescribed consultees relating to noise and vibration under Phase 2.B.</i>			
<b>Section 42: Local Authorities (prescribed under section 43 of the Act)</b>			
<i>No comments were received from the local authorities relating to noise and vibration under Phase 2.B.</i>			
<b>Section 42: Persons with an interest in the land (prescribed under section 44 of the Act)</b>			
<i>No comments were received from persons with an interest in the land relating to noise and vibration under Phase 2.B.</i>			
<b>Section 47: Duty to consult local community</b>			
Judy Holland	I am now extremely concerned about the entire wind farm cabling routes by both Ørsted and Vattenfall (I have written to them too) which will cross in the field behind our home (address below) and which will have far more impact on us than we previously thought now that the working corridors, site access routes and construction compounds/marshalling yards are coming to light. If plans are passed this will have a massive long term impact on us with noise, dust and access in and out of our home.	I	Generally, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts to local residential receptors, either through site selection/route refinement or through the identification of suitable mitigation measures. Where there are impacts to residential receptors, these are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3), for example noise during the construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning of the project is addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 8: Noise and Vibration. Impacts associated with dust are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 9: Air Quality and impacts in relation to access are considered in volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport. In all cases, a cumulative impact assessment is presented where the potential for combined impacts with other projects are considered.
Anthea Spray	<p>This project is going to ruin our beautiful countryside for years to come; our Government is expecting many new houses to be built also taking up rural landscapes. What is going to happen to our wildlife, the flora and fauna of our local area? They are already endangered and reduced greatly in numbers due to loss of habitat, pests and diseases. Now you want to scar our county, create noise and devastation across our land and through our quiet villages.</p> <p>You will destroy historic sites that archaeologists have yet to reveal and our coastline is so vulnerable to erosion that this project cannot but do more harm than good. As you see I am not in favour of any of this project. PLEASE reconsider whether it is not possible to bring power ashore where structures are already available to distribute it to properties along the coast.</p>	I	<p>Through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive ecological receptors. For example, Weybourne Cliffs and Kelling Heath SSSI have been avoided and no direct impacts are predicted on these designated sites from Hornsea Three. Additional mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project are outlined in topic specific chapters, and include the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts on local road networks, ecological receptors (e.g. hedgerows) and hydrological features (e.g. main rivers).</p> <p>In respect to historic sites, an assessment of impacts on heritage assets is provided in Environmental Statement, volume 3, chapter 5: Historic Environment and volume 2, chapter 9: Marine Archaeology. Impacts on marine processes including those associated with coastal erosion are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 1: Marine Processes.</p> <p>Environmental Statement, volume 3, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives sets out the process of identifying a grid connection location and landfall. It is noted that the aim of the grid connection option appraisal was to identify the most economic and efficient design option for the connection of a project. Although both National Grid and Orsted input into the appraisal process (in respect to economic and strategic factors), the eventual grid connection offer is determined by National Grid. In May 2016, Hornsea Three was formally offered a grid connection at Norwich Main Substation as a result of this appraisal process which has informed the subsequent landfall and route refinement.</p>

<sup>56</sup> Y = Yes change made; N = No change made; I = Incorporated into or considered when producing the assessment or landowner voluntary agreement offer; N/A = Not applicable.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>56?</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 48: Duty to publicise</b>			
No comments were received in response to the Public Notice relating to the introduction under Phase 2.B.			

Table 3.23: Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Focused Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.C) relating to noise and vibration

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>57?</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 42: Prescribed consultees (The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009: Schedule 1))</b>			
Oulton Parish Council	<p>Oulton Parish Council (OPC) sets out its concerns following the receipt of limited information from Orsted obtained at one public meeting on 6th March 2018 and the answer to a number of written questions received late on 20th March 2018. The late adoption of Oulton airfield as the proposed Main Construction Compound and the inability of Orsted to engage with OPC earlier has meant that OPC has not had the chance to adequately consider many of the wider issues of this project Some are touched on here (for example, project phasing, ducting, HVAC or HVDC transmission) but the PC reserves the right to raise other issues in the coming months. OPC remains very concerned that this and the similar Vattenfall project has significant issues for the road network and quality of life of residents in our area. To date, nothing that has been provided in the Oersted documentation provides any comfort and the consequences of this project for this area for up to 8 years and beyond are significant.</p> <p>OPC have been advised by PINS that we can respond to this focused consultation even though we do not appear on maps in this round of the consultation. Oulton did however appear in Orsted's announcement on 12th February 2018 as the choice of Main Construction Compound. The implications of this fact were not immediately fully appreciated by the parish council because of a lack of information and a lack of Reponses from Orsted, despite request questions and a request from OPC to attend a parish council meeting to explain. After repeated requests, Orsted representatives finally came to a parish council meeting on 6th March 2018 to meet with councillors and residents. Answers to most questions were still not forthcoming until 20th March 2018. The document from Emily Woolfenden, emailed to OPC on that date, has been the first attempt at specific information that we have had from Orsted, and there are still many substantive gaps. - OPC acknowledges that the document contains some facts previously unknown to us but it deeply disappointed by the small number of these. Some of the facts have been useful to us in grasping the scale and implications of the compound - but some have only served to exacerbate our concerns.</p>	I	<p>Information pertaining to the site selection for the main construction compound is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives. Given the nature of the Oulton Airfield, which comprises existing hardstanding, its use as the main construction compound has less potential for significant effects than other sites which were under consideration.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, Hornsea Three recognises the sensitivity of this location and since its identification as the main construction compound, Hornsea Three has sought to identify measures to minimise any impacts on Oulton village, local residents and the local road network. In this regard, where properties are located in close proximity to the Oulton Airfield, the Project will ensure that sensitive construction management measures, such as noise, dust and traffic control are considered. These are documented in an outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), which accompanies the DCO application. Furthermore, it is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this also forms part of the DCO application.</p> <p>Impacts associated with the use of Oulton Airfield as the main construction compound are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3).</p>

<sup>57</sup> Y = Yes change made; N = No change made; I = Incorporated into or considered when producing the assessment or landowner voluntary agreement offer; N/A = Not applicable.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>57</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Oulton Parish Council	<p>Noise disturbance - The noise generated by activities on the compound would impact severely on the quality of life of Oulton residents especially those surrounding the airfield - at The Old Railway Gatehouse and Manor Farm - and the prevailing wind would carry noise over to the 24 dwellings in Oulton Street. This is an extremely rural area: at night it is utterly quiet here, so any noise would be intrusive and cause disturbance. The PC is extremely concerned about the reference to generators on site why would generators be necessary at all, as electricity is already installed on the airfield to power the landowner's animal housing?</p> <p>We note that silenced power generators would be used but it is our experience that there is no such thing as an absolutely silent generator, as yet. If generators would have to be used for a short period, then it would be essential for acoustic fencing to be employed, especially to protect as much as possible the residents at Manor Farm. The PC is also concerned about the likelihood of noisy reversing alarms, which are a curse in a rural area. Can Orsted assure residents that only white-noise alarms will be used and that this will be included in a planning condition that will specifically place upon Orsted the responsibility to ensure that all contractors using the site have such alarms fitted? The PC is similarly appalled by the proposal of the traffic notice to be generated by 134 HGV movements on a daily basis - at least at peak times. We cannot reiterate too strongly or too often that the HGV traffic through Oulton Street has already reached absolute saturation point in terms of noise disturbance to residents and highway function and safety. The addition of any more traffic noise would constitute a severe and unacceptable adverse impact on the quality of life of our residents.</p>	I	<p>Information pertaining to the site selection for the main construction compound is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives. Given the nature of the Oulton Airfield, which comprises existing hardstanding, its use as the main construction compound has less potential for significant effects than other sites which were under consideration.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, Hornsea Three recognises the sensitivity of this location and since its identification as the main construction compound, Hornsea Three has sought to identify measures to minimise any impacts on Oulton village, local residents and the local road network. In this regard, where properties are located in close proximity to the Oulton Airfield, the Project will ensure that sensitive construction management measures, such as noise, dust and traffic control are considered. These are documented in an outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), which accompanies the DCO application. Furthermore, it is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this also forms part of the DCO application.</p> <p>Impacts associated with the use of Oulton Airfield as the main construction compound are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3). Impacts relating to traffic and transport are specifically assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport.</p>
<b>Section 42: Local Authorities (prescribed under section 43 of the Act)</b>			
No comments were received from the local authorities relating to noise and vibration under Phase 2.C.			
<b>Section 42: Persons with an interest in the land (prescribed under section 44 of the Act)</b>			
No comments were received from persons with an interest in land relating to noise and vibration under Phase 2.C.			
<b>Section 47: Duty to consult local community</b>			
Robert Shoals	<p>One thing that was touched on was that of vehicle movement in and out of the site, the majority of this movement will involve heavy plant and in the case of cable delivery to site storage and distribution from that storage to various installation sites it will be Abnormal Loads. The Street, Oulton is the feed road to the site and is totally unsuitable for this traffic as has already been proven on previous planning applications. This road already carries more than its fair share of heavy traffic. To the immediate south of the site entrance is a cottage which sits atop of a hump in the road, to the north of the site entrance is the homes of the streets residents which also sit roadside, numerous cars sit on the road outside these properties. Other concerns about noise and light pollution which I also have fade into insignificance by comparison. The choice of this site is completely WRONG.</p>	I	<p>Since its identification as the main construction compound, Hornsea Three has sought to identify measures to minimise any impacts on Oulton village, local residents and the local road network. In this regard, where properties are located in close proximity to the Oulton Airfield, the Project will ensure that sensitive construction management measures, such as noise, dust and traffic control are considered. These are documented in an outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), which accompanies the DCO application. Furthermore, it is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this also forms part of the DCO application.</p> <p>It is noted that lighting during the onshore construction phase will be short term and temporary, used only when required (and generally limited to certain working hours) and designed to avoid unnecessary illumination. Light spill during out of hours working will be minimised through the use of task-orientated lighting, as set out in the outline CoCP which accompanies the DCO application.</p> <p>Impacts associated with the use of Oulton Airfield as the main construction compound are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3).</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>57</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Hannah Sturt	<p>I write to tell you of my disagreement with the above proposal. Although we are a small number of residents we are unused to high amounts of traffic, noise and lighting. You will be intruding on our country way of life and that of the wildlife, there are endangered bird species living here, including the song thrush which is n the conservation status red list. It must also be noted that while the airfield was offered to you as a proposed site, none of the residents were asked by the owner if this would be acceptable. I hope that you will consider the proposal as if it were your home in the village.</p>	I	<p>Information pertaining to the site selection for the main construction compound is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives. Given the nature of the Oulton Airfield, which comprises existing hardstanding, its use as the main construction compound has less potential for significant effects than other sites which were under consideration.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, Hornsea Three recognises the sensitivity of this location and since its identification as the main construction compound, Hornsea Three has sought to identify measures to minimise any impacts on Oulton village, local residents and the local road network. In this regard, where properties are located in close proximity to the Oulton Airfield, the Project will ensure that sensitive construction management measures, such as noise, dust and traffic control are considered. These are documented in an outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), which accompanies the DCO application. Furthermore, it is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this also forms part of the DCO application.</p> <p>Impacts associated with the use of Oulton Airfield as the main construction compound are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3).</p>
Gordon Fryett	<p>Observations and Objections regarding the proposal to use Oulton Airfield as the Main Storage / Operating Compound as follows: The inappropriateness of the scale of this proposal and its activities in this location. In effect, this proposal is for massive industrial-scale use. It is based purely on commercial and financial benefit for the proposer whilst attempting to hid behind the smoke-screen of National Infrastructure when other options were identified.</p>	I	<p>Information pertaining to the site selection for the main construction compound is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives. Given the nature of the Oulton Airfield, which comprises existing hardstanding, its use as the main construction compound has less potential for significant effects than other sites which were under consideration.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, Hornsea Three recognises the sensitivity of this location and since its identification as the main construction compound, Hornsea Three has sought to identify measures to minimise any impacts on Oulton village, local residents and the local road network. In this regard, where properties are located in close proximity to the Oulton Airfield, the Project will ensure that sensitive construction management measures, such as noise, dust and traffic control are considered. These are documented in an outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), which accompanies the DCO application. Furthermore, it is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this also forms part of the DCO application.</p>



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>57</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Gordon Fryett	<p>We are very concerned by the serious negative environmental impact that such a development would have not only on the local flora and fauna but even more importantly on the health and wellbeing of the residents of Oulton Street, of Oulton Village and of the wider Community</p>	I	<p>Through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive ecological receptors. Additional mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project are outlined in topic specific chapters, and include the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts on local road networks, ecological receptors (e.g. hedgerows) and hydrological features (e.g. main rivers).</p> <p>In respect to the main construction compound at Oulton, Hornsea Three recognises the sensitivity of this location and since its identification as the main construction compound, Hornsea Three has sought to identify measures to minimise any impacts on Oulton village, local residents and the local road network. In this regard, where properties are located in close proximity to the Oulton Airfield, the Project will ensure that sensitive construction management measures, such as noise, dust and traffic control are considered. These are documented in an outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), which accompanies the DCO application. Furthermore, it is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this also forms part of the DCO application.</p>
CD Lambert	<p>To whom it may concern. PLEASE THINK AGAIN. I live with my family in Oulton Street and have down so for 30 years. Oulton street is adjacent to the proposed site of the huge Construction compound for the Hornsea Project. Oulton is a small rural community that is already in the middle of a 3,000 plus acre farm, the current owners of the proposed site. We get a constant stream of heavy agricultural traffic 7 days a week and up to 15 hours a day passing through the Street in an addition to regular local traffic. This is a country road barely wide enough to pass another car coming the opposite way. A proposed anaerobic digester plant was refused on the basis that it could not legitimately absorb the increased traffic it would generate on such a small road with blind corners and such restricted access to increased heavy traffic movements without running a real and increased risk of accidents. There is only two ways of accessing the proposed site and they both use Oulton Street. Yet you are proposing to do just that by increasing the amount of heavy traffic and all the noise lighting and disturbance that would cause to the local residents in the name of green energy. There has already been an alternative site proposed at Western Longville on a main road but Oulton is not being proposed instead, WHY?</p> <p>We have had wind farms, anaerobic digesters, solar farms and now this, we are mentally exhausted trying to protect our way of life. We are not being over defensive or selfish we are distraught by this proposal. The proposed old airfield site was built in the second world war to protect our freedom not to take it away. We do not need to protect the planet by destroying small rural communities such as ours and we will fight to keep ours.</p> <p>Please think again and withdraw this proposal if you have any sense of what is right and respect for others there are other options.</p>	I	<p>Information pertaining to the site selection for the main construction compound is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives. Given the nature of the Oulton Airfield, which comprises existing hardstanding, its use as the main construction compound has less potential for significant effects than other sites which were under consideration.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, Hornsea Three recognises the sensitivity of this location and since its identification as the main construction compound, Hornsea Three has sought to identify measures to minimise any impacts on Oulton village, local residents and the local road network. In this regard, where properties are located in close proximity to the Oulton Airfield, the Project will ensure that sensitive construction management measures, such as noise, dust and traffic control are considered. These are documented in an outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), which accompanies the DCO application. Furthermore, it is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this also forms part of the DCO application.</p> <p>Impacts associated with the use of Oulton Airfield as the main construction compound are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3). Impacts relating to traffic and transport are specifically assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>57</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Robert Sturt	<p>I am writing in response to your consultation with regards to the proposed construction at the Oulton Airfield Site. I wonder if your team has properly researched the area? The surrounding roads are not suitable for such a level of traffic - HGV vehicles will really struggle. There are no pavements and limited room for 2-way car traffic.</p> <p>A previous application for an anaerobic digester was refused because of traffic issues. The street is populated with houses on the main roads with no pavements</p> <p>There is already farm traffic</p> <p>The street is often used as a shortcut</p> <p>In Winter weather your traffic will experience serious issues</p> <p>Simply put you really need to consider this carefully?</p> <p>Use a warehouse somewhere with good access and not a rural farm location. I also wonder about the merit of your project anyway? Isn't this yet another poorly thought out government scheme to help your business maximise profits? Solar technology is going to improve massively over the next couple of decades - when people fully adopt the technology, nobody is going to want to buy your government backed subsidy energy scheme.</p>	I	<p>Information pertaining to the site selection for the main construction compound is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives. Given the nature of the Oulton Airfield, which comprises existing hardstanding, its use as the main construction compound has less potential for significant effects than other sites which were under consideration.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, Hornsea Three recognises the sensitivity of this location and since its identification as the main construction compound, Hornsea Three has sought to identify measures to minimise any impacts on Oulton village, local residents and the local road network. In this regard, where properties are located in close proximity to the Oulton Airfield, the Project will ensure that sensitive construction management measures, such as noise, dust and traffic control are considered. These are documented in an outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), which accompanies the DCO application. Furthermore, it is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this also forms part of the DCO application.</p> <p>Impacts associated with the use of Oulton Airfield as the main construction compound are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3). Impacts relating to traffic and transport are specifically assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport.</p>
Clive Searson and Nicola Tanner	<p>We are the residents at The Old Railway Gatehouse, Oulton Street. We are totally horrified that your company propose to put a compound in without any correspondence with local residents, especially when it is going to have an adverse impact on our lives. It is unacceptable to have a compound that will be disruptive to our quality of life. We purchased our house in good faith and were told that no planning applications would be forthcoming due to the rejection of the AD plant in 2014. We have to deal with noise from cars and farm traffic on a daily basis, it is noticeably loud especially as when it goes over the hump in the road it intensifies the noise. The noise levels in our house are very clear, you can hear cars and farm traffic as it passes our house clearly. All of our windows on our house are viewable from the road and even though double glazed it is intrusive and does not shut out the sound. It will be unacceptable to have heavy construction traffic passing our house night and day. It will have a serious impact on our lives and well being. As I work in staff recruitment I take phone calls from 7.00am through to 9:00pm. My work day is already disrupted through passing traffic, if it were to increase it would make my job unworkable. The noise levels generated during harvest are bad enough. We are the only house that will be seriously affected by all the traffic to and from site and it is unacceptable that we should have to live with it.</p> <p>There are no footpaths along the road and only a few unofficial passing places. The road is very popular for local dog walkers and for cyclists following "The Tudor Route". The road itself is quite narrow and in places when cars and farm traffic are passing each other it can be dangerous. Adding construction traffic and low loaders to traverse this route as it is not wide enough. We accept that farm traffic is going to pass our house as it is a farming community, the noise can be disruptive now, with construction traffic too it will be unbearable. The compound itself will be offset to the right behind our house. The lights and generators will be very disturbing especially at night when sound travels. The lit compound would light a normally dark sky and will stand out like a sore thumb. The constant hum of generator's in the background are not conducive with relaxation time in our garden. There your proposal would result in material harm in the living conditions as of us as residents.</p>	I	<p>Hornsea Three recognises the sensitivity of this location and since its identification as the main construction compound, Hornsea Three has sought to identify measures to minimise any impacts on Oulton village, local residents and the local road network. In this regard, where properties are located in close proximity to the Oulton Airfield, the Project will ensure that sensitive construction management measures, such as noise, dust and traffic control are considered. These are documented in an outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), which accompanies the DCO application. Furthermore, it is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this also forms part of the DCO application.</p> <p>Impacts associated with the use of Oulton Airfield as the main construction compound are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3). Impacts relating to traffic and transport are specifically assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport. Impacts to pedestrian safety, amenity, severance and driver delay, amongst others, are also assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport.</p> <p>It is noted that lighting during the onshore construction phase will be short term and temporary, used only when required (and generally limited to certain working hours) and designed to avoid unnecessary illumination. Light spill during out of hours working will be minimised through the use of task-orientated lighting, as set out in the outline CoCP which accompanies the DCO application. Lighting during construction will take into account the requirements set out in British Standard (BS) EB 12464-2:2014 (BSI, 21014) and guidance from the Institute of Lighting Professionals (Institute of Lighting Professionals, 2011 'Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Obtrusive Light').</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>57</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Peter Glenser	<p>The Manor House - I note that that the proposed hours of operation are from 6 am to 7 pm during the week and from 6 am until 5 pm on Saturdays. I vividly remember looking at the Norfolk Churches website when we made the decision to buy this house. It contained the following description of the immediate vicinity: <i>"The area between Aylsham and Holt can seem among the most remote in Norfolk, a landscape of scattered villages unknown to the busy traffic a few miles off on the Cromer road... At a lost crossroads where four deep cut narrow roadways meet is St Peter and St Paul, not far from the great Hall. Elms and oaks are all about, their treetops restless on this late summer day. When the wind drops, you can hear a car approaching from miles off - but not many come this way."</i> The peace and quiet of this remote location was a major factor in our decision to buy the house. The quiet enjoyment of this property will be severely effected by the construction of a site nearly eight acres in size, with lights, generators, facilities for staff and heavy vehicle movements just a few hundred metres away and in the direction the house faces. It is difficult to overstate how quiet this area is and how much vehicle reversing alarms, engines and even voices will disturb this silence. Similarly the area is very dark at night – inevitably security lighting will cause light pollution in this dark skies area.</p>	I	<p>Proposed working hours are set out in the outline CoCP which forms part of the DCO application. The outline CoCP is a 'living' document that will be updated as required post submission of the DCO application, during the Examination Period following more detailed engagement with stakeholders and post examination by way of instruction of the Examining Authority and Secretary of State.</p> <p>Given the nature of the Oulton Airfield, which comprises existing hardstanding, its use as the main construction compound has less potential for significant effects than other sites which were under consideration. Notwithstanding this, Hornsea Three recognises the sensitivity of this location and since its identification as the main construction compound, Hornsea Three has sought to identify measures to minimise any impacts on Oulton village, local residents and the local road network. In this regard, where properties are located in close proximity to the Oulton Airfield, the Project will ensure that sensitive construction management measures, such as noise, dust, light and traffic control are considered. These are documented in an outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), which accompanies the DCO application. Furthermore, it is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this also forms part of the DCO application.</p> <p>Impacts associated with the use of Oulton Airfield as the main construction compound are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3).</p> <p>It respect to lighting in particular, lighting during construction will take into account the requirements set out in British Standard (BS) EB 12464-2:2014 (BSI, 21014) and guidance from the Institute of Lighting Professionals (Institute of Lighting Professionals, 2011 'Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Obtrusive Light'). Based on the mitigation and management measures in place, no significant light spill is anticipated.</p>
Mrs M L and Mr R L G Williams	<p><b>The Proposed use of Oulton farmland as Main Compound</b> As the major problem with this project is the total unsuitability of local roads for the volume of HGVs, it is worth mentioning that this issue has been tried and tested twice in the very recent past.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Broadland District rejected a Planning Proposal and then the appeal turned down for an Aerobic Digester in Oulton Street</li> <li>2. The National Trust dropped a project for a large Caravan Park at Middle Farm (opposite Oulton Lodge)</li> </ol> <p>We are concerned to see at this late stage that the promise at the open meetings that Oulton Street/Blickling Road would not be affected was not true.</p> <p>We wish to object to the proposed development to use Oulton as a storage depot which would transform the character of a peaceful rural village into a noisy living hell and a dangerous place to live.</p>	I	<p>Since its identification as the main construction compound, Hornsea Three has sought to identify measures to minimise any impacts on Oulton village, local residents and the local road network. In this regard, where properties are located in close proximity to the Oulton Airfield, the Project will ensure that sensitive construction management measures, such as noise, dust and traffic control are considered. These are documented in an outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), which accompanies the DCO application. Furthermore, it is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this also forms part of the DCO application.</p> <p>Impacts associated with the use of Oulton Airfield as the main construction compound are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3).</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>57</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Mrs M L and Mr R L G Williams	<p><b>For the inhabitants of the village</b> The applicant's estimate of traffic seems totalling unrealistic for the area and we foresee that the roads will gridlocked. The houses in Oulton Street abut straight onto the road. Many do not have front gardens or drives to lessen the noise of heavy traffic. More importantly these houses do not have a pavement on either side of the road. Many do not have garages or space and thus cars are parked on the side of the road which is narrow. The absence of pavements make serious risk for children walking or running along between houses or to the village playing field to the north of the village- thus a serious hazard for children.</p>	I	It is noted that impacts relating to access as well as pedestrian safety, amenity, severance and driver delay, amongst others, are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport. A Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this also forms part of the DCO application.
<b>Section 48: Duty to publicise</b>			
No comments were received in response to the Public Notice relating to noise and vibration under Phase 2.C.			

### 3.9 Air Quality

Table 3.24: Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.A) relating to air quality

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>58</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 42: Prescribed consultees (The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009: Schedule 1))</b>			
Planning, South Norfolk Council	<p>Air Quality Dust from the construction phase, particularly in dry windy weather. The PEIR outlines measures that will be taken to address this issue which are considered acceptable but the detail will need to be agreed at the appropriate time.</p>	I	Measures to minimise dust are set out in the Outline Code of Construction Practice which forms part of the DCO application. These have been taken into consideration in the assessment of potential impacts associated with air quality in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 9: Air Quality. The outline CoCP is a 'living' document that will be updated as required post submission of the DCO application, during the Examination Period following more detailed engagement with stakeholders and post examination by way of instruction of the Examining Authority and Secretary of State.
Natural England	<p>3.2.7 Vol. 3 Chapter 9 – Air Quality 9.12.1.15 Without sight of the controls referred to in 9.12.1.15 it is not possible to comment other than to say dust is not only a potential issue in itself but also may carry nutrients and pollutants, similarly to runoff as described above. This could have greater impact on ecological receptors than the dust per se and this should be recognised. Where dust settles it will have the potential to run off into watercourses with impacts as for run off, but potentially away from any mitigation or monitoring and so onsite control, including all exposed soils, will be vital.</p>	Y	<p>As part of the project design process, several designed-in measures have been proposed to reduce the potential for air quality impacts, including dust. These are outlined in Environmental Statement, volume 3, chapter 9: Air Quality and include the development of a Dust Management and Monitoring Plan, a process for communicating with the local community, regular site visits and inspections to monitor dust and standard site maintenance.</p> <p>Potential impacts associated with dust are assessed in Environmental Statement, volume 3, chapter 9: Air Quality. This concludes that there would be no significant effects in relation to air quality as a result of Hornsea Three.</p> <p>Measures to minimise the settling of dust and to prevent runoff entering watercourses are set out in the Outline Code of Construction Practice which forms part of the DCO application, and includes a commitment to prepare Pollution Prevention and Emergency Response Plans.</p>

<sup>58</sup> Y = Yes change made; N = No change made; I = Incorporated into or considered when producing the assessment or landowner voluntary agreement offer; N/A = Not applicable.



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>58</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 42: Local Authorities (prescribed under section 43 of the Act)</b>			
Plumstead Parish Council	Concerns have been raised over noise during construction. Will this be 9.00 am to 5.00 pm only?	I	<p>Proposed working hours are set out in the outline CoCP which forms part of the DCO application. The outline CoCP is a 'living' document that will be updated as required post submission of the DCO application, during the Examination Period following more detailed engagement with stakeholders and post examination by way of instruction of the Examining Authority and Secretary of State.</p> <p>In terms of the duration of the construction phase for the whole scheme, Hornsea Project Three could be built out in up to two phases. There are various possible reasons for phasing including constraints in the supply chain or requirements of the government's Contract for Difference subsidy regime which offshore wind farms currently rely on to secure a price for the electricity produced by a project. It is currently anticipated that the total duration of onshore construction works could be up to eight years, which has reduced from eleven years previously proposed.</p>
Plumstead Parish Council	If the sub-station is necessary much more detail is required concerning visual impact, noise and lighting. What planting is to take place?	I	<p>Impacts associated with visual amenity and noise are addressed in volume 3, chapters 4 and 8 respectively. Based on the principles of the lighting strategy for Hornsea Three, no significant effects in relation to lighting is anticipated.</p> <p>An indicative planting scheme for the HVDC converter/HVAC substation is provided in volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources. The measures for managing such provisions is outlined in the outline Landscape Management Plan which accompanies the DCO application.</p>
Plumstead Parish Council	The working width of the scheme passes close to the occupants of Heath Farm and Range Farm – nuisance and disturbance should be kept to a minimum.	I	<p>Where sensitive receptors are in close proximity to onshore works, the Project will ensure that sensitive construction management measures, such as noise, dust and traffic control are considered. These are documented in an outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), which accompanies the DCO application. Impacts on residential receptors are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement.</p>
Oulton Parish Council	Noise assessments need to be rigorous, especially in light of the fact that Cawston has issues regarding 'hum' from Salle substation which is small in comparison.	I	<p>An assessment of the potential noise impacts from the construction and operation of Hornsea Three is provided in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 8: Noise and Vibration and its supporting technical annexes.</p>
Swardeston Parish Council	7. How does Dong Energy intend to alleviate any noise and light pollution consequent upon the construction and operation of the substation?	I	<p>During construction noise and light pollution would be controlled through appropriate design and construction management measures documented in the outline Code of Construction Practice which forms part of the DCO application.</p> <p>For operation, it is noted that a number of measures which represent best practicable means have been designed-in to the project to reduce impacts where reasonable. In respect to lighting, this would be designed in accordance with best practice guidance and would be directional to avoid light pollution.</p> <p>Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 8: Noise and Vibration provides an assessment of impacts arising from Hornsea Three in relation to noise and vibration. The assessment considers impacts during construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning and concludes that taking into consideration the mitigation proposed by Hornsea Three, no significant effects would occur.</p>



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>58</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
River Glaven Conservation Group	The PIER describes screening assessments for a booster station, but I think doesn't comment on any need for tree planting to screen it from nearby visual impact. Again background noise assessment is made. At what point can it be possible to judge the incremental effect of a booster station on noise and indeed light pollution? This information may be hidden within the depths of the PIER- or be produced later. We will attend the consultation dates and be able to ask more but answers to the above would be appreciated.	I	<p>During design refinement, visual screening has been proposed for the HVAC booster station to minimise impacts. Indicative proposals are shown within the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.</p> <p>An assessment of both construction and operational noise impacts associated with the onshore infrastructure (including the HVAC booster station) is provided within Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 8: Noise and Vibration. Details of the baseline noise surveys which have been undertaken to inform the noise assessment are presented within Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 8.1: Baseline Noise Survey.</p> <p>During construction noise and light pollution would be controlled through appropriate design and construction management measures documented in the outline Code of Construction Practice which forms part of the DCO application. In respect to lighting, site lighting at the HVAC booster station will only operate when required and will be directional to avoid unnecessary illumination.</p>
Norfolk County Council	<p>Local Member Views</p> <p>2.39 The Local County Councillor for Melton Constable has made the following comments:</p> <p>2.40 There is generally little opposition to these proposals in absolute terms and local residents appreciate the importance of national infrastructure and securing future energy supply;</p> <p>2.41 There are concerns about the lack of mitigating measures planned in respect of the onshore HVAC Booster Station; and</p> <p>2.42 The Local Member strongly urges the County Council to insist that the developers provide detailed mitigating measures as part of their submission in respect of: height, visibility and noise – relating to the HVAC booster station at Little Barningham.</p>	I	<p>Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts to local residential receptors, either through site selection/route refinement (see Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives) or through the identification of suitable mitigation measures. Where there are impacts to residential receptors, these are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3).</p> <p>Appropriate mitigation measures relating to the onshore HVAC booster station are also identified in the relevant topic specific chapters. For example, visual disturbance impacts and associated mitigation are outlined in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources. This includes, for example, the restoration of habitats (including hedgerows) which cannot be avoided and landscape planting around the HVAC booster station to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.</p>
Planning, South Norfolk Council	<p>The Council's response to your consultation was agreed at the Development Management Committee meeting on 13 September 2017 and I enclose a copy of the committee report for your information.</p> <p>Our response to the consultation refers to three key considerations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Heritage Assets</li> <li>• Landscape</li> <li>• Noise and Pollution</li> </ul>	N	Noted, specific comments on these considerations are considered in the following points.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>58</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Planning, South Norfolk Council	<p>Noise and Vibration</p> <p>Noise from the construction phase has the potential to have an impact on the residents of the surrounding area. The PEIR outlines measures that will be taken to address this issue which are considered acceptable but the detail will need to be agreed at the appropriate time.</p> <p>Noise from the infrastructure is Low Frequency Noise (particularly in the 50Hz third octave band) which tends to be associated with electrical equipment (e.g. transformers). The PEIR outlines measures that will be taken to address this issue which are considered acceptable but the detail will need to be agreed at the appropriate time.</p>	I	<p>An Outline CoCP forms part of the DCO application and contains management measures that the Undertaker and its construction contractors will be required to adopt and implement for all construction activities associated with Hornsea Three. This includes measures to minimise construction noise, such as using plant conforming with the relevant legislation relating to noise and vibration; ensure plant machinery is turned off when not in use and undertaking construction works in accordance with the best practicable means.</p> <p>Mitigation measures in relation to noise during the operational phase of Hornsea Three are detailed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 8: Noise and Vibration. The objective of the measures are to control and limit noise levels, so far as is reasonably practicable, to minimise disturbance to sensitive receptors. The measures which Hornsea Three have committed to include the preparation of an Operational Noise Management Plan (NMP) for the onshore HVAC booster station and onshore HVDC converter/HVAC substation, to be agreed with the relevant local planning authority, prior to the start of noise generating works. Hornsea Three has also committed to developing acoustic mitigation during the detailed design stage for the onshore HVDC converter/HVAC substation to minimise noise impacts at surrounding residential NSRs. Given the location of the HVAC booster station relevant to the nearest residential receptor, and the commitment of Hornsea Three to internalise the noisiest equipment, similar acoustic mitigation is not required for the HVAC booster station.</p>
Broadland District Council	<p>The impact on local communities and residential amenities as a result of the increased vehicular activity including heavy plant associated with the construction phases of the onshore export cable route including the removal of excavated material, the delivery of large sections of cables and the traffic movements associated with delivering backfill material. In addition the impact of the traffic movements being centred around the identified temporary construction compounds and the additional construction compounds that the PEIR states 'will be required to facilitate the construction process will be identified in the Environmental Statement' and the resulting noise disturbance/light pollution in these locations and traffic routes that are in close proximity to residential properties. Figure 8.1 on pg. 8 of Chapter 8 - Noise and vibration does not include the temporary construction compound identified at Oulton Street or the alternative cable route west of Salle Park within the 1 km noise and vibration study area buffer as shown in the 'Phase 2 Statutory Consultation Plan'. The district Council expects the imposition of conditions to set out the permitted hours of working, permitted activities at the temporary construction compounds and maximum permitted noise levels to reduce the impact on the nearby local communities.</p>	I	<p>Impacts on the local road network is assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport. Associated disruption in respect to noise and vibration and dust are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapters 8 and 9: Noise and Vibration and Air Quality respectively.</p>
Holt County Division	<p>Night time access has been suggested by some, but that then has further implications for residents – with noise and vibration from such vehicles causing disturbance where some properties adjoin the highway.</p>	I	<p>Working hours are set out in the outline CoCP which forms part of the DCO application. The need for any night-time working would be subject to agreement with the local planning authority. Associated impacts relating to noise and vibration are set out in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 8: Noise and Vibration.</p>
Edgefield, Bodham, Corpusty & Saxthorpe, Hempstead and Plumstead Parish Councils (and others)	<p>3. Mitigations of impact of HVAC booster station At present, based on the drawings, descriptions and 3D models we have seen, there are no mitigating measures planned around the construction of the HVAC booster station at Little Barningham and this is simply unacceptable. The potential height on its own would create an eyesore that could significantly undermine the quality of life of people living in, and passing through, the area. Not to mention the noise.</p> <p>There are very few rural services in North Norfolk and precious little economic activity beyond tourism. The quality of life and the beautiful natural environment we enjoy are what people get instead and this could be significantly eroded by the developers' plans if mitigation steps are not put in place. 97% of residents said that improving the natural habitat after construction was finished was "important" or "very important" - the strongest response of all the issues covered and the answer that had the greatest consensus (standard deviation: 0.56). 95% furthermore said that the natural environment has a lot to do with their quality of life.</p> <p>Visual</p>	I	<p>Information pertaining to the site selection for the HVAC booster station is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives, whilst maximum dimensions are provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description.</p> <p>Through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive ecological receptors. For example, the orientation of the HVAC booster station has been optimised to minimise impacts on nearby field boundaries (hedgerows and trees) as well as maximise natural screening. Additional mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project are outlined in topic specific chapters, and include the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts on local road networks, ecological receptors (e.g. hedgerows) and hydrological features (e.g. main rivers); and landscape planting around the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>58</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>The proposed 12.5m structure will be visible over hundreds of hectares, including from all neighbouring villages, and a significant length of the Holt road. We do not recognize the visualisations we have been shown by the developer based on our local knowledge, and we will undertake experiments ourselves to see the true distance over which the structure as currently planned would be seen. Significant height mitigations should be volunteered by the developer or required as a condition of the order, to reduce substantially the relative height to the extent that it would be similar in size to other aesthetically limited constructions in the local area: only churches remotely approach the height currently proposed. We urge the developers to consider ideas for this – a very small selection of which include: digging out the foundations so the building starts at a lower level; using the soil to create a bank around the construction and planting the scheme with trees.</p> <p>We note the lengthy disclaimers attached to the developer’s visualisations and feel they are therefore an ineffective tool to understand the visual impact of the booster station from different viewpoints. Physical demonstrations would be required in order to understand the true visibility of the proposed construction.</p> <p>77% of residents said that ensuring the height of the booster station was kept to a minimum was “very important” and this is an area we hope the developers will consider seriously before making their application - at present no mitigations whatsoever are proposed and this is clearly unacceptable.</p> <p>We have been informed that flood lighting will be needed on site to provide safe working conditions at night in the event of emergency. We accept this, but do not understand why this lighting needs to be motion-sensitive. For the purposes of security we understand remote monitored, motion-sensitive, infrared cameras would be equally effective and request that any flood lighting be manually triggered either remotely or from on-site so as to prevent any eventuality where the night sky in this remote and rural area is illuminated unnecessarily.</p> <p>Noise and vibration</p> <p>Currently the developer proposes noise and vibration mitigation that reduces the noise impact of the booster station to “acceptable levels”. We have seen no evidence that these levels are respectful of the fact that, at night in North Norfolk, the environment is virtually absent of any background noise or vibration interference whatsoever. Nor are we confident that background studies have been carried out at sites close to the proposed construction.</p> <p>We insist that the required noise and vibration levels within 500m of the proposed booster station are set at the current background levels at those locations on a clear night.</p> <p>We strongly urge the developers to provide detailed noise and vibration mitigation steps as part of their application, rather than leave any doubt whatsoever that the targets will be adequate. If local people are being dragged into a national infrastructure project with no way of knowing what the impact will be, and with no formal powers of recourse, then the enforcement of rights will only be able to be fought for post hoc by residents through protest and inconvenience once the DCO has been granted. It benefits everyone for the precise specification of “acceptable levels” to be disclosed upfront – and at a level that is agreeable.</p> <p>We believe that the available mitigation options should be able to reduce noise and vibration well below statutory levels – and that the extraordinary nature of this development means it is quite appropriate for entirely subjective levels to be set.</p> <p>96% of residents said that ensuring the booster station couldn’t be heard nearby was “important” or “very important”, making it the highest rated issue relating to the booster station, and the booster-station related issue whose response had the greatest consensus (standard deviation: 0.67). As it stands, it is still unclear whether the current background noise levels were sampled in appropriate places, or by suitably independent third parties.</p> <p>Decommissioning</p> <p>We seek reassurance from the developers that any potential booster station will be adequately demolished and removed at the end of its working life and the land restored.</p> <p>The HVAC booster station will be of significant and long-term detriment to our area, and our area</p>		<p>substation to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>58</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
	alone – and the best in class mitigation practices should be deployed, however costly. For the avoidance of doubt, our proposal in point two above should require the cost comparison to be inclusive of the cost of mitigations to the booster station in the case of HVAC.		
Swainsthorpe Parish Council	Councillors are also extremely concerned about the potential for noise pollution. The site is planned for a very rural area where there is very little noise, especially at night. The parish council understands it is possible that a whine or a hum may emit from the site and councillors would request in the strongest terms that any steps possible to reduce this as a result of additional steps which could be taken during the construction, should be taken.	I	Potential noise impacts during the operation of the HVDC converter/HVAC substation is addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 8: Noise and Vibration, along with proposed mitigation where appropriate.
Swannington with Alderford and Little Witchingham Parish Council	I am writing to provide input into the consultation process, regarding the proposed route for the cables. Alderford and Hall Road, Alderford The proposed route passes close to several residential properties in Alderford. You have explained through parish councillors' meetings the timescales and digging processes. Parishioners' concerns in particular relate to; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noise and dust/dirt attenuation</li> <li>Disruption to Hall road and the Reepham Road</li> <li>The possibility of significant extension of the construction timescales if the project has to be delivered in phases.</li> <li>Dong identifying all utility cables and pipes, including live privately-owned water pipes</li> <li>Accessing the construction area from compounds</li> <li>Local compensation - benefit</li> </ul>	I	Where possible and practicable the cable corridor route selected seeks to avoid passing adjacent to properties. This is to reduce impacts associated with construction disturbance and to seek to minimise conflicts such as Heavy Goods Vehicle (HGV) traffic movements. However, it is not possible to avoid passing in close proximity to all properties on the route. Where properties are located in close proximity, the Project will ensure that sensitive construction management measures, such as noise, dust and traffic control are considered. These are documented in an outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), which accompanies the DCO application.  Potential impacts on residential receptors are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapter (as well as the inter-related effects chapter) contained within Environmental Statement volume 3.
Swannington with Alderford and Little Witchingham Parish Council	Noise attenuation: <b>more detail is needed on how residents are not to be burdened by loud and persistent noise and dust/ dirt</b>	I	Where properties are located in close proximity, the Project will ensure that sensitive construction management measures, such as noise, dust and traffic control are considered. These are documented in an outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), which accompanies the DCO application.  Potential noise impacts during the operation of the HVDC converter/HVAC substation is addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 8: Noise and Vibration, along with proposed mitigation where appropriate.
<b>Section 42: Persons with an interest in the land (prescribed under section 44 of the Act)</b>			
Dr George Carman	Comments on Proposed onshore Mannington HVAC booster station at Shrubs Farm We are concerned that the proposed onshore Shrubs Farm Booster Station will create a real and significant risk of a significant adverse impact to our family amenity through (i) long term visual impact from approach roads between our market town Holt and homes (very high likelihood and very high consequence) (ii) long term increased background noise (very high likelihood and very high consequence). Figure 1 shows the results of Viewshed modelling (in green) using the Google Earth Digital Terrain Model and algorithm for a 12.5 m high structure at the proposed HVAC Shrubs Farm site indicating it will be visible (at ground level) over (i) 20 ha of land including houses at Edgefield (intersection of Ramsgate Street and Holt Road- including popular 17th Century country pub -The Pigs. (ii) About 200 ha of land including houses around Little Barningham village and Corpusty Road being 3 km east of the site (iii) 60 ha of land west of the proposed site. Whilst topography and trees provide a screen to the east and south east it is noted that trees are not a permanent feature of the landscape and in fact harvesting of some of the plantation has already commenced. (iv) Some 30 ha of undeveloped land 5 km southwest of the proposed site south of the Corpusty-Briston Road. Figure 2 shows the increased viewshed for the proposed 17.5 metre above ground level lighting proposed for the 2.5Ha site	N	The maximum parameters associated with the HVAC booster station is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description.  Generally, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts to local residential receptors, either through site selection/route refinement or through the identification of suitable mitigation measures. Where there are impacts to residential receptors, these are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3), for example noise during the operation of the HVDC converter/HVAC substation is addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 8: Noise and Vibration.  Impacts relating to landscape and visual resources are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual resources. Photographic panels along the cable corridor, as well as indicative visualisations have been prepared to inform the assessment of impacts and are provided in Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 4.5: Photographic Panels, Wireframes and Photomontages. Appropriate mitigation measures for visual disturbance are outlined in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources. This includes, for example, the restoration of habitats (including hedgerows) which cannot be avoided and landscape planting around the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>58</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>Therefore, there is considerable risk (very high likelihood and very high consequence) the North Norfolk landscapes will be "industrialised" over more than many hundreds of hectares by the 150 x 30 m buildings and the 17.5 m high lighting of the site. We accept that higher resolution DTMs and alternative algorithms may provide alternative interpretations and we respectfully request DONG to supplement their Visual Impact reports with Viewshed analyses.</p> <p>Furthermore, we are concerned the final location of the HVAC booster station may change and move closer to family property. We assess this risk to be of modest likelihood but with an extreme and unacceptable consequence.</p> <p>In Conclusion with respect to the proposed HVAC Booster stations we wish (in order of priority)</p> <p>(i) There be NO onshore HVAC booster station and that this is achieved by (a) constructing all booster stations offshore and/or (b) use of existing/emerging HVDC technology.</p> <p>(ii) Height of Booster station above ground level be reduced by excavating 3 to 5 metre and construction of an appropriate waterproof cellar.</p> <p>(iii) That the noise emission be reduced to the very highest of industry capability and exceeds current Best Industry Practice (not ALARP4 and not the minimum of the Statutory Requirement). It is not acceptable to say the project will meet the minimum regulatory requirements since TIME as shown that previous standards are no longer appropriate e.g. highway driving speeds or the use of asbestos.</p> <p>(iv) Sound mitigation be installed including cladding and berms (to a height equal to the height of the building)</p> <p>(v) We question the need for any lighting – particularly at 17.5 m. above ground level. DONG is respectfully requested to consider the use of infra-red technology for security which would obviate the need for any lighting. Any other security lighting to be kept below 10 metres and installed with motion sensors so that lights are not left on permanently.</p>		<p>proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.</p> <p>Due to current uncertainty (see volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives), a decision on which transmission system (HVDC or HVAC) to adopt will not be made until post consent after extensive engagement with potential systems suppliers has taken place. As a result of this, we have conducted our assessments based on a realistic worst-case scenario, which could be either HVDC or HVDC technology depending on the receptor.</p>
Dr George Carman	Visual and noise impact of Mannington HVAC Booster station with better than best industry practice being targeted (as opposed to minimal statutory requirement)	I	Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 8: Noise and Vibration provides an assessment of the potential noise impacts from the HVAC booster station, along with associated mitigation measures where required. It is noted that a number of measures which represent best practicable means have been designed-in to the project where reasonable, for example: site hoardings and maintenance of equipment and vehicles.



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>58</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Stephen and Sandra Carman	<p>Comments on Proposed onshore HVAC booster station at Shrubs Farm</p> <p>We are concerned that the proposed onshore Shrubs Farm Booster Station will create a real and significant risk of a significant adverse impact to our family amenity through</p> <p>(i) long term visual impact from approach roads between our market town Holt and homes</p> <p>(ii) long term increased background noise</p> <p>(iii) Light pollution Figure 1 shows the results of Viewshed modelling (in green) using the Google Earth Digital Terrain Model and algorithm for a 12.5 m high structure at the proposed HVAC Shrubs Farm site indicating it will be visible (at ground level) over</p> <p>(i) 20 ha of land including houses at Edgefield (intersection of Ramsgate Street and Holt Road- including popular 17th Century country pub -The Pigs.</p> <p>(ii) About 200 ha of land including houses around Little Barningham village and Corpusty Road being 3 km east of the site</p> <p>(iii) 60 ha of land west of the proposed site. Whilst topography and trees provide a screen to the east and south east it is noted that trees are not a permanent feature of the landscape and in fact harvesting of some of the plantation has already commenced.</p> <p>(iv) Some 30 ha of undeveloped land 5 km southwest of the proposed site south of the Corpusty-Briston Road. Figure 2 shows the increased viewshed for the proposed 17.5 metre above ground level lighting proposed for the 2.5Ha site</p> <p>Therefore, there is considerable risk the North Norfolk landscapes will be “industrialised” over more than many hundreds of hectares by the 150 x 30 m buildings and the 17.5 m high lighting of the site.</p> <p>Furthermore, we are concerned the final location of the HVAC booster station may change and move closer to family property</p> <p>In Conclusion with respect to the proposed HVAC Booster stations we wish (in order of priority)</p> <p>(i) There be NO onshore HVAC booster station and that this is achieved by (a) constructing all booster stations offshore and/or (b) use of DC current</p> <p>(ii) Height of Booster station above ground level be reduced by excavating 3 to 5 metre and construction of an appropriate waterproof cellar.</p> <p>(iii) That the noise emission be reduced to the very highest of industry capability and exceeds current Best Industry Practice (not ALARP4 and not the minimum of the Statutory Requirement). It is not acceptable to say the project will meet the minimum regulatory requirements since TIME as shown that previous standards are no longer appropriate e.g. highway driving speeds or the use of asbestos.</p> <p>(iv) Sound mitigation be installed including cladding and berms (to a height equal to the height of the building)</p> <p>(v) We question the need for any lighting – particularly at 17.5 m. above ground level. DONG is respectfully requested to consider the use of infra-red technology for security which would obviate the need for any lighting. Any other security lighting to be kept below 10 metres and installed with motion sensors so that lights are not left on permanently</p>	I	<p>The maximum parameters associated with the HVAC booster station is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description.</p> <p>Generally, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts to local residential receptors, either through site selection/route refinement or through the identification of suitable mitigation measures. Where there are impacts to residential receptors, these are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3), for example noise during the operation of the HVDC converter/HVAC substation is addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 8: Noise and Vibration.</p> <p>Impacts relating to landscape and visual resources are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual resources. Photographic panels along the cable corridor, as well as indicative visualisations have been prepared to inform the assessment of impacts and are provided in Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 4.5: Photographic Panels, Wireframes and Photomontages. Appropriate mitigation measures for visual disturbance are outlined in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources. This includes, for example, the restoration of habitats (including hedgerows) which cannot be avoided and landscape planting around the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.</p> <p>Due to current uncertainty (see volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives), a decision on which transmission system (HVDC or HVAC) to adopt will not be made until post consent after extensive engagement with potential systems suppliers has taken place. As a result of this, we have conducted our assessments based on a realistic worst-case scenario, which could be either HVDC or HVDC technology depending on the receptor.</p>
Christopher Bond, Bidwells, on behalf of Evans-Lombe Trust & Great Melton Farms	<p>Algarsthorpe Farmhouse</p> <p>The original route will cross immediately in front of Algarsthorpe Farmhouse, a substantial eight bedroom property with views overlooking the River Yare Valley.</p> <p>The original route would sever the main access to Algarsthorpe Farmhouse which runs from the Bawburgh/Marlingford Road (approaching from the north).</p> <p>Algarsthorpe Barns, which include a recording studio, are used by the business of [REDACTED], a broadcaster and media producer. Therefore, any disturbance, particularly noise, will make it difficult for this business to function.</p> <p>Algarsthorpe Farm House is used by Mrs Sarah Buxton for her business as a legal and business affairs consultant in the media; hence the need to reduce any disturbance to the property.</p>	Y	<p>The alternative route proposed and adopted is now to the rear of the property with tree screening between the two. Concerns regarding potential noise impact during works noted. Access to property also noted in relation to potential impact.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>58</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Jane Kenny, Savills (general comments)	vii. Construction Programme – at no point throughout our discussions has it been indicated that the construction programme is to be up to 11 years long with up to three phases and a maximum gap of four years. There is no detail on how this will actually be phased and impact on individual landowners. Despite this a construction period over this length of time will cause immeasurable disruption to farming businesses and the local tourist industry. This coupled with the ‘maximum scenario design’ will have a detrimental affect upon the environment and there is no clear detail on how this is going to be mitigated.	Y	The possible phasing of the project has now been reduced to two possible phases, and a subsequent maximum construction period of 8 years. This period includes the construction of all offshore elements of the project, with onshore work taking a maximum of 3 years per phase to complete.
Jane Kenny, Savills, on behalf of Mr and Mrs N Darling	Mr & Mrs N Darling/ Intwood Properties, Long Meadow Barn, Intwood The PEIR document acknowledges that there will be disruption adjacent to the corridor in the form of noise, dust, vibration and restricted access. However it does not provide any clarity on how this will be mitigated. Our clients run a film location business and have a number of holiday lets along the route. Clarity is required on how these businesses at the site are going to be protected from the impact of the scheme.	I	The film location business at the property has been noted. The project will adopt working standards for the construction period and will be able to consider other working practices to reduce and mitigate the impact to the land, local properties and the business in question.
Jane Kenny, Savills (general comments)	vi. The PEIR refers to possible noise from the Booster Station, however having discussed the matter with DONG engineers we understand that they are yet to assess the impact before mitigation measures can be determined. It is our view based on previous experience from the Salle sub-station that the impact will be significant and the provision of mitigation measures needs to be set out in more detail.	I	Due to the early stage of development at the time of release of the PEIR, this detail was not yet available. Further information is included in the Environmental Statement.
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co on behalf of AV Youngs Ltd	Tourism and amenity: The proposed cable route will come within 200m of the principle farmstead of Pitt Farm where there are existing dwellings, proposals for creation of more dwellings in the farm buildings and a thriving campsite. a. To the West of Pitt Farm is a thriving campsite known as Baconsthorpe Meadows i. The campsite is open 1st March to 31st October and will expect to receive more than 1000 arrivals during that time. ii. Average stay is 3 nights with some staying up to 14 nights iii. The campsite is profitable and once the current season ends will be entering a phase of considerable development, investment and expansion of service provision. b. The proposed works corridor includes part of the campsite and therefore even if the cables are laid in the further west extremity of the proposed corridor there will be significant disruption to the campsite. c. The campsite is at a vulnerable stage where it must develop a reputation as a “go to” venue in a highly competitive local marketplace. d. Significant disturbance from cable installation works could lead to negative reviews and the campsite gaining a poor reputation. e. DONG will need to take steps to minimise disturbance including, and not limited to: i. Ensuring vehicular access is always available ii. Not disrupting occupants with noise, dust, smell or lights iii. Investigate moving the cable corridor to the western side of the farm iv. Considering restricted working hours and season in this part of the project.	Y	Hornsea Three acknowledged the details regarding the campsite and the potential impact the cable route adjacent to this could have. The cable corridor was amended accordingly.
Sarah Bristow	<b>Onshore Substation</b> - A bit close to my house, worried about noise, and limited access for building works	I	Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts to local residential receptors, either through site selection/route refinement or through the identification of suitable mitigation measures. Where there are impacts to residential receptors, these are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3), for example noise is addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 8: Noise and Vibration.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>58</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Natasha & Steve Hall	Having received all the paperwork with reference to the above project I just wondered how you expect non engineering people to understand any of it. We have been very accommodating with DONG wanting to put up wind /noise monitors in our garden but with no information on why or what consequences this will have on our property.	I	Response noted. Sufficient technical detail must be included within the Environmental Statement to ensure sufficient transparency in method and assessment, as well as to inform responses from statutory consultees. To assist in the communication of those more technical aspects to members of the public, a non-technical summary has been provided as part of the DCO Application.
Natasha & Steve Hall	After receiving a few calls from concerned people asking if I was happy with what was said on radio Norwich I thought I had better email to check facts. It appears that everyone is happy and there are no concerns about the Hornsea wind farm project everybody has been kept informed (which we had not up to when we went to Swardeston village hall event) and found out information for ourselves. I don't think at this stage before planning that an assumption should be made that everyone is in agreement with this project- obviously they are talking to people who live miles from the site and who have no visual or noise impact. Our concerns still remain unanswered and have had no response since event 4th September	N	Ørsted clarified that no assumption had been made that local communities were fully supportive of the proposal at that stage. Ørsted explained that it had taken part in the radio interviews to encourage wider participation in the consultation. Ørsted reassured that consultee that Hornsea Three was still in the planning pre-application stage and noted that further refinements to Hornsea Three were anticipated following receipt of comments as part of the statutory consultation.
Natasha/Steven Hall	<b>PEIR surveys</b> - My property excluded from visual sound survey - major impact	I	Where there are impacts to residential receptors, these are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3).
Natasha/Steven Hall	<b>Proposal</b> - Cannot answer above as still awaiting communication with reference to compensation as we seem to be the only private residents affected - visual - noise - devaluation of our property. We feel we have been overlooked	I	Where there are impacts to residential receptors, these are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3). Hornsea Three has met with this stakeholder following PEIR to further discuss their concerns.
<b>Section 47: Duty to consult local community</b>			
National Farmers Union (NFU)	Dust/Irrigation Clarification is needed on how practical issues like dust will be controlled during construction and how can the effect on irrigation be minimised?	I	Hornsea Three confirmed that greater detail on dust management can be found in the Environmental Statement.
Christine Walton	<b>Landfall</b> - At present this is near and a spectacular beautiful countryside and coast line. Noise, disruption and dirt for 11 years with the outcome to local residents - definitely not.	Y	During the design refinement Hornsea Three has sought to minimise the duration of any disruption, and has reduced the total number of phases to two and the total duration of the construction phase onshore to eight years. Within this, the maximum duration for construction of the onshore cable corridor is approximately 2.5 years, this therefore means that the maximum duration over which construction could occur would be 5.5 years incorporating two phases (assuming a three-year gap between the two phases). The work associated with each phase is expected to progress along the Hornsea Three onshore cable corridor with a typical active construction works duration of three months at any particular location.  Hornsea Three has identified appropriate mitigation measures to minimise visual, noise and dust impacts which are set out in the relevant topic chapters of the Environmental Statement.
<b>Section 48: Duty to publicise</b>			
No comments were received in response to the Public Notice relating to air quality under Phase 2.A.			

Table 3.25: Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Further Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.B) relating to air quality

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>59</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 42: Prescribed consultees (The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009: Schedule 1))</b>			
<i>No comments were received from the prescribed consultees relating to air quality under Phase 2.B.</i>			
<b>Section 42: Local Authorities (prescribed under section 43 of the Act)</b>			
Estelle Hook, Norfolk Coast Partnership	We suggest that construction traffic should use carefully selected routes within the AONB, to minimise disruption, damage and pollution.	I	Impacts relating to access are addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport. It is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this forms part of the DCO application.
<b>Section 42: Persons with an interest in the land (prescribed under section 44 of the Act)</b>			
<i>No comments were received from persons with an interest in land relating to air quality under Phase 2.B.</i>			
<b>Section 47: Duty to consult local community</b>			
<i>No comments were received from the local community relating to air quality under Phase 2.B.</i>			
<b>Section 48: Duty to publicise</b>			
Judy Holland	I am now extremely concerned about the entire wind farm cabling routes by both Ørsted and Vattenfall (I have written to them too) which will cross in the field behind our home (address below) and which will have far more impact on us than we previously thought now that the working corridors, site access routes and construction compounds/marshalling yards are coming to light. If plans are passed this will have a massive long term impact on us with noise, dust and access in and out of our home.	I	Generally, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts to local residential receptors, either through site selection/route refinement or through the identification of suitable mitigation measures. Where there are impacts to residential receptors, these are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3), for example noise during the construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning of the project is addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 8: Noise and Vibration. Impacts associated with dust are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 9: Air Quality and impacts in relation to access are considered in volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport. In all cases, a cumulative impact assessment is presented where the potential for combined impacts with other projects are considered.

<sup>59</sup> Y = Yes change made; N = No change made; I = Incorporated into or considered when producing the assessment or landowner voluntary agreement offer; N/A = Not applicable.

Table 3.26: Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Focused Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.C) relating to air quality

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>60</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 42: Prescribed consultees (The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009: Schedule 1))</b>			
Oulton Parish Council	<p>Traffic &amp; Transport Assessment and HGV Movements - It has been confirmed that Oulton airfield was not chosen as the site for its compound by Orsted, but was put forward by the landowner. The landowner no doubt proposed the site's suitability on the grounds of its previous uses by Bacton gas pipeline (2003) &amp; Sheringham Shoals windfarm (2009) as a compound. Both these projects were much smaller in scale than that proposed by Orsted - thus generating far fewer traffic movements - and lasted for only 18 months each. Even then, the impact of the increase in traffic on the inhabitants of the Old Railway Gatehouse was considerable, but the resident was too polite to complain.</p> <p>Weston Longville as the preferred site was finally abandoned –after assessment- because of the discovery of various constraints, but to date Oulton's traffic assessment has not even been completed. It is now stated that :“The relevant assessments for Oulton Airfield as the Main Construction Compound will be included in the ES that we submit alongside our DCO application in Q2 2018.” (p.8)</p> <p>This situation is entirely unsatisfactory as it will prevent OPC from reviewing the assessments for accuracy before they are submitted. We must also point out that this approach is entirely invalid as it pre-judges the outcome of the assessments to be positive.</p> <p>In answer to our request for “likely traffic movements (type and number) that would be generated...” the response is that: “At this point in time the Project cannot supply this level of detail”. This statement is made despite the fact that on a previous page we have been told of *A forecast peak of 213 daily staff movements *A forecast peak of 134 daily HGV movements ***Are these movements IN and OUT ....or only in one direction?</p> <p>However, these apparent hard facts are immediately described as being “movements on any part of the network” and hedged about with caveats such as: It is important to note however that not all staff and not all HGVs associated with a section would travel to the Main Compound.” (p.6)</p> <p>Maybe - but surely most of them would start and finish at the compound each day? The Main Construction Compound (irrespective of temporary compounds along the route) certainly has to perform the function of a central hub of the activities generated by the construction of the cable corridor for the entire 8 years of the project - or else it is a meaningless concept. For that reason, it has to be understood as a concentration point for construction traffic as compared to the work sites along the cable corridor. In any case, it is our contention that Orsted's position on these traffic types and movements is intentionally and unnecessarily vague. Orsted is not a novice in the sphere of cable corridor construction. Hornsea Project One has already been under construction for approximately 2 years in Lincolnshire. There is an active Main Construction Compound at Holton le Clay. Orsted's Project Managers ought to be able therefore to extrapolate from their ongoing experience at this other site and provide Oulton Parish Council with a vivid and accurate description of the likely patterns of activity and movement at the proposed site in Oulton. ***Why has Orsted not felt able to provide us with such a clear description?</p> <p>In the absence of an answer to the question above, OPC can only deduce that the reason has something to do with the severe adverse impacts on their quality of life that are likely to be experienced by the inhabitants of Oulton. There could of course be another reason: that they do not feel the need to address our valid concerns directly because they know that, as this project is viewed as a piece of national infrastructure, local material planning considerations can be largely ignored.</p>	I	<p>Information pertaining to the site selection for the main construction compound is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives. Given the nature of the Oulton Airfield, which comprises existing hardstanding, its use as the main construction compound has less potential for significant effects than other sites which were under consideration.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, Hornsea Three recognises the sensitivity of this location and since its identification as the main construction compound, Hornsea Three has sought to identify measures to minimise any impacts on Oulton village, local residents and the local road network. In this regard, where properties are located in close proximity to the Oulton Airfield, the Project will ensure that sensitive construction management measures, such as noise, dust and traffic control are considered. These are documented in an outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), which accompanies the DCO application. Furthermore, it is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this also forms part of the DCO application.</p> <p>Impacts associated with the use of Oulton Airfield as the main construction compound are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3). Impacts relating to traffic and transport are specifically assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport.</p>

<sup>60</sup> Y = Yes change made; N = No change made; I = Incorporated into or considered when producing the assessment or landowner voluntary agreement offer; N/A = Not applicable.



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>60</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>Such an attitude would be worrying indeed.</p> <p>There are in fact many serious “constraints” standing in the way of the positive assessment of the Oulton site as suitable.</p> <p>Not least is the force of the Appeal Decision in 2014 to dismiss the proposal for a Centralised Anaerobic Digester on the former airfield. During the course of this Appeal a traffic simulation programme was produced which proved conclusively that highway dysfunction would occur relentlessly, if HGV traffic was sent regularly in 2 directions along that part of the lane. The Inspector’s conclusion was that the proposal</p> <p>“ would endanger highway safety and the satisfactory functioning of the highway network” and that “despite the proposed improvements to the highway network the cumulative impacts of the proposed development would be severe.”</p> <p>It is stated tentatively in the Orsted document that the difference between the AD and Hornsea Project 3 is that Hornsea is only “temporary”. This depends entirely on your definition of ‘temporary’. 8 years is a very long time: long enough for a child of 9 to grow up and leave home; long enough for an 80 year-old to be forced to live out her last years intimidated by the noise, speed and size of this additional traffic.</p> <p>The second constraint is precisely another cumulative impact - that of the traffic that will be generated by the choice of nearby Docking Farm Oulton by the Vattenfall project for another storage compound and PMA (Primary Mobilisation Area). All such traffic will be competing directly with the Hornsea Three traffic (and all existing traffic) on the narrow southern stretch of The Street (a ‘C’ road) on its way to the B1149. These cumulative impacts should be assessed now: it is unacceptable to leave this judgement until after both projects are submitted for DCO. The final constraint is the existence of the hamlet of Oulton Street itself. It was suggested at the PC meeting on 6th March by Orsted that their solution to highway dysfunction and danger on the southern end of The Street, might be to operate their own one-way system and bring half their traffic through the northern end - the settlement of Oulton Street. The statement is made in the document that : “the Project cannot make a commitment that traffic associated with the project will not pass through the settlement of Oulton Street. “Residents of Oulton Street find this statement breathtaking in its lack of understanding of the local circumstances. No developer has ever suggested doing such a thing - on the contrary an S106 Undertaking has been offered to prevent exactly this from happening. The reasons are obvious to anyone familiar with the situation: most of the cottages have walls and windows directly on the roadway, without benefit of pavement or front garden. In summer, with windows open, conversations inside the cottages often have to be suspended whenever an HGV goes past. Abnormal loads being delivered by night would simply wake up every single resident of 24 dwellings. Many cars are parked on the road, partly because some cottages have no off-street parking but also because many inhabitants deliberately park their cars on the Street, in order to protect their houses from being further damaged by the vibrations caused by enormous agricultural HGVs passing directly alongside.</p> <p>Agricultural HGVs have increased enormously in size and weight over recent years and cottages shake when some of the larger ones drive past. Oulton Street has already reached saturation point in terms of its ability to absorb this sort of traffic - especially during the now protracted periods of harvest time; residents are already experiencing severe adverse impacts on a daily basis.</p> <p>We are similarly deeply concerned to read the statement that: “the application will not be proposing bespoke mitigation at...The Old Railway Gatehouse.” Please refer back to the AD Appeal Decision of 2014 which contains a graphic description by a Planning Inspector of living conditions within that dwelling.</p> <p>In addition, it is a mystery to the PC how construction traffic HGVs would cope with the B1354 (Saxthorpe / Blickling road – now downgraded to a ‘C’ road) once it reached the northern end of The Street. This road is narrow and capricious, with an extremely nasty right-angle bend and a single-lane bridge. This option would take traffic even further away from the cable corridor</p>		

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>60</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>(already nearly 6km away from the compound) and spread, rather than dilute, the pain. Operating a one-way system would be no solution and would utterly destroy the quality of life of local residents.</p> <p>Finally, in this section, OPC notes that: "the focus of the application is to manage traffic through the CTMP" and that the CTMP (Construction Traffic Management Plan) will clearly not be available for inspection until after – probably long after - submission for the DCO. This statement gives us no reassurance whatsoever. Not only does this fact completely disable OPC's ability to comment constructively in advance, but it also significantly heightens our concerns about the potential for mismanagement of construction traffic. At Orsted's Main Compound on Hornsea Project One, the local community were misled into believing that the CTMP (involving e.g. restrictions on right-hand turning of HGVs across streams of traffic) applied to all HGVs using the compound. Only after many months of relentless questioning did Orsted reveal that the CTMP applied only to traffic generated by the main contractor on the compound - and that it did not cover in any significant way traffic generated by sub-contractors or haulage companies - often carrying abnormal loads.</p> <p>A CTMP would clearly not provide the protection we need as a community from what we fear will be a free-for-all for HGV and other traffic associated with this proposal. Any CTMP that does not cover all traffic generated, becomes worthless and impossible to police.</p> <p><b>Conclusion of this section:</b> It is our position that, as the selection of Oulton has come so late in the pre-application phase of this project, submission of the DCO should be delayed until all relevant assessments of the suitability of the site as the Main Construction Compound have been completed, and discussed in full with the parish.</p>		
<b>Section 42: Local Authorities (prescribed under section 43 of the Act)</b>			
No comments were received from the local authorities relating to air quality under Phase 2.C.			
<b>Section 42: Persons with an interest in the land (prescribed under section 44 of the Act)</b>			
No comments were received from persons with an interest in land relating to air quality under Phase 2.C.			
<b>Section 47: Duty to consult local community</b>			
Simon and Zoe Dunford	<p>We live in Oulton Street - a conservation area on the National Trust's flagship Blickling Hall estate - and are extremely worried about the significant disruption to our lives that this would cause. If it was just a matter of months, we would put up with it. But it seems this would go on for years, not months. And potentially as many as eight years in the worst case scenario.</p> <p>We attended the meeting at Oulton Chapel with completely open minds about the project - but I'm afraid came away feeling seriously concerned about noise, traffic, light pollution, dust etc etc. We live at the Old Post Office, which like most of the properties in the Street, is built immediately on the roadside (no front garden or pavement). The farm traffic is already at saturation point, and already makes peaceful enjoyment of our home a real challenge.</p> <p>To introduce further heavy traffic into this small, rural village - with its walkers, cyclists, children, and visitors to Blickling Hall and the RAF Oulton museum and memorial - would be incredibly insensitive and no doubt harm the reputation of your company.</p> <p>Even if the traffic did not come all the way through the village, being directly downwind of the site we know that we would be disrupted by the noise/dust as this is something we already have to put up with from the existing farm works. With two asthma sufferers in the family (one adult and one child) the thought of more dust heading our way is very worrying.</p>	I	<p>Given the nature of the Oulton Airfield, which comprises existing hardstanding, its use as the main construction compound has less potential for significant effects than other sites which were under consideration. Notwithstanding this, Hornsea Three recognises the sensitivity of this location and since its identification as the main construction compound, Hornsea Three has sought to identify measures to minimise any impacts on Oulton village, local residents and the local road network. In this regard, where properties are located in close proximity to the Oulton Airfield, the Project will ensure that sensitive construction management measures, such as noise, dust, light and traffic control are considered. These are documented in an outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), which accompanies the DCO application. Furthermore, it is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this also forms part of the DCO application.</p> <p>Impacts associated with the use of Oulton Airfield as the main construction compound are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3).</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>60</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 48: Duty to publicise</b>			
<i>No comments were received in response to the Public Notice relating to air quality under Phase 2.C.</i>			

### 3.10 Electromagnetic Fields (EMF)

Table 3.27: Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.A) relating to electromagnetic fields (EMF)

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>61</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 42: Prescribed consultees (The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009: Schedule 1))</b>			
High Kelling Parish Council	2) Health concerns - concerns were expressed with regards the effects of electro-magnetic radiation from the cables.	I	<p>Environmental Statement, volume 3, annex 3.3: EMF Compliance Statement comprises an assessment of the static and extremely low frequency (ELF) EMFs that will be generated by the Hornsea Project Three onshore transmission infrastructure (cabling), giving maximum predicted field strengths to assess compliance with health protection guidelines for public exposure to EMFs.</p> <p>Annex 3.3 concludes that the maximum magnetic field strength directly above a cable, using worst-case assumptions where required, is also well below the guideline public exposure limits set to protect health. The cables eventually selected for the project will be required to fall within the envelope assessed and meet the prescribed standards and hence will not generate greater EMF.</p> <p>Relevant to this, it is noted that the view of health protection bodies, based on a wide-ranging health evidence base (including studies of reproductive and developmental effects, cardiovascular disease, neurodegenerative disorders, the immune system, and genotoxic effects), is that low-frequency EMF is not a cause of health risks and that the guideline exposure standards in place (based on well-established effects on the body) are appropriate to protect health.</p>
Little Melton Parish Council	3.) DC transmission would appear to be safer than AC transmission and the PC believes that the technology to be used should be decided upon before final permission is granted as there are different health risks. Gas insulated lines would appear to significantly reduce the magnetic field and the PC would like to see this technology used.	I	<p>Due to current uncertainty (see Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Alternatives), a decision on which transmission system (HVDC or HVAC) to adopt will not be made until post consent after extensive engagement with potential systems suppliers has taken place. As a result of this, our assessments are conducted based on a realistic worst-case scenario, which could be either HVDC or HVDC technology depending on the receptor.</p>
Little Melton Parish Council	4.) The PC would like to be put in touch with communities that already host comparable cables (both AC and DC) so that the PC can ask directly about any problems. There are concerns that AC will give rise to audible vibrations.	I	<p>Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 8: Noise and Vibration provides an assessment of impacts arising from Hornsea Three in relation to noise and vibration. The assessment considers impacts during construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning will be presented.</p> <p>It is noted that this chapter concludes that the onshore cables, which will be buried, will not generate any perceptible noise or vibration.</p>
Little Melton Parish Council	5.) Can Dong provide independent verification that the electric field will be fully absorbed at the shallowest depth of burial. One parishioner has questioned this based on the Skin Depth calculation.	I	<p>Hornsea Project Three will comply with the recommended EMF guidelines set to protect public health. A voluntary Code of Practice, that was developed by the UK Government, will be followed to provide evidence of this compliance in the DCO application for the development. More information can be found in Environmental Statement, volume 4, annex 3.3 Electro-Magnetic Fields (EMF) Compliance Statement.</p>

<sup>61</sup> Y = Yes change made; N = No change made; I = Incorporated into or considered when producing the assessment or landowner voluntary agreement offer; N/A = Not applicable.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>61</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Little Melton Parish Council	6.) Can Dong comment on the why they quote a 360 $\mu$ T limit for public exposure when the government Standard Note SNSC-06453 states 'reference level for the general public is 100 $\mu$ T'. Admittedly this still exceeds the predicted field strengths.	I	Hornsea Project Three will comply with the recommended EMF guidelines set to protect public health. A voluntary Code of Practice, that was developed by the UK Government, will be followed to provide evidence of this compliance in the DCO application for the development. More information can be found in Environmental Statement, volume 4, annex 3.3 Electro-Magnetic Fields (EMF) Compliance Statement.
Little Melton Parish Council	<b>Health</b> - Electric cables create an Electric field in proportion to their voltage and a magnetic field in proportion to the current flowing through the cable. When you travel under the high voltage cables that pass over Little Melton Road and Burnthouse, you can often hear a crackling as the electric field acts on particles in the air. Because the Dong cable will be buried, Dong states that the electric field will be absorbed by the earth and not reach the surface. The magnetic field will extend about 10m either side of the outer cables in the corridor and because the cables are close to the ground surface, anyone standing directly over the cable will be in a stronger field than someone standing under an overhead cable. Magnetic fields are measured in Teslas. One Tesla (T) = 1,000,000 micro Teslas ( $\mu$ T)  The field strength will depend on whether AC or DC is used to transmit the power and Dong will not decide on this until the project is granted approval, as wind farms are a new and evolving technology. AC fields induce a current in human tissue and this is an important difference from the static magnetic field generated by our planet. The maximum field strength directly over the cable could be 55 $\mu$ T, the earth's magnetic field is 50 $\mu$ T in the UK. Domestic appliances commonly generate similar strength fields and razors and hair dryers are much higher. Travelling on electric train can expose you to a 50 $\mu$ T field, an MRI scan can have a field up to 9,400,000 $\mu$ T. Dong state that Government has set a limit of 360 $\mu$ T for continuous public exposure.	I	Environmental Statement, volume 3, annex 3.3: EMF Compliance Statement comprises an assessment of the static and extremely low frequency (ELF) EMFs that will be generated by the Hornsea Project Three onshore transmission infrastructure (cabling), giving maximum predicted field strengths to assess compliance with health protection guidelines for public exposure to EMFs.  Annex 3.3 concludes that the maximum magnetic field strength directly above a cable, using worst-case assumptions where required, is also well below the guideline public exposure limits set to protect health. The cables eventually selected for the project will be required to fall within the envelope assessed and meet the prescribed standards and hence will not generate greater EMF.  Relevant to this, it is noted that the view of health protection bodies, based on a wide-ranging health evidence base (including studies of reproductive and developmental effects, cardiovascular disease, neurodegenerative disorders, the immune system, and genotoxic effects), is that low-frequency EMF is not a cause of health risks and that the guideline exposure standards in place (based on well-established effects on the body) are appropriate to protect health.
Little Melton Parish Council	<b>Health consequences</b> - Some studies have found a correlation between living close to overhead power cables and leukemia in children. Continuous exposure to an Electromagnetic field in the home is likely to be more significant than occasional exposure to the field generated by electrical appliances. As yet no biological mechanism has been found to explain how the cables could cause cancer and most of the mechanisms that have been suggested relate to the electric field from overhead cables but which Dong claim is absorbed by the earth above underground cables. The statistical basis of the studies has been questioned as confounding factors could be present.	I	Very extensive scientific research has been carried out to investigate potential for health risks from EMF. As a result, national and international health protection bodies have developed guidelines for public EMF exposure that are set to protect health. These guidelines are based on the lowest field strength at which there is a perceptible effect on the body, with a further precautionary margin applied. The underground cables and substation associated with the Hornsea Project Three Offshore Wind Farm grid connection will comply with the recommended EMF guidelines set to protect public health.  A voluntary Code of Practice, that was developed by the UK Government, will be followed to provide evidence of this compliance in the DCO application for the development. More information can be found in Environmental Statement volume 4, annex 3.3 Electro-Magnetic Fields (EMF) Compliance Statement.
Little Melton Parish Council	<u>Parish Council opinion</u> <b>Effects on people whilst in their homes and in public places</b> - The magnetic field from the cables falls off sharply with distance and will not be detectable beyond the edges of the cable corridor, so there should be no risk to people in their homes and on the public roads. The cables will cross under roads but the duration of exposure whilst travelling over the cable will be very short.	I	Noted. Further information on EMF can be found in Environmental Statement, volume 4, annex 3.3: EMF Compliance Statement.



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>61</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Little Melton Parish Council	<u>Parish Council opinion</u> <b>Effects on people whilst on the land above the cables</b> - The cables will pass under the land owned by the Parochial Charity and by Crusaders rugby club (actually in Hetherset). People standing directly above the cables will experience a strong magnetic field. Whilst there is no evidence that this can be harmful, there are few comparable buried cables so there has not been time for long term epidemiological studies. If there is an effect on human physiology then it is likely to be at the quantum level and that is an emerging and complex science, so nothing can be ruled out. However, hairdressers and people travelling on electric trains regularly experience strong magnetic fields and there is no suggestion that their health suffers.	I	Noted. Further information on EMF can be found in Environmental Statement, volume 4, annex 3.3: EMF Compliance Statement.
Little Melton Parish Council	The PC does not believe that the cable poses a threat to the general population of the village and as users of electricity it is reasonable to accept some of the inconveniences associated with the supply. However because the technology and the related science are in their infancy the PC believes that a precautionary approach should be taken - especially as the cable will be in place for at least 25 years and will run under recreational land.	I	Noted. Further information on EMF can be found in Environmental Statement, volume 4, annex 3.3: EMF Compliance Statement.
Little Melton Parish Council	1.) The PC would like to see the cables routed further away from the village and suggests that the cables can follow the same route as the existing overhead lines that lie to the south of Little Melton	I	Where possible and practicable the cable corridor route selected seeks to avoid passing adjacent to properties and residential centres. This is to reduce impacts associated with construction disturbance. Where properties are located in close proximity, the Project will ensure that sensitive construction management measures, such as noise, dust and traffic control are considered. These are documented in an outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), which forms part of the DCO application.  In respect to routing along the existing overhead lines, Hornsea Three were advised to incorporate a 15 m buffer distance to pylons (as advised by National Grid) . This represented a constraint to routing along the same route as the existing overhead lines.
Little Melton Parish Council	2.) The PC notes that the magnetic field strength is inversely proportional to the distance from the conductor by a factor of $2\pi$ (circumference of a circle) and that reference fields are measured 1m above ground. Someone working in a field or playing rugby may well have their head closer to the ground than 1m . The PC would like to see the cable buried at least 2m deep where it passes under recreational land (including the Parochial Charity land, which potentially may be used for allotments and the growing of fruit trees).	I	Noted. Further information on EMF can be found in Environmental Statement, volume 4, annex 3.3: EMF Compliance Statement.
Planning, South Norfolk Council	Electromagnetic fields (EMF) An EMF is produced whenever a piece of electrical or electronic equipment (i.e. TV, food mixer, computer mobile phone etc.) is used and thus will be generated by this proposal. The PEIR includes an assessment of EMF from the proposal which indicates that the public will not be exposed to unacceptable levels.	N	Noted

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>61</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Planning, South Norfolk Council	Members raised concerns at the potential pollution impact on the amenities of our residents, in respect of the electromagnetic field (EMF) of the cables and shields. I would request due consideration of this concern is given.	I	<p>Environmental Statement, volume 3, annex 3.3: EMF Compliance Statement comprises an assessment of the static and extremely low frequency (ELF) EMFs that will be generated by the Hornsea Project Three onshore transmission infrastructure (cabling), giving maximum predicted field strengths to assess compliance with health protection guidelines for public exposure to EMFs.</p> <p>Annex 3.3 concludes that the maximum magnetic field strength directly above a cable, using worst-case assumptions where required, is also well below the guideline public exposure limits set to protect health. The cables eventually selected for the project will be required to fall within the envelope assessed and meet the prescribed standards and hence will not generate greater EMF.</p> <p>Relevant to this, it is noted that the view of health protection bodies, based on a wide-ranging health evidence base (including studies of reproductive and developmental effects, cardiovascular disease, neurodegenerative disorders, the immune system, and genotoxic effects), is that low-frequency EMF is not a cause of health risks and that the guideline exposure standards in place (based on well-established effects on the body) are appropriate to protect health.</p>
Holt County Division	<p>Health concerns</p> <p>Many residents along the cable corridor have spoken about the safety of the technology, mostly with points about the potential effects of EMF. I am led to understand that in Italy underground cables are metal shielded to mitigate against these concerns? I can see no reference to this in the information I have read and wonder why it is not a practice supported here – is this a pure financial consideration?</p>	I	<p>Environmental Statement, volume 3, annex 3.3: EMF Compliance Statement comprises an assessment of the static and extremely low frequency (ELF) EMFs that will be generated by the Hornsea Project Three onshore transmission infrastructure (cabling), giving maximum predicted field strengths to assess compliance with health protection guidelines for public exposure to EMFs.</p> <p>Annex 3.3 concludes that the maximum magnetic field strength directly above a cable, using worst-case assumptions where required, is also well below the guideline public exposure limits set to protect health. The cables eventually selected for the project will be required to fall within the envelope assessed and meet the prescribed standards and hence will not generate greater EMF.</p> <p>Relevant to this, it is noted that the view of health protection bodies, based on a wide-ranging health evidence base (including studies of reproductive and developmental effects, cardiovascular disease, neurodegenerative disorders, the immune system, and genotoxic effects), is that low-frequency EMF is not a cause of health risks and that the guideline exposure standards in place (based on well-established effects on the body) are appropriate to protect health.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>61</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
North Norfolk District Council	<p>In setting out the Council's position a report was produced for discussion by the Council's Cabinet. (A copy of the Cabinet report and draft minutes are attached with this letter) (SEE ATTACHMENT).</p> <p>Cabinet resolved on 05 September 2017 to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Endorse the content of the report as being the Council's formal position and response to the current round of consultation being undertaken in respect of DONG Energy's Hornsea Project Three offshore windfarm development, and</li> <li>2) Re-state the Council's ongoing commitment to discuss and negotiate with DONG Energy to achieve the best outcome for North Norfolk from this major development proposal.</li> <li>3) Seek advice regarding potential health implications to the local community.</li> <li>4) Request that DONG Energy further explore Direct Current transmission arrangements as the proposed development is refined in the coming months</li> </ol> <p>In respect of point 3) above and potential health implications, concerns were expressed that the proposal would involve the laying of cables carrying very high voltages across large areas of the District and, in respect of those cables, questions were asked whether the health implications associated with electromagnetic fields (EMF) along the intended cable route had been fully explored and were understood. The District Council would therefore request assurance from DONG Energy, through submission of appropriate technical reports, that the cables being laid (whether HVAC or HVDC) would not give rise to health risks to nearby residents or other sensitive receptors from EMF or from other effects associated with the transmission of high voltage electricity along buried cables.</p>	I	<p>Environmental Statement, volume 3, annex 3.3: EMF Compliance Statement comprises an assessment of the static and extremely low frequency (ELF) EMFs that will be generated by the Hornsea Project Three onshore transmission infrastructure (cabling), giving maximum predicted field strengths to assess compliance with health protection guidelines for public exposure to EMFs.</p> <p>Annex 3.3 concludes that the maximum magnetic field strength directly above a cable, using worst-case assumptions where required, is also well below the guideline public exposure limits set to protect health. The cables eventually selected for the project will be required to fall within the envelope assessed and meet the prescribed standards and hence will not generate greater EMF.</p> <p>Due to current uncertainty (see volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives), a decision on which transmission system (HVDC or HVAC) to adopt will not be made until post consent after extensive engagement with potential systems suppliers has taken place. As a result of this, we have conducted our assessments based on a realistic worst-case scenario, which could be either HVDC or HVDC technology depending on the receptor.</p>
Weybourne Parish Council	<p>3. The parish council is also concerned that there may be more than a single corridor for cabling and have further concerns re health risks following reports of the heat generated by these new cables.</p>	I	<p>Further details regarding the potential construction methodology of the project are set out in the Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description. The potential for thermal impacts to surrounding soil from the cables are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 1: Geology and Ground Conditions and concludes that effects would not be significant. Consideration is given to EMF emissions in Environmental Statement, volume 3, annex 3.3: EMF Compliance Statement.</p>
<b>Section 42: Local Authorities (prescribed under section 43 of the Act)</b>			
Planning, South Norfolk Council	<p>Electromagnetic fields (EMF) An EMF is produced whenever a piece of electrical or electronic equipment (i.e. TV, food mixer, computer mobile phone etc.) is used and thus will be generated by this proposal. The PEIR includes an assessment of EMF from the proposal which indicates that the public will not be exposed to unacceptable levels.</p>	N	Noted

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>61</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Planning, South Norfolk Council	Members raised concerns at the potential pollution impact on the amenities of our residents, in respect of the electromagnetic field (EMF) of the cables and shields. I would request due consideration of this concern is given.	I	<p>Environmental Statement, volume 3, annex 3.3: EMF Compliance Statement comprises an assessment of the static and extremely low frequency (ELF) EMFs that will be generated by the Hornsea Project Three onshore transmission infrastructure (cabling), giving maximum predicted field strengths to assess compliance with health protection guidelines for public exposure to EMFs.</p> <p>Annex 3.3 concludes that the maximum magnetic field strength directly above a cable, using worst-case assumptions where required, is also well below the guideline public exposure limits set to protect health. The cables eventually selected for the project will be required to fall within the envelope assessed and meet the prescribed standards and hence will not generate greater EMF.</p> <p>Relevant to this, it is noted that the view of health protection bodies, based on a wide-ranging health evidence base (including studies of reproductive and developmental effects, cardiovascular disease, neurodegenerative disorders, the immune system, and genotoxic effects), is that low-frequency EMF is not a cause of health risks and that the guideline exposure standards in place (based on well-established effects on the body) are appropriate to protect health.</p>
North Norfolk District Council	<p>In setting out the Council's position a report was produced for discussion by the Council's Cabinet. (A copy of the Cabinet report and draft minutes are attached with this letter) (SEE ATTACHMENT). Cabinet resolved on 05 September 2017 to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Endorse the content of the report as being the Council's formal position and response to the current round of consultation being undertaken in respect of DONG Energy's Hornsea Project Three offshore windfarm development, and</li> <li>2) Re-state the Council's ongoing commitment to discuss and negotiate with DONG Energy to achieve the best outcome for North Norfolk from this major development proposal.</li> <li>3) Seek advice regarding potential health implications to the local community.</li> <li>4) Request that DONG Energy further explore Direct Current transmission arrangements as the proposed development is refined in the coming months</li> </ol> <p>In respect of point 3) above and potential health implications, concerns were expressed that the proposal would involve the laying of cables carrying very high voltages across large areas of the District and, in respect of those cables, questions were asked whether the health implications associated with electromagnetic fields (EMF) along the intended cable route had been fully explored and were understood. The District Council would therefore request assurance from DONG Energy, through submission of appropriate technical reports, that the cables being laid (whether HVAC or HVDC) would not give rise to health risks to nearby residents or other sensitive receptors from EMF or from other effects associated with the transmission of high voltage electricity along buried cables.</p>	I	<p>Environmental Statement, volume 3, annex 3.3: EMF Compliance Statement comprises an assessment of the static and extremely low frequency (ELF) EMFs that will be generated by the Hornsea Project Three onshore transmission infrastructure (cabling), giving maximum predicted field strengths to assess compliance with health protection guidelines for public exposure to EMFs.</p> <p>Annex 3.3 concludes that the maximum magnetic field strength directly above a cable, using worst-case assumptions where required, is also well below the guideline public exposure limits set to protect health. The cables eventually selected for the project will be required to fall within the envelope assessed and meet the prescribed standards and hence will not generate greater EMF.</p> <p>Due to current uncertainty (see volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives), a decision on which transmission system (HVDC or HVAC) to adopt will not be made until post consent after extensive engagement with potential systems suppliers has taken place. As a result of this, we have conducted our assessments based on a realistic worst-case scenario, which could be either HVDC or HVDC technology depending on the receptor.</p>
<b>Section 42: Persons with an interest in the land (prescribed under section 44 of the Act)</b>			
Jill Angela Claudia Margaillan	<p>Thanked for paperwork relating to the consultation. Objection: Unknown Risks of Electromagnetic Fields[1] that underground cables may generate in close proximity to my home/business and additional reasons below: [1] Referenced SN06453.pdf Underground power lines and health - House of Commons <a href="http://www.emfs.info/sources/underground/">http://www.emfs.info/sources/underground/</a> <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/electric-and-magnetic-fields-health-effects-of-exposure">https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/electric-and-magnetic-fields-health-effects-of-exposure</a></p>	Y	Hornsea Three noted the land owner's concerns and the relevant land plot has been avoided by the proposed cable route.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>61</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Jane Kenny, Savills (general comments)	Electro Magnetic Fields –there is considerable concern over the lack of detail in respect of EMF and the impact on health as well as the interference on Soil Sense Technology, RTK and other agricultural software.	I	Please see the detail included within the EMF compliance note regarding EMF's. As the type of cable construction cannot yet be confirmed, the specific detail on EMF that is likely to be produced cannot either.  Responses regarding the agricultural software in question were provided following investigation into these and the frequency they operate at.
Jane Kenny, Savills on behalf of Mr and Mrs Wharton	Individual Concerns  Mr & Mrs Wharton – Foxhills, Weybourne The area of land to be affected by the cable route is a camp site. The businesses USP is its beautiful location within the AONB of Weybourne with views of the sea. Whilst the scheme is under construction the business will not be able to function due to the land take. If the scheme takes up to 11 years to be completed, the business will be destroyed. If an alternative design is proposed and therefore the disruption is minimal, the business will still not be able to function whilst construction is underway due to the land take, the constant heavy traffic from Muckleburgh via the proposed access on the eastern boundary of our clients ownership. As referred to above, there are real concerns over EMF's and health bearing in mind that this is a camp site and when the land is returned it will be sterilised for the siting tents or campervans. There is concern over that the fragile coastline has been invaded twice at Weybourne, resulting in excessive damage during high tides and storms. A third cable landfall, will cause further, weakening, speeding erosion of the coastline and it is not clear how this is going to be prevented.	Y	The cable route has been amended to avoid any land owned by the Whartons
Ray Pearce	<b>PEIR</b> - Yes, you have not researched the EMF effects on human beings and are reliant on others flawed science. You intend to cause us harm by prosecuting your proposals and have disregarded our opinions. You have not included us in your surveys! You have not entered into a meaningful dialogue with us and have delayed any reply until after your submission of the PEIR. You have provided no research of your own on the effects of EMFs on the residents who will be forced to live near to your transmission cables. Yes! Stop and reconsider your actions from a humane point of view. You are going to cease harm to us.	I	Environmental Statement, volume 3, annex 3.3: EMF Compliance Statement comprises an assessment of the static and extremely low frequency (ELF) EMFs that will be generated by the Hornsea Project Three onshore transmission infrastructure (cabling), giving maximum predicted field strengths to assess compliance with health protection guidelines for public exposure to EMFs.  Annex 3.3 concludes that the maximum magnetic field strength directly above a cable, using worst-case assumptions where required, is also well below the guideline public exposure limits set to protect health. The cables eventually selected for the project will be required to fall within the envelope assessed and meet the prescribed standards and hence will not generate greater EMF.  Relevant to this, it is noted that the view of health protection bodies, based on a wide-ranging health evidence base (including studies of reproductive and developmental effects, cardiovascular disease, neurodegenerative disorders, the immune system, and genotoxic effects), is that low-frequency EMF is not a cause of health risks and that the guideline exposure standards in place (based on well-established effects on the body) are appropriate to protect health.
Ray Pearce	<b>Mitigation methods</b> - YES! Look at an alternative connection point at Walpole with a marine cable and stop this nonsense. You and Vattenfall are forcing us to live within 80 metres of a 6 GW power supply; that is 5 times greater than the output from Sizwell B. Why? Corporate greed!	I	Environmental Statement, volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives sets out the process of identifying a grid connection location and associated cable routes.  The aim of the grid connection option appraisal was to identify the most economic and efficient design option for the connection of a project. Although both National Grid and Orsted input into the appraisal process (in respect to economic and strategic factors), the eventual grid connection offer is determined by National Grid. In July 2016, Hornsea Three was formally offered a grid connection at Norwich Main Substation as a result of this appraisal process.



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>61</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Ray Pearce	<p><b>Comments regarding proposal</b> - Consider, very, very, carefully the science regarding EMFs and there effects on human children and the likelihood of power lines causing childhood leukaemia. Ask yourself, if my family were being forced to live within 80 metres of a 6 GIGA WATT power supply, would that be acceptable!? You have a morale duty of care to us and the people of Norfolk.</p>	I	<p>Environmental Statement, volume 3, annex 3.3: EMF Compliance Statement comprises an assessment of the static and extremely low frequency (ELF) EMFs that will be generated by the Hornsea Project Three onshore transmission infrastructure (cabling), giving maximum predicted field strengths to assess compliance with health protection guidelines for public exposure to EMFs.</p> <p>Annex 3.3 concludes that the maximum magnetic field strength directly above a cable, using worst-case assumptions where required, is also well below the guideline public exposure limits set to protect health. The cables eventually selected for the project will be required to fall within the envelope assessed and meet the prescribed standards and hence will not generate greater EMF.</p> <p>Relevant to this, it is noted that the view of health protection bodies, based on a wide-ranging health evidence base (including studies of reproductive and developmental effects, cardiovascular disease, neurodegenerative disorders, the immune system, and genotoxic effects), is that low-frequency EMF is not a cause of health risks and that the guideline exposure standards in place (based on well-established effects on the body) are appropriate to protect health.</p>
<b>Section 47: Duty to consult local community</b>			
Ray and Diane Pearce	<p>You submitted your PEIR document on 27th July 2017. We had had no meaningful direct contact from you prior to the submission of the PEIR except for the provision of a set of FAQs which were already in the public domain; this is despite having asked you specific questions relevant to our property being within close proximity to the crossing point of your transmission cables, with those proposed by Vattenfall's Norfolk Vanguard and Boreas. On 18th July 2017, we submitted an email with detailed referencing containing questions regarding your project and the (now titled) "Inter-related effects" of the cable crossing point impacting our residence (location details above). However, you did not reply and only after your submission of the PEIR were we emailed by Emily Woolfenden (Stakeholder Relations). Ms Woolfenden merely referred us to the PEIR Document in order that we search for our own answers and she did not answer any of the specifics.</p>	N/A	<p>Ørsted initially directed the consultee to the FAQ document on the Hornsea Three website that provided responses to commonly asked questions on Electro-Magnetic Fields (EMFs). Once the PEIR was published in July 2017, Ørsted directed the consultee to annex 3.3: EMF Compliance Statement. Representatives from Ørsted subsequently met with the consultee in August 2017 to discuss their concerns in more detail. The difference between inter-related and cumulative effects was clarified and it was noted that a full assessment of the cumulative impact with the two Vattenfall schemes had not been possible, as they were yet to publish their PEI.</p> <p>The Electrical Manager for Hornsea Three and an independent EMF advisor then met with the consultee at the September 2017 community consultation events. In response to concerns raised in their written response and in person, Ørsted and Vattenfall jointly commissioned an independent study and resulting report which explores the electric and magnetic fields (EMFs) that could occur to their maximum extent where power cables from two large wind farms cross one another. The report calculates this for the crossing of Ørsted's Hornsea Project Three and Vattenfall's Norfolk Vanguard and Norfolk Boreas offshore wind farms.</p>
Ray and Diane Pearce	<p>We contest that the crossing of your cables with Vattenfall's will have an effect on the environment, the ecology, the population and human health, and most importantly, there will be a cumulative effect. The PEIR makes it clear that the minimum depth of the cables will be 1.2 metres and the maximum 2 metres. Therefore, how are you planning to engineer the crossing without effecting the local environment? The maximum depth of the proposed transmission cables is governed and limited by the cable's ability to dissipate heat. Accordingly, there is a requirement for you to coordinate a plan which will effect the relative depth of either your cable trench or Vattenfall's, with a consequence on the environment.</p>	I	<p>The depths of 1.2 m and maximum of 2 m are those associated where cables are installed via open cut method. Where our proposed cables cross over other infrastructure, other installation methods, such as trenchless installation techniques (e.g. horizontal directional drilling, HDD) can be deployed. Paragraphs 3.6.11.8 and 3.7.1.14 of Environmental Statement Chapter 3: Project Description notes the methodology for HDD crossings. The exact depth and length of each HDD will be dependent on the nature of the obstruction being crossed – in this instance the proposed works by Vattenfall. Therefore, at the crossing point with the proposed Vanguard cables either set of cable will be installed at a greater depth to ensure that no permanent above ground works are required.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>61</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Ray & Diane Pearce	We will address the effects of cumulative EMF's in our formal return as it is highly technical and requires a deal of detail. However, be aware that, we do not accept you can merely dismiss the issue without a proper assessment. Emily Woolfenden's comment in her email that: "...given the margin in the PEIR assessment for compliance with UK policy on EMFs, it is <b>expected</b> that any cumulative impacts with the Vattenfall cables will fall well within recommended guideline levels." is ill-conceived, dismissive, and not acceptable. If you only <b>expect</b> to fall within guidelines, you have not carried out a valid assessment of a significant environmental risk within the terms of reference of the EIA Directive and production of the PEIR. You have, therefore, once again, failed in your legal duty to describe and assess a significant environmental impact of your proposed development.	I	Environmental Statement, volume 1, Annex 3.3: EMF Compliance Statement comprises an assessment of the static and extremely low frequency (ELF) EMFs that will be generated by the Hornsea Project Three onshore transmission infrastructure (cabling), giving maximum predicted field strengths to assess compliance with health protection guidelines for public exposure to EMFs. The assessment concludes that based on the maximum field strengths, using worst-case assumptions where required, the proposals are well below established levels and the Project is compliant. The cables eventually selected for the project will be required to fall within the envelope assessed and meet the prescribed standards and hence will not generate greater EMF.  In demonstrating that the cables installed for Hornsea Project Three will be compliant with health protection guidelines for public exposure, no further work is required in respect of Hornsea Three.
Laura Philpott	My family and I live [REDACTED]. Our property will be directly affected by all of the proposed wind farm projects in Norfolk; Vattenfall's Vanguard & Boreas projects and Dong's Hornsea Three project. This letter outlines specific questions that apply to all of these projects. We require full and comprehensive answers to these questions in order to satisfy ourselves that these projects do not pose a direct threat to the health and wellbeing of our family. I understand that you have all committed to open and transparent communication with stakeholders and affected communities and therefore I look forward to your responses and the start of some meaningful dialogue in relation to our specific concerns. [...] As a family, we are incredibly concerned about the projects you are proposing. Each project in isolation comes with its own dangers but if all of these projects were to be approved our home will be surrounded by a triangulation of underground cables, in some cases less than 40 metres away, exposing my family to EMF levels that to date have been unquantified by any of the organisations responsible for these plans.	N	This is acknowledged and is responded to under the individual points below.
Laura Philpott	My understanding is that the consultation process is designed to ensure that all key stakeholders in the process have an opportunity to be heard and their questions answered. I also believe that it is the responsibility of those making these proposals to reassure me, my family and the other households throughout Norfolk, that what they plan to do does not pose a risk to public health. I appreciate given the timescales of your projects technology may advance and the choice of cabling may change in time however, you are seeking feedback and approval for your projects now and over the next few years and therefore you have to provide relevant information based on what you know now about the products you would use and the effects of these products on the environment in which they will be placed. If you cannot or will not provide more data and information in relation to the cables you plan to use then in my opinion you cannot provide any assurances in terms of public health and your plans should be automatically declined. It is not for me to demonstrate that your plans pose a threat, it is for you to prove that they do not. You cannot do this if you don't provide the data and research to support your views. I hope you will do your very best to answer all of the questions I have outlined below fully and support any statements you make in relation to safety with adequate evidence based research and data. To be clear I would like to address each organisation with the same questions as follows;	N	This is acknowledged and is responded to under the individual points below.
Laura Philpott	4. Please advised if there are any other circumstances that could cause the cabling or any other equipment to expose the public to levels over and above those stated in either Q.1 or Q.3	I	Air cored reactors in the onshore substation (used in filter and statcom compounds) have the potential to exceed ICNIRP 1998 guideline levels in close proximity, and we will seek to site these away from the fence line to ensure that EMF levels outside our compound are within the 1998 levels.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>61</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Laura Philpott	5. What testing and evidence will you produce before and after project completion to demonstrate that the cabling effects are as stated?	I	<p>Environmental Statement, volume 4, annex 3.3: EMF Compliance Statement comprises an assessment of the static and extremely low frequency (ELF) EMFs that will be generated by the Hornsea Project Three onshore transmission infrastructure (cabling), giving maximum predicted field strengths to assess compliance with health protection guidelines for public exposure to EMFs. The assessment concludes that based on the maximum field strengths, using worst-case assumptions where required, the proposals are well below established levels and the Project is compliant. The cables eventually selected for the project will be required to fall within the envelope assessed and meet the prescribed standards and hence will not generate greater EMF.</p> <p>In demonstrating that the cables installed for Hornsea Project Three will be compliant with health protection guidelines for public exposure, any subsequent need to monitor is not required or planned to occur, although we note that broader quality control checks are undertaken during the manufacturing and installation process.</p>
Laura Philpott	6. What risks are there to the general public if cabling is unexpectedly damaged or eroded in any way and what measure do you put in place to ensure that any problems with the cables are detected before risk to human life?	I	<p>Cable failures are very rare, and usually a result of 3rd party damage (e.g. excavations over the cable). For third party damages, the cables that are buried will appear on the utility register (everyone should consult the utilities database prior to undertaking excavations) and will be covered with protective covers and warning tapes to reduce the risk.</p> <p>Typically, cable routes will be walked over on occasion as part of maintenance activities, to identify where damage may have occurred. It is also standard to test the cable sheath, to identify where minor damage may have occurred, which could be indicative of ongoing degradation.</p> <p>It should be noted that ongoing maintenance of the high voltage cables will be the responsibility of an offshore transmission operator (OFTO), and not Orsted. During a fault, earthing systems are designed to minimise touch-and step potential to safe levels and protective systems operate in &lt;500ms to isolate the failed cable.</p>
Laura Philpott	7. A very significant concern for us in the presence of multiple cables, all in relatively close proximity to one another. Please clearly demonstrate the effects of this arrangement and provide evidence based data to show what impact this could have to the exposure levels experienced in our home. It is unacceptable for any of you to avoid this question. At this stage there is no certainty as to which project will be approved first and therefore you all have to accept you may be laying your cables in an environment where other cables are already in place. You therefore need to work together, as you have stated you will, to ensure your combined projects do not elevate the risk to communities and clearly demonstrate what the impact will be where multiple cables exist or cross in your cable corridors.	I	<p>The magnetic field strength from cables drops very rapidly with distance away from them, and as stated above, there is no electric field above ground level. The maximum magnetic field strength directly above a cable, is also well below the guideline public exposure limits set to protect health – less than 15% in fact, for the Hornsea Project Three cables.</p> <p>Magnetic field strength is therefore dominated by the closest source, rather than there being a cumulative effect from multiple underground cables. Therefore, the effect will be equal to the effect of either the Hornsea Project Three or Vattenfall cables, whichever is greater.</p> <p>The effect of having multiple cables running in parallel to each other has been assessed in Annex 3.3 (i.e. for the multiple Hornsea Project Three cables), and was also assessed earlier in the Environmental Statement for Hornsea Project Two, in which the cumulative scenario of Hornsea Project Two and Hornsea Project One cables next to each other was considered. In all these cases, it can be seen from the graphs of magnetic field strength that the peaks remain above each particular cable, that field strength drops rapidly to very low (background) levels away to the sides of where the cables are laid, and that the guideline public exposure limit set to protect health is not exceeded.</p> <p>In terms of timescales for the Project, the planning application to the Planning Inspectorate was in quarter two 2018. If the application is accepted it will go into examination, with a decision expected in late 2019. Based on these timescales, the earliest that construction could take place would be 2021, and the earliest it could become operational would be 2025.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>61</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Robert and Jane Scarfe	<p><b>Route of Buried Cables:</b> Most properties on Great Melton Road, Little Melton appear to lie within 40 metres of the HVAC underground cable. That is in the danger zone from electro-magnetic radiation according to your own documentation. (Electro-magnetic compliance statement 1.4.2). What is this one kilometre buffer zone protecting against? Electro-magnetic radiation or low frequency vibration?</p>	I	<p>Environmental Statement, volume 3, annex 3.3: EMF Compliance Statement comprises an assessment of the static and extremely low frequency (ELF) EMFs that will be generated by the Hornsea Project Three onshore transmission infrastructure (cabling), giving maximum predicted field strengths to assess compliance with health protection guidelines for public exposure to EMFs.</p> <p>Annex 3.3 concludes that the maximum magnetic field strength directly above a cable, using worst-case assumptions where required, is also well below the guideline public exposure limits set to protect health. The cables eventually selected for the project will be required to fall within the envelope assessed and meet the prescribed standards and hence will not generate greater EMF.</p> <p>Relevant to this, it is noted that the view of health protection bodies, based on a wide-ranging health evidence base (including studies of reproductive and developmental effects, cardiovascular disease, neurodegenerative disorders, the immune system, and genotoxic effects), is that low-frequency EMF is not a cause of health risks and that the guideline exposure standards in place (based on well-established effects on the body) are appropriate to protect health.</p>
Robert and Jane Scarfe	<p><b>Health Hazards:</b> There has been considerable speculation about the health hazards of living near to high voltage power cables. There is no evidence that we can find that burying them is any safer. Your documentation is extremely sketchy on this point, maybe intentionally, unless we are missing something. Will you please comment?</p>	I	<p>Environmental Statement, volume 3, annex 3.3: EMF Compliance Statement comprises an assessment of the static and extremely low frequency (ELF) EMFs that will be generated by the Hornsea Project Three onshore transmission infrastructure (cabling), giving maximum predicted field strengths to assess compliance with health protection guidelines for public exposure to EMFs.</p> <p>Annex 3.3 concludes that the maximum magnetic field strength directly above a cable, using worst-case assumptions where required, is also well below the guideline public exposure limits set to protect health. The cables eventually selected for the project will be required to fall within the envelope assessed and meet the prescribed standards and hence will not generate greater EMF.</p> <p>Relevant to this, it is noted that the view of health protection bodies, based on a wide-ranging health evidence base (including studies of reproductive and developmental effects, cardiovascular disease, neurodegenerative disorders, the immune system, and genotoxic effects), is that low-frequency EMF is not a cause of health risks and that the guideline exposure standards in place (based on well-established effects on the body) are appropriate to protect health.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>61</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Gregg and Tomoko Bontly	<p>We are happy to have an offshore wind farm, but we don't think an additional high voltage power substation in our villages (Stoke Holy Cross and Dunston) would be safe due to the impact of very strong electromagnetic fields (EMFs). We are strongly hoping that we will not have another high voltage power substation in and near our villages. Stoke Holy Cross and Dunston are populated and family-oriented areas with many young children. The proposed power station will cause health risks to residents in our villages. So please change the location of the substation to a more isolated area so that residents, especially our children, will not be at any increased risks of serious illnesses such as leukaemia</p>	I	<p>Environmental Statement volume 4, annex 3.3: EMF Compliance Statement comprises an assessment of the static and extremely low frequency (ELF) EMFs that will be generated by the Hornsea Project Three onshore transmission infrastructure (cabling), giving maximum predicted field strengths to assess compliance with health protection guidelines for public exposure to EMFs.</p> <p>Annex 3.3 concludes that the maximum magnetic field strength directly above a cable, using worst-case assumptions where required, is also well below the guideline public exposure limits set to protect health. The cables eventually selected for the project will be required to fall within the envelope assessed and meet the prescribed standards and hence will not generate greater EMF.</p> <p>Relevant to this, it is noted that the view of health protection bodies, based on a wide-ranging health evidence base (including studies of reproductive and developmental effects, cardiovascular disease, neurodegenerative disorders, the immune system, and genotoxic effects), is that low-frequency EMF is not a cause of health risks and that the guideline exposure standards in place (based on well-established effects on the body) are appropriate to protect health.</p>
Jeremy Fielding	<p>My name is Jeremy Fielding and I live in one of two homes closest to where you are proposing to run underground electric cables in Alderford [REDACTED]. I would like you to address my concerns regarding this, which are as follows: Health. Disruption. Noise. Future property values. As you well know we already have a high voltage pylon wires to the side of our property, with the risk of health issues that brings and now you want to increase that risk.</p> <p>We will face inevitable disruption and noise and would like to know what safeguards are in place with regard to this and whether work is carried out at night</p> <p>The uncertainty with regard to property values will need to be addressed as should some sort of compensation to those most affected. I hope there will not be a total disregard for people who are affected, as so often happens and we will expect our well being to be priority.</p>	I	<p>Where possible and practicable the cable corridor route selected seeks to avoid passing adjacent to properties. This is to reduce impacts associated with construction disturbance and to seek to minimise conflicts such as Heavy Goods Vehicle (HGV) traffic movements. However, it is not possible to avoid passing in close proximity to all properties on the route. Where properties are located in close proximity, the Project will ensure that sensitive construction management measures, such as noise, dust and traffic control are considered. These are documented in an outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), which accompanies the DCO application. Night works will be minimised as far as reasonably practicable.</p> <p>In respect to compensation, we will compensate landowners who are directly affected by the cable through their land. Compensation is paid for the freehold depreciation of the land affected by the easement and for all reasonable and substantiated losses arising from construction of the project.</p>
Cllr Graham Everett (District Councillor for Reepham) - Broadland District Council	<p>The points I would like to raise are:</p> <p>1) The previous issue about the depth of the cables has been addressed as I understand they will now be laid at a depth at 1.2 mts rather than the originally proposed 0.7 mts which will address the concerns raised.</p>	Y	<p>The onshore cables will be buried at a minimum depth of 1.2 m, further details on the cable installation is provided in Environmental Statement, volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description.</p>



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>61</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
David and Julie Brooks	<p>There are major concerns over Magnetic Field effects on local wild life and people where they cross or are close to the 80 metre cable corridors. Will there be metal shielding of the cables to minimise EMF effects as is carried out in other European countries such as Italy? The detailed cross section of trenches/cable installation for Hornsea 1 does not show any metal shielding. Is Hornsea 3 going to be the same construction?</p>	I	<p>Environmental Statement, volume 3, annex 3.3: EMF Compliance Statement comprises an assessment of the static and extremely low frequency (ELF) EMFs that will be generated by the Hornsea Project Three onshore transmission infrastructure (cabling), giving maximum predicted field strengths to assess compliance with health protection guidelines for public exposure to EMFs.</p> <p>Annex 3.3 concludes that the maximum magnetic field strength directly above a cable, using worst-case assumptions where required, is also well below the guideline public exposure limits set to protect health. The cables eventually selected for the project will be required to fall within the envelope assessed and meet the prescribed standards and hence will not generate greater EMF.</p> <p>Relevant to this, it is noted that the view of health protection bodies, based on a wide-ranging health evidence base (including studies of reproductive and developmental effects, cardiovascular disease, neurodegenerative disorders, the immune system, and genotoxic effects), is that low-frequency EMF is not a cause of health risks and that the guideline exposure standards in place (based on well-established effects on the body) are appropriate to protect health.</p>
Robert and Jane Scarfe	<p>We live at [REDACTED] Little Melton and have serious concerns about your proposed route running alongside and extremely close to our homes. I attach the objections which have been widely circulated within the village to be considered as part of your public consultation. We would like to see the route deviate further away from us in the open fields near the current overhead power lines. We have studied the analysis put forward by the geophysicist George Stronge which I believe has been sent to you and he reaches a very different conclusion on the potential risks. This is new and untried technology and we believe you should play safe and minimise risk to residents by siting the cables as far as possible from as many homes as possible. We also fear noise pollution.</p> <p>We attended the meeting at Swardeston for parish councillors and submitted our suggestions and contact details to you then but have had no response. I am sending this to you before the 20th September public consultation period ends.</p>	N/A	<p>Points noted and full details responded to for each respective element below.</p>
Robert and Jane Scarfe	<p>Magnetic field If the magnetic field were harmful that would mean pedestrians, dogs and cyclists, who regularly and repeatedly pass up and down the Great Melton Road, will be travelling each time for something like a quarter of a mile within 2-3 metres of the outermost conductor. That is well within what Dong themselves describe as the cable corridor "buffer" (safety?) zone. (Dong's diagrams and figures measure the magnetic field strength from the centremost of the six conductors. Yet even their figures suggest some radiation extending 20 metres from the centre conductor so, in my opinion, this is not representative of what will affect the Great Melton Road).</p>	I	<p>Environmental Statement, volume 3, annex 3.3: EMF Compliance Statement comprises an assessment of the static and extremely low frequency (ELF) EMFs that will be generated by the Hornsea Project Three onshore transmission infrastructure (cabling), giving maximum predicted field strengths to assess compliance with health protection guidelines for public exposure to EMFs.</p> <p>Annex 3.3 concludes that the maximum magnetic field strength directly above a cable, using worst-case assumptions where required, is also well below the guideline public exposure limits set to protect health. The cables eventually selected for the project will be required to fall within the envelope assessed and meet the prescribed standards and hence will not generate greater EMF.</p> <p>Relevant to this, it is noted that the view of health protection bodies, based on a wide-ranging health evidence base (including studies of reproductive and developmental effects, cardiovascular disease, neurodegenerative disorders, the immune system, and genotoxic effects), is that low-frequency EMF is not a cause of health risks and that the guideline exposure standards in place (based on well-established effects on the body) are appropriate to protect health.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>61</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Robert and Jane Scarfe	<p>Low frequency vibration</p> <p>We are also concerned about low frequency vibration transmitted through the soil if AC transmission is used – which will be the case if our recollection of what was said at Dong's recent presentation to parish councils is correct. They struck us as evasive when asked if the current would be AC or DC.</p> <p>The six multi-phased cables are likely to create an additive or subtractive magnetic field effect, especially at points where the route changes direction. Veering off towards Burnthouse Lane is a good example. In my opinion that renders the predictions of rapid fall-off of the magnetic field generated by these shallow buried underground cables as purely speculative on Dong's part. There was talk at the meeting about measuring sound levels and their effects on "receptors", which is their word for local residents, after the project had been commissioned – ie once it's too late to do anything about it. We fear this low level 50Hz vibration 24/7 will be audible to Great Melton Road residents and intrude upon their lives.</p>	I	<p>Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 8: Noise and Vibration will provide an assessment of impacts arising from Hornsea Three in relation to noise and vibration. The assessment will consider impacts during construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning will be presented.</p> <p>In respect to the baseline noise and vibration levels, this has been established through a combination of desk studies, baseline surveys and consultation. The baseline is established in order to provide a background level against which to assess any impacts from Hornsea Three.</p> <p>It is noted that the onshore cables, which will be buried, will not generate any perceptible noise or vibration.</p>
Robert and Jane Scarfe	<p>Electromagnetic Radiation</p> <p>Another thing which came up at the meeting is that there is likely to be a ground heating effect of about half a degree. That indicates that there will be electromagnetic radiation from the cables causing this effect, the potential consequences of which to human health are unknown. Yet the Dong representatives claimed there would be no significant radiation. This is contradictory because without radiation there can't be any form of heating – even half a degree.</p> <p>We disagree with the parish council comparisons between the potential magnetic field and emissions from low powered domestic appliances and equipment such as kettles and shavers. These are used intermittently at significantly lower field strength than a high voltage distribution cable in continuous use.</p>	I	<p>The potential impact relating to thermal effects of the cables on surrounding soil has been assessed in Environmental Statement Volume 3, chapter 1: Geology and Ground Conditions. The thermal impact is predicted to be of local spatial extent within the immediate vicinity of each cable within the ground and any shallow aquifer unit, but of long term duration, of continual occurrence and high reversibility. The potential impact will be minimised by the use of a thermal stabilising layer (i.e. stabilised backfill) which will limit heat transference to the surrounding soil and shallow groundwater.</p> <p>This concludes at most, a minor adverse effect, which is not significant in EIA terms.</p>
Robert and Jane Scarfe	<p>Conclusion</p> <p>In conclusion, there is little evidence of harm or lack of it, because this is unproven technology. There is some evidence that close proximity to electromagnetic radiation is harmful, based on overhead power lines. We therefore call upon Dong to re-route these cables further away from our homes in Little Melton.</p>	I	<p>Environmental Statement, volume 3, annex 3.3: EMF Compliance Statement comprises an assessment of the static and extremely low frequency (ELF) EMFs that will be generated by the Hornsea Project Three onshore transmission infrastructure (cabling), giving maximum predicted field strengths to assess compliance with health protection guidelines for public exposure to EMFs.</p> <p>Annex 3.3 concludes that the maximum magnetic field strength directly above a cable, using worst-case assumptions where required, is also well below the guideline public exposure limits set to protect health. The cables eventually selected for the project will be required to fall within the envelope assessed and meet the prescribed standards and hence will not generate greater EMF.</p> <p>Relevant to this, it is noted that the view of health protection bodies, based on a wide-ranging health evidence base (including studies of reproductive and developmental effects, cardiovascular disease, neurodegenerative disorders, the immune system, and genotoxic effects), is that low-frequency EMF is not a cause of health risks and that the guideline exposure standards in place (based on well-established effects on the body) are appropriate to protect health.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>61</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Sarah Small	I am very concerned about the proposed onshore cable route near to the village Little Melton where I live with my family. This route runs very close to the village and crosses 4 roads that lead in and out of the village. My children and I travel along those roads up to 16 times a day and would therefore be crossing the cable up to 16 times a day. I cannot find any research to show that myself and my children would not be at increased risk of leukaemia and other cancers from the increased exposure we would get from the electromagnetic radiation from the underground cables	I	<p>Environmental Statement, volume 3, annex 3.3: EMF Compliance Statement comprises an assessment of the static and extremely low frequency (ELF) EMFs that will be generated by the Hornsea Project Three onshore transmission infrastructure (cabling), giving maximum predicted field strengths to assess compliance with health protection guidelines for public exposure to EMFs.</p> <p>Annex 3.3 concludes that the maximum magnetic field strength directly above a cable, using worst-case assumptions where required, is also well below the guideline public exposure limits set to protect health. The cables eventually selected for the project will be required to fall within the envelope assessed and meet the prescribed standards and hence will not generate greater EMF.</p> <p>Relevant to this, it is noted that the view of health protection bodies, based on a wide-ranging health evidence base (including studies of reproductive and developmental effects, cardiovascular disease, neurodegenerative disorders, the immune system, and genotoxic effects), is that low-frequency EMF is not a cause of health risks and that the guideline exposure standards in place (based on well-established effects on the body) are appropriate to protect health.</p>
Sarah Small	Failing this will the company be providing compensation for people who live near the onshore cable route and would feel compelled to move because of the health or other concerns? Also what level of compensation would be provided for property values reducing near the route?	I	<p>Where possible and practicable the cable corridor route selected seeks to avoid passing adjacent to properties. This is to reduce impacts associated with construction disturbance and to seek to minimise conflicts such as Heavy Goods Vehicle (HGV) traffic movements. However, it is not possible to avoid passing in close proximity to all properties on the route. Where properties are located in close proximity, the Project will ensure that sensitive construction management measures, such as noise, dust and traffic control are considered. These are documented in an outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), which accompanies the DCO application. Night works will be minimised as far as reasonably practicable.</p> <p>In respect to compensation, we will compensate landowners who are directly affected by the cable through their land. Compensation is paid for the freehold depreciation of the land affected by the easement and for all reasonable and substantiated losses arising from construction of the project.</p>
Sarah Small	Please could the cable be routed further away from the village and cross fewer of the roads that lead into and out of the village.	I	<p>Environmental Statement, volume 3, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives sets out the process of route refinement which considered, amongst other factors, technical and environmental factors.</p> <p>Where possible and practicable the cable corridor route selected seeks to avoid passing adjacent to properties. This is to reduce impacts associated with construction disturbance and to seek to minimise conflicts such as Heavy Goods Vehicle (HGV) traffic movements. However, it is not possible to avoid passing in close proximity to all properties on the route. Where properties are located in close proximity, the Project will ensure that sensitive construction management measures, such as noise, dust and traffic control are considered. These are documented in an outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), which accompanies the DCO application.</p>
Robert and Christine Strong	We object to the proposed siting of underground electricity cables adjacent to Gt Melton Road, Little Melton. Our concerns are with regard to the potential adverse effects upon our health and the health risks generally. We make the following comments.	N	Noted, responses provided to individual comments.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>61</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Robert and Christine Strong	<p>Magnetic Field – How far will it extend?</p> <p>It has been suggested by Little Melton Parish Council, in its document “Dong windfarm cable – consequences for Little Melton” state, “The magnetic field will extend about 10m either side of the outer cables...” In the same document the Parish Council also state, “The magnetic field from the cables falls off sharply with distance and will not be detectable beyond the edges of the cable corridor, so there should be no risk to people in their homes and on the public roads.” We are unsure from where the Parish Council has obtained this information.</p> <p>According to Dong’s documentation, the magnetic field will be detectable to some extent at least 27m from the outer cable. As the outer cable will only be 10m from the edge of the road, this would put the properties along Gt Melton Road permanently within the magnetic field.</p> <p>However, we consider that both these figures for the distance that the magnetic field will extend are incorrect.</p> <p>The calculations in the attached document show that the magnetic field could in fact extend a minimum of 320m from the cable and a maximum of 3,169m. (3.1km) This will not only put occupants along Gt Melton Road well within the affected area, but also much of Little Melton. The penetration depth is significantly larger than that stated by Dong, and the field strength will also be greater.</p> <p>We have been advised, in layman’s terms, that one reason for the huge discrepancy between Dong’s figure of only 27m and the calculation below of between 320m and 3.1km, is that Dong has not taken into account the fact that the soil is a conductor of electricity. This means that secondary electromagnetic fields will be induced in the surrounding soil by the process of electromagnetic induction (see Maxwell, Ampere and Faraday’s scientific laws below).</p> <p>We wish Dong to properly explain:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. How have they calculated the distance that the magnetic field will extend beyond the corridor and the strength of the magnetic field?</li> <li>2. At what distance do they consider the field strength becomes negligible, and how have they calculated this?</li> <li>3. How do they intend to ensure that the parishioners of Little Melton will not be living within a magnetic field created by their cable?</li> </ol> <p>Scientific laws this argument is based on:  A combination of Maxwell’s and Ampere’s laws: A magnetic field is generated in space by the flow of current and that field is proportional to the total current.  Faraday’s law: A time varying magnetic field induces an electrical field in a conductor that is proportional to the rate of change of magnetic flux.</p> <p>Process of electromagnetic induction:  Current flowing through an electricity cable will generate a magnetic field that is proportional to the total current (Maxwell and Ampere’s laws).  Assuming the electricity is alternating (AC) it will generate a time varying magnetic field.  This time varying magnetic field will then induce an electrical field in surrounding conductors such as the soil (Faraday’s law).</p>	I	<p>Environmental Statement, volume 3, annex 3.3: EMF Compliance Statement comprises an assessment of the static and extremely low frequency (ELF) EMFs that will be generated by the Hornsea Project Three onshore transmission infrastructure (cabling), giving maximum predicted field strengths to assess compliance with health protection guidelines for public exposure to EMFs.</p> <p>Annex 3.3 concludes that the maximum magnetic field strength directly above a cable, using worst-case assumptions where required, is also well below the guideline public exposure limits set to protect health. The cables eventually selected for the project will be required to fall within the envelope assessed and meet the prescribed standards and hence will not generate greater EMF.</p> <p>Relevant to this, it is noted that the view of health protection bodies, based on a wide-ranging health evidence base (including studies of reproductive and developmental effects, cardiovascular disease, neurodegenerative disorders, the immune system, and genotoxic effects), is that low-frequency EMF is not a cause of health risks and that the guideline exposure standards in place (based on well-established effects on the body) are appropriate to protect health.</p>



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>61</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Robert & Christine Strong	<p>Siting of cables close to line of dwelling At Little Melton, the proposed corridor runs adjacent and close to a line of several houses. The only other place throughout the proposed route from the North Norfolk coast where the corridor runs adjacent and close to a line of several houses is at High Kelling. This results in many houses and their occupants being affected by the electricity passing through the cables.</p> <p>In addition, the proposed corridor running along Great Melton Road is very narrow, narrower than the width of the corridor at most other places throughout its length from North Norfolk to South Norfolk. This results in the cables having to be closer to the edge of the corridor and therefore closer to any nearby properties.</p>	N	Noted, see specific response regarding EMF associated with Hornsea Three.
Mervyn Bibb	<p>I became aware today of some concerns about the potential extent of the electromagnetic field resulting from installation of the cable corridor and that it may have been under-estimated by DONG Energy. There also seems to be some uncertainty about the subsequent biological impact. I note the following from your attached document: 1.5.1.11 In conclusion, on the basis of the guidance for EMFs from electricity infrastructure adopted in the UK and the published evidence to support that, it is considered that the levels of EMFs from the proposed development would be well below the guideline public exposure reference levels set to protect health. "considered that" implies some degree of uncertainty, and if the extent of the electromagnetic field is greater than you calculated, then this raises further doubt. Given these uncertainties, it thus seems prudent to locate the corridor as far away from residences as reasonably possible. Consequently, we do not understand why DONG Energy is considering the alternative route which would place the cables in much closer proximity to our residences. Could you also please respond to this point, and tell us why the alternative route is being considered? It makes absolutely no sense to us.</p>	I	<p>Environmental Statement, volume 3, annex 3.3: EMF Compliance Statement comprises an assessment of the static and extremely low frequency (ELF) EMFs that will be generated by the Hornsea Project Three onshore transmission infrastructure (cabling), giving maximum predicted field strengths to assess compliance with health protection guidelines for public exposure to EMFs.</p> <p>Annex 3.3 concludes that the maximum magnetic field strength directly above a cable, using worst-case assumptions where required, is also well below the guideline public exposure limits set to protect health. The cables eventually selected for the project will be required to fall within the envelope assessed and meet the prescribed standards and hence will not generate greater EMF.</p> <p>Relevant to this, it is noted that the view of health protection bodies, based on a wide-ranging health evidence base (including studies of reproductive and developmental effects, cardiovascular disease, neurodegenerative disorders, the immune system, and genotoxic effects), is that low-frequency EMF is not a cause of health risks and that the guideline exposure standards in place (based on well-established effects on the body) are appropriate to protect health.</p>
Ray & Diane Pearce	<p>Conclusion: The PEIR for the Hornsea Three Project is an incomplete and flawed document. The allocation of the connection point for the developer to connect to the UK NETS is arbitrary and has been left to another 'for profit' company, namely National Grid plc, to make a nationally important decision which has far reaching consequences and dubious commercial intent. There is a lack of detail and discussion surrounding how and why it is necessary for two competing projects to cross their transmission systems. Most importantly, the PEIR gives no consideration for any cumulative effects, interrelated effects, or, more importantly, any environmental impact for the cable crossing point. We implore the Planning Inspectorate to reconsider and co-ordinate the routing of off-shore wind farm transmission cables before rural Norfolk is subjected to a prolonged, damaging and disruptive programme of cable laying by successive developers intent on profiteering from permissive legislation.</p>	I	<p>Environmental Statement, volume 3, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives sets out the process of identifying a grid connection location. The aim of the grid connection option appraisal was to identify the most economic and efficient design option for the connection of a project. Although both National Grid and Orsted input into the appraisal process (in respect to economic and strategic factors), the eventual grid connection offer is determined by National Grid. In May 2016, Hornsea Three was formally offered a grid connection at Norwich Main Substation as a result of this appraisal process.</p> <p>Volume 3, Chapter 11: Inter-related effects of the Environmental Statement provides an assessment of the likely effects should the same type of impact affect the same receptor group during each of the three key project phases (i.e. construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning), and therefore have the potential to combine and result in an overall effect of greater significance. It also provides an assessment of the likely effects should multiple impact types occur on the same receptor group (e.g. noise and landscape and visual impacts may affect the same residential properties); impacts may individually be considered insignificant, but when considered together, could amount to a significant cumulative effect. The potential for impacts arising as a result of Hornsea Project Three to combine with other planned developments (including the Vattenfall projects) is assessed in each respective topic chapter, under the heading 'Cumulative Effect Assessment'.</p>
Ray & Diane Pearce	<p>Electro-Magnetic Fields (EMFs): (PEIR Reference: Volume 4 Annex 3.3) The EMF issue is difficult, highly technical and open to conjecture. In response to Dong Energy's</p>	I	<p>Environmental Statement, volume 3, annex 3.3: EMF Compliance Statement comprises an assessment of the static and extremely low frequency (ELF) EMFs that will be generated by the Hornsea Project Three onshore transmission infrastructure (cabling), giving maximum predicted</p>



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>61</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>provision of a set of FAQs, published prior to the PIER, we asked our questions by email response as at Attachment 3 (SEE ATTACHMENT 3); we still await a detailed written response. Subsequently, we have discussed the figures in the PEIR with the Project Engineer for the Hornsea Three Project, accompanied by an EMF specialist from National Grid plc. Despite the depth of our discussion with the representatives, we still have grave reservations about the amount of exposure we will have to the Extra Low Frequency (ELF) EMFs generated by the Hornsea Three Project cables, with the cumulative effect from the Vanguard and Boreas cables, all passing in proximity to our home. We were advised that the theoretical figures in the PEIR are well within the Government's guidelines and we should not be concerned. However, having reviewed the questions we have previously posed regarding EMFs and having been advised that these would be answered by the PEIR, we contest that the PEIR should have been more comprehensive, informative and detailed. That is, we, as members of the public, should not have to seek information from Dong Energy's representatives when it should have been provided in the consultation documents.</p> <p>Of note is that the PEIR recognises that: "The evidence base for a causal link between ELF EMFs and childhood leukaemia remains inconclusive, as despite extensive research, no plausible mechanism for a weak magnetic field to cause the disease has been established." However, we reiterate, there are studies where there is a "plausible mechanism" for a "causal link between ELF EMF's" and developing cell damage as per the study at Reference 3; causal link is therefore plausible and we refute the argument.</p> <p>In our email (SEE ATTACHMENT 3) we established that the NRPB, the EU's SCENHIR and the ICNIRP call for further research of EMFs effects on humans (of a "High Priority" study in the EU's case) to be carried out to establish exposure guidelines and limitations by scientific experiment. Therefore, without further research we could still, potentially, be exposed to a higher than safe level of magnetic radiation, especially where the cables are planned to cross. The PEIR supports this argument at Annex 3.3 Para 1.2.2.16 where it is stated that:  "... the evidence examined remains inconclusive: some evidence of a possible increase in childhood leukaemia risk at long-term magnetic field exposure, in the order of 0.3–0.4 <math>\mu</math>T, continues to support the IARC classification of ELF EMFs as a possible carcinogen (e.g. (Kheifets, 2010) (Schüz, 2011) (Sermage- Faure, et al., 2013) (Zhao, et al., 2014)), but again evidence of a causal relationship or a mechanism to explain causation has not been established."  Therefore, it is important even from the PEIR evidence that Dong Energy answers the following questions which we have repeatedly asked:  1. At what distance away from the Hornsea 3 cable trench, with cables buried at 1.2 metres and carrying 2.4 GW of power, will the measured magnetic field strength be equal to 0.4 <math>\mu</math>T?  2. What will be the cumulative EMF where Dong's cables and the Vattenfall cables cross?  3. What would be the cumulative effect of HVDC cables' EMF with the Earth's local static field in a North to South or East to West orientation?  4. What will be the multiplying effect on the EMF of having both cable trenches, as per current plans, either side of our property (i.e. with our residence at the centre of any residual field)?  5. What is your reference document for the effects of an aligned EMF from the crossing of cables carrying 2.4 GW and 3.6 GW with a potential combined cumulative field strength of up to 6 GW of power?</p> <p>Quantifiably, 6 GW of power is sufficient to power approximately 5 million homes which is around 18% of the UK's demand. However, this will uniquely be transmitted in proximity to private residences with this amount of power potentially flowing through where the cables cross. What is not made clear in the PEIR is that the distance between each cable is critical to the cumulative effect of the EMF from each cable and that EMF's can be reduced by phase shifting the current in each cable to reduce the magnetic field effects.</p>		<p>field strengths to assess compliance with health protection guidelines for public exposure to EMFs.</p> <p>Annex 3.3 concludes that the maximum magnetic field strength directly above a cable, using worst-case assumptions where required, is also well below the guideline public exposure limits set to protect health. The cables eventually selected for the project will be required to fall within the envelope assessed and meet the prescribed standards and hence will not generate greater EMF.</p> <p>Relevant to this, it is noted that the view of health protection bodies, based on a wide-ranging health evidence base (including studies of reproductive and developmental effects, cardiovascular disease, neurodegenerative disorders, the immune system, and genotoxic effects), is that low-frequency EMF is not a cause of health risks and that the guideline exposure standards in place (based on well-established effects on the body) are appropriate to protect health.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>61</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>The DECC Code of Practice is a 'Voluntary Code of Practice' which means it holds no legal substance. Should Dong Energy install a transmission system that 'theoretically' meets the "voluntary guidelines" but, in practice, the measured field strengths exceed them, how would we, as members of the public, be able to challenge the developer? By way of example, the cladding on Grenfell Tower was installed with the installers and the developers following a "Voluntary Code of Practice" but the cladding was the likely cause of grievous harm and death. Furthermore, the Code of Practice requires the developer to provide: "A calculation or measurement of the maximum fields directly above the cable." That is a 'calculation' and not just a list of figures which are not open to scrutiny. The mathematical constant for the magnetic permeability used in the calculation has not been provided and the PEIR is elusive as to how the provided figures were calculated. Therefore, the PEIR should describe the calculation by way of a worked example. The PEIR concludes that: "... it is considered that the levels of EMFs from the proposed development would be well below the guideline public exposure reference levels set to protect health." However, without the specific design of the cable crossing point and a study of the interaction between both the Hornsea Three cables and those from Vanguard and Boreas this can neither be concluded nor supposed. Similarly, Dong Energy's representatives maintain that: "... given the margin in the PEIR assessment for compliance with UK policy on EMFs, it is expected that any cumulative impacts with the Vattenfall cables will fall well within recommended guideline levels." Again, when dealing with a potential public health issue nothing should be 'expected' and the PEIR should provide the firm evidence by research for the project's impact on the environment, especially for an environment which human beings could be forced to chronically endure. In conclusion to the EMF issue, the PEIR lacks any detail or acknowledgement for the effect of magnetic fields at the crossing point of the Hornsea Three, Vanguard and Boreas cables. The theoretical figures provided are not open to scrutiny. The argument that there is insufficient evidence to support any possible danger to public health is fundamentally flawed as exemplified by research not provided by the developer. The 'Code of Practice' is voluntary and therefore not necessarily legally binding. We reiterate that: where there is doubt, and importantly, lack of scientific evidence to support the argument, the Definitions of Precautionary Principle should be invoked. Within the principle, the World Commission on the Ethics of Scientific Knowledge and Technology under the auspices of UNESCO (amongst other World and European bodies) states: "When human activities may lead to morally unacceptable harm that is scientifically plausible but uncertain, actions shall be taken to avoid or diminish that harm ..." and goes onto say that: "The judgement of plausibility should be grounded in scientific analysis." Therefore, planning to create a potentially harmful environment, without plausible scientific research and analysis, could be deemed to be unethical and we will continue to challenge Dong Energy on this principle.</p>		
Pat Floyd	<p><b>Export Cable</b> - How much heat will the underground cables garner etc and will that affect farming and wildlife?</p>	I	<p>The potential impact relating to thermal effects of the cables on surrounding soil has been assessed in Environmental Statement Volume 3, chapter 1: Geology and Ground Conditions. The thermal impact is predicted to be of local spatial extent within the immediate vicinity of each cable within the ground and any shallow aquifer unit, but of long term duration, of continual occurrence and high reversibility. The potential impact will be minimised by the use of a thermal stabilising layer (i.e. stabilised backfill) which will limit heat transference to the surrounding soil and shallow groundwater. This concludes at most, a minor adverse effect, which is not significant in EIA terms</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>61</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
John Mangan	<p><b>Proposal</b> - I remain concerned about the EMI and magnetic impact of the cables on walkers etc who find themselves in close proximity to the cables even though the calculations and evidence indicate that this is not of concern. Fear of the unknown, I suppose</p>	I	<p>Environmental Statement, volume 3, annex 3.3: EMF Compliance Statement comprises an assessment of the static and extremely low frequency (ELF) EMFs that will be generated by the Hornsea Project Three onshore transmission infrastructure (cabling), giving maximum predicted field strengths to assess compliance with health protection guidelines for public exposure to EMFs.</p> <p>Annex 3.3 concludes that the maximum magnetic field strength directly above a cable, using worst-case assumptions where required, is also well below the guideline public exposure limits set to protect health. The cables eventually selected for the project will be required to fall within the envelope assessed and meet the prescribed standards and hence will not generate greater EMF.</p> <p>Relevant to this, it is noted that the view of health protection bodies, based on a wide-ranging health evidence base (including studies of reproductive and developmental effects, cardiovascular disease, neurodegenerative disorders, the immune system, and genotoxic effects), is that low-frequency EMF is not a cause of health risks and that the guideline exposure standards in place (based on well-established effects on the body) are appropriate to protect health.</p>
Robert Stronge	<p><b>Onshore Cable</b> - Please see email sent separately regarding the distance that the magnetic field extends from the cables and the siting of the narrow corridor close to many house at Little Melton.</p>	I	<p>Environmental Statement, volume 3, annex 3.3: EMF Compliance Statement comprises an assessment of the static and extremely low frequency (ELF) EMFs that will be generated by the Hornsea Project Three onshore transmission infrastructure (cabling), giving maximum predicted field strengths to assess compliance with health protection guidelines for public exposure to EMFs.</p> <p>Annex 3.3 concludes that the maximum magnetic field strength directly above a cable, using worst-case assumptions where required, is also well below the guideline public exposure limits set to protect health. The cables eventually selected for the project will be required to fall within the envelope assessed and meet the prescribed standards and hence will not generate greater EMF.</p>
Robert Stronge	<p><b>80m Refinement</b> - Please see email sent separately regarding the distance that the magnetic field extends from the cables and the siting of the narrow corridor close to many house at Little Melton.</p>	I	<p>Environmental Statement, volume 3, annex 3.3: EMF Compliance Statement comprises an assessment of the static and extremely low frequency (ELF) EMFs that will be generated by the Hornsea Project Three onshore transmission infrastructure (cabling), giving maximum predicted field strengths to assess compliance with health protection guidelines for public exposure to EMFs.</p> <p>Annex 3.3 concludes that the maximum magnetic field strength directly above a cable, using worst-case assumptions where required, is also well below the guideline public exposure limits set to protect health. The cables eventually selected for the project will be required to fall within the envelope assessed and meet the prescribed standards and hence will not generate greater EMF.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>61</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Robert Stronge	<b>EIA</b> - We believe your calculations at the distance the magnetic field will extend from the cables in incorrect.	I	<p>Environmental Statement, volume 3, annex 3.3: EMF Compliance Statement comprises an assessment of the static and extremely low frequency (ELF) EMFs that will be generated by the Hornsea Project Three onshore transmission infrastructure (cabling), giving maximum predicted field strengths to assess compliance with health protection guidelines for public exposure to EMFs.</p> <p>Annex 3.3 concludes that the maximum magnetic field strength directly above a cable, using worst-case assumptions where required, is also well below the guideline public exposure limits set to protect health. The cables eventually selected for the project will be required to fall within the envelope assessed and meet the prescribed standards and hence will not generate greater EMF.</p>
Robert Stronge	<b>Proposal</b> - Please see email. Our concerns are on the grounds of health risk.	I	<p>Environmental Statement, volume 3, annex 3.3: EMF Compliance Statement comprises an assessment of the static and extremely low frequency (ELF) EMFs that will be generated by the Hornsea Project Three onshore transmission infrastructure (cabling), giving maximum predicted field strengths to assess compliance with health protection guidelines for public exposure to EMFs.</p> <p>Annex 3.3 concludes that the maximum magnetic field strength directly above a cable, using worst-case assumptions where required, is also well below the guideline public exposure limits set to protect health. The cables eventually selected for the project will be required to fall within the envelope assessed and meet the prescribed standards and hence will not generate greater EMF.</p>
Geoff Fisher	<b>80m Refinement</b> - Nearby residents along the refined corridor route will be concerned about potential long-term effects from EMF radiation	I	<p>Environmental Statement, volume 3, annex 3.3: EMF Compliance Statement comprises an assessment of the static and extremely low frequency (ELF) EMFs that will be generated by the Hornsea Project Three onshore transmission infrastructure (cabling), giving maximum predicted field strengths to assess compliance with health protection guidelines for public exposure to EMFs.</p> <p>Annex 3.3 concludes that the maximum magnetic field strength directly above a cable, using worst-case assumptions where required, is also well below the guideline public exposure limits set to protect health. The cables eventually selected for the project will be required to fall within the envelope assessed and meet the prescribed standards and hence will not generate greater EMF.</p> <p>Relevant to this, it is noted that the view of health protection bodies, based on a wide-ranging health evidence base (including studies of reproductive and developmental effects, cardiovascular disease, neurodegenerative disorders, the immune system, and genotoxic effects), is that low-frequency EMF is not a cause of health risks and that the guideline exposure standards in place (based on well-established effects on the body) are appropriate to protect health.</p>
<b>Section 48: Duty to publicise</b>			
No comments were received in response to the Public Notice relating to electromagnetic fields (EMF) under Phase 2.A.			

Table 3.28: Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Further Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.B) relating to electromagnetic fields (EMF)

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>62</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 42: Prescribed consultees (The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009: Schedule 1))</b>			
Oulton Parish Council	At the cross over point of both projects there is concern that the cables will not be assessed as a whole regarding <b>EMF</b> but as individual projects. It would appear that at the cross over point there could be a combination of HVAC/HVDC cabling (HOW3) & HVAC/HVDC (Norfolk vanguard) depending on what each company finally decides on. If each company opts for HVDC then there is no need for a Booster station, there does seem to be a lack of information regarding which technology will be used yet the projects are very close to pre application stage. As time goes on and with more questions than answers it would be useful if someone from Orsted could come and explain to Oulton Parish councillors and residents what the impact will be regarding the compound and some more information regarding EMF and the cabling crossover points and the impact of a large Booster station in the locality.	I	Environmental Statement, volume 3, annex 3.3: EMF Compliance Statement comprises an assessment of the static and extremely low frequency (ELF) EMFs that will be generated by the Hornsea Project Three onshore transmission infrastructure (cabling), giving maximum predicted field strengths to assess compliance with health protection guidelines for public exposure to EMFs.  Annex 3.3 concludes that the maximum magnetic field strength directly above a cable, using worst-case assumptions where required, is also well below the guideline public exposure limits set to protect health. The cables eventually selected for the project will be required to fall within the envelope assessed and meet the prescribed standards and hence will not generate greater EMF. At the crossing point, the same principle applies and projects (individually, or cumulatively) will need to ensure that the EMF created remains within the health protection thresholds set for public exposure to EMFs.
Little Melton Parish Council	<b>Great Melton Road</b> Ørsted prefer to route the cable close to GM Rd in order to avoid the garden of a property on Little Melton Rd. Residents of GM Rd are still concerned that the magnetic field extends further than is calculated by Ørsted and a response to the calculations submitted by George Stronge is needed urgently so that people can be properly informed.	I	In respect to EMF, Environmental Statement, volume 3, annex 3.3: EMF Compliance Statement comprises an assessment of the static and extremely low frequency (ELF) EMFs that will be generated by the Hornsea Project Three onshore transmission infrastructure (cabling), giving maximum predicted field strengths to assess compliance with health protection guidelines for public exposure to EMFs.  Annex 3.3 concludes that the maximum magnetic field strength directly above a cable, using worst-case assumptions where required, is also well below the guideline public exposure limits set to protect health. The cables eventually selected for the project will be required to fall within the envelope assessed and meet the prescribed standards and hence will not generate greater EMF.
Little Melton Parish Council	<b>Great Melton Road</b> The PC will request that the cables furthest from GM Rd are installed in Phase 1 as this may give the opportunity to measure the actual magnetic field before subsequent phases are installed - which will be subject to a further planning process.	I	Environmental Statement, volume 4, annex 3.3: EMF Compliance Statement comprises an assessment of the static and extremely low frequency (ELF) EMFs that will be generated by the Hornsea Project Three onshore transmission infrastructure (cabling), giving maximum predicted field strengths to assess compliance with health protection guidelines for public exposure to EMFs. The assessment concludes that based on the maximum field strengths, using worst-case assumptions where required, the proposals are well below established levels and the Project is compliant. The cables eventually selected for the project will be required to fall within the envelope assessed and meet the prescribed standards and hence will not generate greater EMF.  In demonstrating that the cables installed for Hornsea Project Three will be compliant with health protection guidelines for public exposure, any subsequent need to monitor is not required or planned to occur, although we note that broader quality control checks are undertaken during the manufacturing and installation process.
<b>Section 42: Local Authorities (prescribed under section 43 of the Act)</b>			
No comments were received from the local authorities relating to electromagnetic fields (EMF) under Phase 2.B.			

<sup>62</sup> Y = Yes change made; N = No change made; I = Incorporated into or considered when producing the assessment or landowner voluntary agreement offer; N/A = Not applicable.



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>62</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 42: Persons with an interest in the land (prescribed under section 44 of the Act)</b>			
Mr and Mrs Bullimore	<p>You buy a nice plot of land for £40,000 utility and amenity not agricultural for 10 years summer house, store sheds, pony 180 trees, pony, wildlife, camping parties, stay for days have water put on fence if spend another £5,000 on it.</p> <p>8 gardens plots at Kelling or 1 sugar beet field that makes sense! Multimillion job like this has to go and corss the beet fields not our little gardens.</p> <p>The buzz from the cables will drive wildlife away, drive my pony crazy and give you cancer. We live in our field sleep camp eat nobody lives in a beet field get it!!!</p> <p>You have give me hassle for 2 years and more to come NO NO CABLES UNDER ACROSS OR ANYBODY ON MY LAND OR I WILL TAKE ACTION LEGAL AND OBSTRUCTIVE.</p>	N	Land has not been and will not be accessed without prior consent or authority. The project has confirmed that the intention is to directional drill under all of the land in this vicinity, rather than open-cut trench.
Ray and Diane Pearce	<p>2. Our home's location (Reference 3), is in a unique position with regards to the project. Our property is within 80m of the proposed cable route, adjacent to the position where the Hornsea Three cables cross the Vanguard and Boreas cables, and, with the prospect of having Hornsea Three's 'Main Construction Compound' within 20m of our boundary. Despite the PEIR's requirements to carry out and report on 'Cumulative Effects', our property not been specifically included for assessment. Therefore, this 'further consultation' is clearly a missed opportunity for Ørsted to redress several issues.</p>	I	<p>The main construction compound for the project will be located at Oulton Airfield, accessed off the B1149. Since the PEIR, Hornsea Three has refined the proposals for the secondary compounds, with five located along the onshore cable corridor. The nearest secondary compound to the location mentioned in the response is located approximately 2.5 km to the south, although a storage area is located to the north of the potential Vanguard crossing (in the corner of a field to the south of Cawston Road B1145) which is shown in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description.</p> <p>Cumulative effects from Hornsea Three in combination with other proposed projects (including Vanguard) are addressed in topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3). This assessment does not refer to specific properties, but does provide a realistic worst case assessment which considers potential effects on the nearest sensitive receptors to onshore construction works.</p>
Ray and Diane Pearce	<p>3. The design, engineering and construction of the crossing point, with up to 54 cables carrying a total of 6 GW of power (1.8 GW for Vanguard, 1.8 GW for Boreas and 2.4 GW for Hornsea Three) was not adequately considered in either project's PEIR. We assert that the combined impact of the proposed plans should not be underestimated as having a permanent impact on our residential property, FHL and B&amp;B business. The project has already had a high impact on our property as its value has fallen. We have therefore been 'blighted' by the proximity of the planned cable routes; our businesses and our income will suffer going forward. We have raised these issues, amongst others, with Hornsea Three by letter and formal response to the PEIR. A copy of DONG (now Ørsted) Energy's reply to our issues is, for the record, at Attachment 2.</p>	I	<p>Impacts to socio-economics and tourism are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 10: Socio-Economics.</p> <p>Where properties are located in close proximity, the Project will ensure that sensitive construction management measures, such as noise, dust and traffic control are considered. These are documented in an outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), which accompanies the DCO application, and seek to minimise potential impacts on local businesses and residents.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>62</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Ray and Diane Pearce	<p>5. We draw your attention to the Planning Inspectorate's directive, as follows: The Overarching NPS [National Policy Statement] for Energy (EN-1) Para. 4.2.5: " When considering cumulative effects, the ES should provide information on how the effects of the applicant's proposal would combine and interact with the effects of other development (including projects for which consent has been sought or granted, as well as those already in existence"</p> <p>Therefore, for the cable crossing point issue, Hornsea Three has failed to consider the 'cumulative effects' and has not provided information on how the 'effects of the applicant's [Hornsea Project Three's] proposal' will 'combine and interact with the effects of other developments' [Norfolk Vanguard's]. This is typical of Ørsted's lack for important detail and disregard for the Public's opinions. As acknowledged in the letter, we have raised our issues with members of the project team, in writing and verbally, but they have either been dismissed or ignored. The letter (Attachment 2) makes a useful reference for the issues: the following Ørsted (previously DONG Energy) comments are quoted in italics.</p> <p>EMFs "Annex 3.3 of the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) "Electro-Magnetic Fields Compliance Statement" comprises an assessment of the static and extremely low frequency (ELF)_ EMFs that would be generated by the Hornsea Project Three onshore transmission infrastructure, giving maximum predicted field strengths to assess compliance with health protection guidelines for public exposure to EMFs. That assessment identifies that the maximum field strengths, using worst-case assumptions where required, concludes that the proposals are well below established levels and the project is compliant. This Electro-Magnetic Fields Compliance Statement will be updated as part of the final application taking into account any design changes. In this regard, DONG Energy has already gone well beyond the minimum requirements for a developer at this planning application stage, in order that residents are as informed as possible"</p>	I	<p>Cumulative effects from Hornsea Three in combination with other proposed projects (including Vanguard) are addressed in topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3). This assessment does not refer to specific properties, but does provide a realistic worst case assessment which considers potential effects on the nearest sensitive receptors to onshore construction works.</p> <p>Environmental Statement, volume 3, annex 3.3: EMF Compliance Statement comprises an assessment of the static and extremely low frequency (ELF) EMFs that will be generated by the Hornsea Project Three onshore transmission infrastructure (cabling), giving maximum predicted field strengths to assess compliance with health protection guidelines for public exposure to EMFs.</p> <p>Annex 3.3 concludes that the maximum magnetic field strength directly above a cable, using worst-case assumptions where required, is also well below the guideline public exposure limits set to protect health. The cables eventually selected for the project will be required to fall within the envelope assessed and meet the prescribed standards and hence will not generate greater EMF.</p>
Ray & Diane Pearce	<p>6. We acknowledge that we have had meetings with both NG EMF specialists and Hornsea Three's Electrical Project Manager. However, we still have concerns regarding the cumulative effect from the cable crossing point as the peak energy flow is significant at 6GW. There is no precedence for the crossing point, to the proposed scale of the combined projects, elsewhere in the UK for buried cables. The crossing point is therefore unique and the PEIR fails to make any relevant reference to it with regards to the cumulative EMFs. Furthermore, without the engineering design for how the cables will physically be placed in relation to each other, both horizontally and vertically, computer modelling of the likely cumulative EMFs cannot take place.</p>	I	<p>Environmental Statement, volume 3, annex 3.3: EMF Compliance Statement comprises an assessment of the static and extremely low frequency (ELF) EMFs that will be generated by the Hornsea Project Three onshore transmission infrastructure (cabling), giving maximum predicted field strengths to assess compliance with health protection guidelines for public exposure to EMFs.</p> <p>Annex 3.3 concludes that the maximum magnetic field strength directly above a cable, using worst-case assumptions where required, is also well below the guideline public exposure limits set to protect health. The cables eventually selected for the project will be required to fall within the envelope assessed and meet the prescribed standards and hence will not generate greater EMF. At the crossing point, the same principle applies and projects (individually, or cumulatively) will need to ensure that the EMF created remains within the health protection thresholds set for for public exposure to EMFs.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>62</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Ray & Diane Pearce	<p>7. As per Orsted's advice, we have spoken with National Grid's (Helpline) EMF Specialist who could model the EMF from the cable crossing point. However, without the data from both projects and the engineering plan for the crossing point, it is impossible for the modelling of the cumulative EMF to be carried out. We accept that modelling the EMFs for each project is possible (as per Hornsea Three PEIR Annex 3.3) but there is no data available in the Vanguard PEIR. The omission of any plan for the cable crossing point is a poor indictment on the lack of regard the project engineers have given to the issue. The environment is the environment and the failure to address how the environment will be impacted by EMFs at the crossing point of up to 54 HVAC cables cannot, and should not, be disregarded.</p> <p>"When combined, cumulative EMF sources do not create incremental changes i.e. two equal EMF sources do not double the field strength, rather peak EMFs in effect over lay on one another. Therefore, the combination of Hornsea Project Three with any other EMF source does not result in an incremental change and therefore combined it is forecast to continue to be well below established standards".</p>	I	<p>Environmental Statement, volume 3, annex 3.3: EMF Compliance Statement comprises an assessment of the static and extremely low frequency (ELF) EMFs that will be generated by the Hornsea Project Three onshore transmission infrastructure (cabling), giving maximum predicted field strengths to assess compliance with health protection guidelines for public exposure to EMFs.</p> <p>Annex 3.3 concludes that the maximum magnetic field strength directly above a cable, using worst-case assumptions where required, is also well below the guideline public exposure limits set to protect health. The cables eventually selected for the project will be required to fall within the envelope assessed and meet the prescribed standards and hence will not generate greater EMF. At the crossing point, the same principle applies and projects (individually, or cumulatively) will need to ensure that the EMF created remains within the health protection thresholds set for for public exposure to EMFs.</p>
Ray & Diane Pearce	<p>8. We are aware that the cumulative effect of two equal EMF sources does not double the field strength. However, without knowledge of the phase shift between interacting cables, the orientation of the relative fields, the distance between the sources of the fields and the peak field strengths, then it is impossible for the above comment that "peak EMFs in effect over lay on one another" to be factually correct. We reiterate, it is imperative to the EIA that the planned engineering of how the Hornsea Three's cables will cross the Norfolk Vanguard and Boreas cables is published for Public scrutiny. It is a failure of the Hornsea Three project team not to address this issue forthwith.</p> <p>Design of Cable Crossing Point</p> <p>"The depths of 1.2 m and maximum of 2 m are those associated where cables are installed via open cut method. Where our proposed cables cross over other infrastructure, other installation methods, such as trenchless installation techniques (e.g. horizontal directional drilling, HDD) can be deployed. Paragraphs 3.6.11.8 and 3.7.1.14 of Chapter 3 'Project Description' notes the methodology for HDD crossings. The exact depth and length of each HDD will be dependent on the nature of the obstruction being crossed – in this instance the proposed works by Vattenfall. Therefore, at the crossing point with the proposed Vanguard cables either set of cable will be installed at a greater depth to ensure that no permanent above ground works are required."</p>	I	<p>Environmental Statement, volume 3, annex 3.3: EMF Compliance Statement comprises an assessment of the static and extremely low frequency (ELF) EMFs that will be generated by the Hornsea Project Three onshore transmission infrastructure (cabling), giving maximum predicted field strengths to assess compliance with health protection guidelines for public exposure to EMFs.</p> <p>Annex 3.3 concludes that the maximum magnetic field strength directly above a cable, using worst-case assumptions where required, is also well below the guideline public exposure limits set to protect health. The cables eventually selected for the project will be required to fall within the envelope assessed and meet the prescribed standards and hence will not generate greater EMF. At the crossing point, the same principle applies and projects (individually, or cumulatively) will need to ensure that the EMF created remains within the health protection thresholds set for for public exposure to EMFs.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>62</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Ray & Diane Pearce	11. The cumulative effects on our residence from these projects, (that is assessable cumulative effects and not just passing reference in a list of receptors decided upon by the developers) for the cable crossing point have not been included in the consultation to date and are a glaring omission from both PEIRs. We have been informed verbally and by email that there are regular discussions between the Vanguard and Hornsea Three project teams regarding how they intend to cross the cables; none of which have been disclosed for EIA or Public scrutiny. This is a scandalous disregard of the NPS and indicative of how the PEIRs are incomplete in important areas of concern. We contest that: there will be cumulative effects between the cables at the crossing point, electrically, thermally and physically. There will also be cumulative effects between the cables regarding soil and water course heating, and, as previously discussed EMFs. It was clear during our joint discussion with the Hornsea Project Three team and NG's EMF specialists that the lack of any cohesive plan or indication of how the cables would be crossed, from either of the project engineers, was a dismal failure on the developer's behalf. The environmental effects for having to bury one set of cables deeper can neither be identified nor assessed for their likely impact without the design. Therefore, the Hornsea Three consultation has failed to address one of the fundamental requirements of the NPS. We hereby request that a delay is placed upon the urgency for both the Vanguard and Hornsea Three projects to continue towards DCO with their plans, while a full, transparent and complete EIA is carried out. We maintain, the crossing of up to 54 buried cables, transporting up to 6GW of power, within 1 metre vertically of each other and 80m horizontally from private residences has never been attempted in the UK before. Hence, the attempt to brush this issue aside is not warranted and raises all sorts of questions for the validity of the Hornsea Project's stance and the environmental impact of the whole project.	I	Cumulative effects from Hornsea Three in combination with other proposed projects (including Vanguard) are addressed in topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3).  Information relating to the construction methodology which may be applied at a crossing point is set out in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description.
Ray & Diane Pearce	15. The unique situation of our property, home, income and health in relation to the Hornsea Three project have not been taken into account, even with the opportunity offered by a 'Further Statutory Consultation.' Despite numerous discussions and correspondence on the very pertinent issues of EMFs and the disruption to our living environment, there are no references or mitigations in evidence. The impact and scale of the cable crossing point, with the Vanguard and Boreas project cables, has been understated in all respects by the project's documentation.	I	Noted, responses provided in individual comments in relation to EMF, disruption impacts and cumulative impacts with Vanguard.
<b>Section 47: Duty to consult local community</b>			
No comments were received from the local community relating to electromagnetic fields (EMF) under Phase 2.B.			
Jo Herbert-Mondal	I'm writing to give you feedback re. The three proposed routes for the cables, which will pass [REDACTED], Little Melton. We are most in favour of the third option - the blue route, as this takes the cables a good way from our barns. We strongly object to the second route, which would closely border our gardens and those of our neighbours, at [REDACTED]. We also object to route 1 if it was located directly next to the gardens of [REDACTED]. Our objections are based not just on the disruption caused by the construction, but also uncertainties about the biological and developmental effect of long term exposure to low levels of electromagnetic radiation, especially on our young children. I hope this is helpful feedback for the next stage of the process.	I	As set out in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives, the southern route has been taken forward by Hornsea Three. This route is shown on the plans which are submitted in support of the DCO application and has been chosen based on a review of technical and environmental constraints as well as community feedback.
Councillor Greg Peck, Broadland District Council	There is a specific issue on the Reephams/Salle boundary at the proposed crossing point of both the Orsted and Vattenfall schemes, which I know you are aware of. You need to revisit your plans and move the cable routes and the cross over point further away from the effected residents. I seek your assurance that you will work together to make this happen.	I	The potential for impacts arising as a result of Hornsea Three to combine with other planned developments (including the Vattenfall projects) is assessed in each respective topic chapter of the Environmental Statement (volume 3), under the heading 'Cumulative Effect Assessment'. Where relevant, specific mitigation measures have been identified to minimise the cumulative effects.
<b>Section 48: Duty to publicise</b>			
No comments were received in response to the Public Notice relating to electromagnetic fields (EMF) under Phase 2.B.			

### 3.11 Socio-economics

Table 3.29: Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.A) relating to socio-economics

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>63</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 42: Prescribed consultees (The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009: Schedule 1))</b>			
Norfolk & Suffolk Constabularies	A copy of the letter has been shared with Superintendent Chris Harvey, based at North Walsham Police Station, who is responsible for policing the North Norfolk and Broadlands Districts. Areas of particular interest to us will be; (i) Mitigation and crime prevention measures put in plus during the construction phase, e.g.; - Protection and security of contractor's equipment. - Standards of behaviour expected from visiting and transient labour force for the project. (ii) Security measures and crime prevention to the proposed transformer substations and related surface equipment and cables. (iii) Any implications to organised and serious crime, e.g. offshore drug and other smuggling, and impact ad safety of national infrastructure. We will be content to receive copy planning notices etc. via our Estate Office and operational matters via Superintendent Chris Harvey.	I	Response noted. Details of security measures during the onshore construction phase of Hornsea Three are set out in outline CoCP which establishes the principles which any principal contractor must follow, the outline CoCP forms part of the DCO application. The operational substation, will be secured in accordance with established standards, with specific measures developed during the detailed design phase.
Plumstead Parish Council	Is there any compensation available in the form of grants to the village because of the affect on amenity, businesses and wildlife etc because of the scheme taking place?	I	Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 10: Socio-economics assesses the potential socio-economic impacts associated with Hornsea Three. In respect to village benefits, it is noted that we have established voluntary Community Benefit Funds (CBFs) for a number of our previous projects, which are currently under construction. These funds can make a valuable contribution to the local area, by supporting projects such as community building improvements and recreation facilities, conservation and wildlife projects etc. Any decision to establish a CBF for Hornsea Project Three would be made post financial investment decision (FID), when the Project has been given the green light to go ahead.
Oulton Parish Council	That you look into the possibility of installing Fibre Broadband into the cable trench.	N	Response is noted, however there are a number of complexities which would be associated with co-locating other cables or assets with the Hornsea Three cables, these are summarised below: - The OFTO owner is unlikely to be comfortable with the activity of laying an additional cable or asset within such close proximity to the Hornsea Three cables due to the extremely high insurance caps which could make the transmission asset unsaleable or jeopardise the business case and increase project risk; - The consent for the installation and operation of any other assets e.g. broadband cables, would need to be obtained by another party (it cannot be obtained as part of the Hornsea Three infrastructure as it has not been stated, consulted on, or incorporated into the Environmental Statement).; and - Finally, the owner/operator of any other assets would be required to source its own agreements with all landowners linearly along the onshore cable corridor route.  On the basis of the above, no such infrastructure is proposed as part of Hornsea Three.

<sup>63</sup> Y = Yes change made; N = No change made; I = Incorporated into or considered when producing the assessment or landowner voluntary agreement offer; N/A = Not applicable.



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>63</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Swardeston Parish Council	10. Again, given the height of the structure, will Dong Energy be giving consideration to entering into agreements with mobile telephone network operators to enable mobile phone masts to be placed on the substation so as to improve reception in the area?	N	Response is noted, however there are a number of complexities which would be associated with co-locating other assets with Hornsea Three, these are summarised below: - The OFTO owner is unlikely to be comfortable with locating another asset within such close proximity to the Hornsea Three cables due to the extremely high insurance caps which could make the transmission asset unsaleable or jeopardise the business case and increase project risk; - The consent for the installation and operation of any other assets e.g. mobile phone masts, would need to be obtained by another party (it cannot be obtained as part of the Hornsea Three infrastructure as it has not been stated, consulted on, or incorporated into the Environmental Statement).; and - Finally, the owner/operator of any other assets would be required to source its own agreements with the relevant landowners at the HVDC converter/HVAC substation.  On the basis of the above, no such infrastructure is proposed as part of Hornsea Three.
Swardeston Parish Council	11. What assurances will Dong Energy give that Parishioners will not suffer financially from the decision to site the substation in the Parish? Clearly some Parishioners will have their homes permanently blighted such that they will become unsaleable. Many others however will find that their properties are reduced in value. For most people, their homes are an important part of their retirement planning. Any loss of value will have serious financial repercussions. How is Dong Energy planning to address this?	N	We will compensate landowners who are directly affected by the cable through their land. Compensation is paid for the freehold depreciation of the land affected by the easement and for all reasonable and substantiated losses arising from construction of the project.
Swardeston Parish Council	12. We understand that Dong Energy has previously established community funds to compensate the community as a whole for the inconvenience suffered during the construction process and whilst the substation is in operation. We have noted the sums being made available by Dong Energy through Grantscape in connection with the Race Bank and Hornsea Project One offshore windfarms. How have these sums been calculated?	N	We have established voluntary Community Benefit Funds (CBFs) for a number of our projects, which are currently under construction. These funds can make a valuable contribution to the local area, by supporting projects such as community building improvements and recreation facilities, conservation and wildlife projects etc. Hornsea Project Three will review the interactions of the project, as the proposal is refined and consider an appropriate way to feed benefits back into the local community. Any decision to establish a CBF for Hornsea Project Three would be made post financial investment decision (FID), when the Project has been given the green light to go ahead.
Swardeston Parish Council	13. The Race Bank and Hornsea Project One compensation schemes appear to have been established to compensate communities over a wide area on the basis, presumably, that they are all adversely affected over the long term through sight of the wind turbines. This will not be the case with the Hornsea Project Three. Since the turbines are well out of sight of land, communities along the cable laying route will only be affected during the relatively brief construction phase. Swardeston alone, with the possible inclusion of the area around the HVAC Booster Station if it is needed, will continue to be affected following the completion of the construction phase by the visual impact and polluting aspects of the continued operation of the substation. Will any community fund either be heavily weighted in favour of this locality, or a separate fund established to compensate Swardeston and its close neighbours.	N	Hornsea Project Three will review the interactions of the project, as the proposal is refined and consider an appropriate way to feed benefits back into the local community. Any decision to establish a CBF for Hornsea Project Three would be made post financial investment decision (FID), when the Project has been given the green light to go ahead.
Swardeston Parish Council	14. Will Swardeston Parish Council have a leading role in determining how any community funds are distributed?	N	Hornsea Project Three will review the interactions of the project, as the proposal is refined and consider an appropriate way to feed benefits back into the local community. Any decision to establish a CBF for Hornsea Project Three would be made post financial investment decision (FID), when the Project has been given the green light to go ahead.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>63</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Norfolk County Council	Additional Comments agreed at EDT Committee 1.1 DONG Energy should set out clearly in the following application stage (Section 56 submission) and the accompanying Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA): (a) how local communities impacted by the onshore construction (e.g. Cable Route, Booster Station and Substation) can have such impacts mitigated; and (b) the need for a "local community fund" to assist the wider community affected by the proposal.	I	Hornsea Three has, through site selection and route refinement sought to minimise impacts on environmental and social receptors. Where there are impacts associated with Hornsea Three, these are assessed within the Environmental Statement, along with mitigation identified to minimise them.  We have established voluntary Community Benefit Funds (CBFs) for a number of our projects, which are currently under construction. These funds can make a valuable contribution to the local area, by supporting projects such as community building improvements and recreation facilities, conservation and wildlife projects etc. Hornsea Project Three will review the interactions of the project, as the proposal is refined and consider an appropriate way to feed benefits back into the local community. However, any decision to establish a community benefit fund for Hornsea Three would be made post financial investment decision (FID).
Norfolk County Council	Additional Comments (Cont.) 2.1 DONG Energy should, given the potentially long timescales for construction (up to 11 years), address the cumulative impact/s on local businesses and communities and provide appropriate compensation for those businesses and communities adversely affected by the construction works	I	Impacts to socio-economics and tourism are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 10: Socio-Economics.  In respect to compensation, we will compensate landowners who are directly affected by the cable through their land. Compensation is paid for the freehold depreciation of the land affected by the easement and for all reasonable and substantiated losses arising from construction of the project.
Norfolk County Council	Socio-Economic Issues 2.16 The County Council strongly encourage, on economic development grounds and supporting the Norfolk economy, DONG Energy to use the Port facilities at Great Yarmouth for: • Construction; assembly and manufacture of windfarm components; and • operations and maintenance.	N	We will certainly explore the ability to use port facilities along the East Coast. We are likely to use more than one port during construction, and cannot yet ascertain where we would site an operations and maintenance base. A decision on which port to use will not be made until detailed discussions have taken place with potential suppliers, at a stage where we have a greater understanding of where the various components will come from and port capabilities. This will likely be post consent.
Norfolk County Council	7.7.1.9 Work in tourist sensitive areas in the summer.	I	Impacts on tourism are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 10: Socio-Economics
Great Yarmouth Borough Council	Policy CS6 of the adopted Great Yarmouth Core Strategy states that port related development proposals will be supported by encouraging a greater presence of higher value technology and energy-based industries in the Borough. It is, therefore, welcomed that Great Yarmouth is acknowledged as having the greatest potential to benefit from the proposed development given our supply chain capacity and capability. Great Yarmouth is the centre for the offshore energy industry in England, with a 50 year history of supporting the offshore oil and gas industry and the burgeoning offshore wind sector. The port of Great Yarmouth is currently involved in the construction of two new windfarms, Galloper and East Anglia 1 and is the operations and maintenance base for the original offshore windfarm at Scroby Sands and Statoil's new Dudgeon Windfarm. Great Yarmouth has developed a wide ranging supply chain of local companies to support the oil, gas and offshore wind sectors.	N	Acknowledged.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>63</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Broadland District Council	It is understood that the length of the build programme is still to be finalised and in respect of the construction programme for the onshore export cables this could be up to 6 years in total, if more than a single phase build out programme is utilised. In the District Council's opinion a 6 year build programme would have very serious implications for the local tourism and agricultural economies. Further details in this respect, together with how the impacts will be mitigated are requested and the applicant is asked to liaise with relevant landowners to minimise the impact of the extended construction programme.	Y	During the design refinement Hornsea Three has sought to minimise the duration of any disruption, and has reduced the total duration of the construction phase onshore to eight years. Within this, the maximum duration for construction of the onshore cable corridor is approximately 2.5 years, this therefore means that the maximum duration over which construction could occur would be 5.5 years incorporating two phases (assuming a three-year gap between the two phases). The work associated with each phase is expected to progress along the Hornsea Three onshore cable corridor with a typical active construction works duration of three months at any particular location.  Impacts on agricultural farm holdings, socio-economics and tourism are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapters 6: Land Use and Recreation and chapter 10: Socio-Economic respectively. Where appropriate, mitigation measures have also been identified within these chapters to minimise potential impacts.
Holt County Division	Impact on local business/economy in a rural location Given the potentially long timescales for construction (up to 11 years), DONG energy needs to address the cumulative impact/s on local businesses and provide appropriate compensation for those businesses adversely affected by the construction works. A clearly defined measurable process needs to be put in place. I am pleased that this has now been added to the County Council submission.	I	Impacts to socio-economics and tourism are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 10: Socio-Economics.  In respect to compensation, we will compensate landowners who are directly affected by the cable through their land. Compensation is paid for the freehold depreciation of the land affected by the easement and for all reasonable and substantiated losses arising from construction of the project.
Holt County Division	Our rural economy is fragile and substantially tourism led, mitigating actions must be put in place prior to the start of construction to address this real concern. Previous windfarm projects have caused significant impact and their size does not come close to this one.	I	Impacts to socio-economics and tourism are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 10: Socio-Economics.
North Norfolk District Council	In setting out the Council's position a report was produced for discussion by the Council's Cabinet. (A copy of the Cabinet report and draft minutes are attached with this letter) (SEE ATTACHMENT). Cabinet resolved on 05 September 2017 to: 1) Endorse the content of the report as being the Council's formal position and response to the current round of consultation being undertaken in respect of DONG Energy's Hornsea Project Three offshore windfarm development, and 2) Re-state the Council's ongoing commitment to discuss and negotiate with DONG Energy to achieve the best outcome for North Norfolk from this major development proposal. 3) Seek advice regarding potential health implications to the local community. 4) Request that DONG Energy further explore Direct Current transmission arrangements as the proposed development is refined in the coming months  In respect of point 3) above and potential health implications, concerns were expressed that the proposal would involve the laying of cables carrying very high voltages across large areas of the District and, in respect of those cables, questions were asked whether the health implications associated with electromagnetic fields (EMF) along the intended cable route had been fully explored and were understood. The District Council would therefore request assurance from DONG Energy, through submission of appropriate technical reports, that the cables being laid (whether HVAC or HVDC) would not give rise to health risks to nearby residents or other sensitive receptors from EMF or from other effects associated with the transmission of high voltage electricity along buried cables.	I	Environmental Statement, volume 3, annex 3.3: EMF Compliance Statement comprises an assessment of the static and extremely low frequency (ELF) EMFs that will be generated by the Hornsea Project Three onshore transmission infrastructure (cabling), giving maximum predicted field strengths to assess compliance with health protection guidelines for public exposure to EMFs.  Annex 3.3 concludes that the maximum magnetic field strength directly above a cable, using worst-case assumptions where required, is also well below the guideline public exposure limits set to protect health. The cables eventually selected for the project will be required to fall within the envelope assessed and meet the prescribed standards and hence will not generate greater EMF.  Due to current uncertainty (see volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives), a decision on which transmission system (HVDC or HVAC) to adopt will not be made until post consent after extensive engagement with potential systems suppliers has taken place. As a result of this, we have conducted our assessments based on a realistic worst-case scenario, which could be either HVDC or HVDC technology depending on the receptor.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>63</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
North Norfolk District Council	<p>In respect of point 4) whilst the District Council recognises that DONG Energy may need at this stage to assess the potential of both HVDC and HVAC transmission Council is aware from public comments made through the current public consultation processes in respect of the Hornsea Project Three and other major offshore wind proposals seeking landfall and connections into the National Grid in Norfolk that the public have a strong preference to see HVDC transmission systems adopted. The Council understands that this is because HVDC technology would remove the need for onshore and offshore booster stations to be provided along the route of the export cables between the turbine field and the connection into the National Grid infrastructure, thereby minimising the impact of these developments on communities in North Norfolk once the construction of any cable corridor works were complete. The District Council has therefore prepared its comments on the PIER report based upon the potential of an HVAC transmission system being deployed, but would ask that DONG Energy continue to appraise both options in the hope that the less intrusive HVDC option might be chosen in the final scheme design. Without prejudice to the comments made above, the District Council is carefully following the debate which is taking place over the use by offshore wind development companies of HVAC and HVDC systems and reserves its position in respect of publically lobbying the Government to better understand the difference between the two transmission systems so that the least environmentally damaging option might be taken forward on this and other schemes.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the position outlined above, the District Council values the relationship which has been established with the DONG Energy team in the development of the Hornsea Project Three project proposal over the past 18 months and looks forward to continued dialogue with you in the coming months as the project proposals are refined so as to achieve the best possible outcome for communities in North Norfolk if the proposal receives Development Consent approval through NSIP and the Secretary of State.</p>	I	<p>Due to current uncertainty (see volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives), a decision on which transmission system (HVDC or HVAC) to adopt will not be made until post consent after extensive engagement with potential systems suppliers has taken place. As a result of this, we have conducted our assessments based on a realistic worst-case scenario, which could be either HVDC or HVAC technology depending on the receptor.</p>
Edgefield, Bodham, Corpusty & Saxthorpe, Hempstead and Plumstead Parish Councils (and others)	<p>1. Unacceptability of 'phasing' that requires the same sections of cable corridor to be dug up more than once We understand that the current commissioning process for projects of this nature could involve consent being granted to the developers in up to three phases. This would involve the digging up of, what is effectively, the same ground along the entire cable corridor up to three times during the length of the project, adversely affect its economic viability, and unnecessarily delay the upgrading and expansion of the nation's electricity supply. This is clearly a ridiculous waste of money. But more importantly, it means all of the negative consequences of the cable corridor will be multiplied and the long-term damage to the area made significantly worse. The effects relate to traffic, tourism and road safety – and above all, the permanent damage to the natural environment.</p> <p>Whatever route it takes, the cable corridor will inevitably involve disrupting areas of unspoiled natural beauty, habitat loss (hedgerows, hedge margins, meadow, wet and ancient woodland), associated habitat fragmentation and the high potential for water pollution (due to soil and nutrient loss to watercourses). We recommend referring to the report produced by the River Glaven Conservation Group for a detailed and thorough explanation of the many significant environmental issues along the route. Several areas of the proposed cable route are areas of High Landscape Value, as well as being subject to deliberate and managed conservation. There is a wide variety of flora and fauna, even in the most apparently straightforward North Norfolk field, the quality of which can only really be appreciated through year-round observation. North Norfolk hosts a significant amount of wildlife, from barn owls to deer, hares and birds of prey including kestrels, buzzards and kites, as well as rare flora and fauna. The natural conditions which make this area of the UK so suitable for wildlife have been preserved for generations, and are unique in the extent to which they have resisted urbanisation, industrialisation and the ensuing noise, light and atmospheric pollution.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Corpusty &amp; Saxthorpe Parish representatives and landowners adjacent to the proposed site of the crossing of the River Bure and its adjacent water meadows are concerned</p>	Y	<p>During the design refinement Hornsea Three has sought to minimise the duration of any disruption, and has reduced the total duration of the construction phase onshore to eight years. Within this, the maximum duration for construction of the onshore cable corridor is approximately 2.5 years, this therefore means that the maximum duration over which construction could occur would be 5.5 years incorporating two phases (assuming a three-year gap between the two phases). The work associated with each phase is expected to progress along the Hornsea Three onshore cable corridor with a typical active construction works duration of three months at any particular location.</p> <p>Through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive ecological receptors. For example, Weybourne Cliffs and Kelling Heath SSSI have been avoided and no direct impacts are predicted on these designated sites from Hornsea Three. Additional mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project are outlined in topic specific chapters, and include the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts on local road networks, ecological receptors (e.g. hedgerows) and hydrological features (e.g. main rivers).</p> <p>Where impacts have not been avoided, these are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement volume 3.</p>



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>63</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>that these environs receive special attention. To mitigate any environmental impact on these, surrounding ancient hedgerows and a domestic water well it is respectfully requested that HDD under-drilling be utilised for approximately 600m length at an appropriate depth below the base of the water well.</p> <p>The above concerns are all grounds on which to object most strongly to the idea of any such development whatsoever carving a decade-long scar through the landscape. Indeed it is extremely rare for a community as wide and representative as the one made up in the signatories of this letter, to come out cautiously in support of something so catastrophic for the local environment. We are, however, understanding of the need the country has as a whole to develop sustainable sources of alternative energy. But we are also mindful of the need to protect and preserve this beautiful and unique asset for generations to come for the benefit of residents, workers and visitors alike.</p> <p>We are reassured to read that the consultation process will give due consideration to the negative impacts of the development on the natural environment. There must, as part of the granting of consent for this development, be a guarantee that the best modern engineering practices (not just the statutory minima) are adopted to repair the effects of the development on the environment and reinstatement of soil, water, flora, fauna and habitats.</p> <p>Nothing will ever be able to be restored completely: no amount of soil stratification will be able to reinstate the balance of soil that has been known and worked by the people here for generations. Visual reinstatement – itself something that takes years – is only one part of the picture.</p> <p>To support this development happening at all has taken patience, understanding and significant compromise, but to allow it to happen three times is patently unacceptable. Minimising the number of times the same areas need digging up had the strongest consensus of all issues connected to the cable route: 95% of respondents rated it as 4 or 5 (out of 5) in importance, with standard deviation of just 0.61 across all responses. Everything that stands to be lost by the construction of the onshore component of this project will be significantly worsened if the work along each point of the cable corridor is not carried out once and once only, quickly and efficiently, and the land reinstated thoroughly and permanently.</p> <p>Whether it is within the control of the developers, or something that only Government can change, we will object vociferously and unendingly to any development consent order that is granted without absolute assurance that individual sections of the cable route will not be 'dug up' on more than one occasion. At the very least, alternative ideas should be explored such as laying all ducting in the first phase so that the land does not need to be dug up more than once.</p> <p>We are utterly dedicated and passionate about this aspect of the proposed development, and will defend our land at all costs – as we have done in the past.</p>		
<p>Edgefield, Bodham, Corpusty &amp; Saxthorpe, Hempstead and Plumstead Parish Councils (and others)</p>	<p>We wish to stress that we are not overall opposed to the development of Hornsea 3: only 36% of respondents said they felt it was very important to stop this type of development happening in Norfolk, and 78% said they were generally in favour of alternative energy developments.</p> <p>We have, however, strong concerns about the current proposals that we wish to have heard. Our voices as members of the local community are somewhat powerless in the face of infrastructure projects of this national significance.</p> <p>Responses to the question of whether local feedback would lead to the plans being adjusted were the most varied: only 47.4% felt they would, with a standard deviation of 1.43. We are therefore appealing directly to DONG Energy's company ethics as well as the initial statutory purpose of the Planning Inspectorate in identifying and acting on key issues resulting from this consultation.</p> <p>We believe that each of our concerns can be addressed through appropriate consideration and investment by the developers and we have avoided suggesting anything that is excessively prescriptive or clearly unachievable.</p> <p>We very much hope that our concerns will be taken seriously so that we can support this opportunity to make the UK's future energy supply more sustainable.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Noted. Please see responses to particular points raised below.</p>



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>63</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
<p>Edgefield, Bodham, Corpusty &amp; Saxthorpe, Hempstead and Plumstead Parish Councils (and others)</p>	<p>3. Mitigations of impact of HVAC booster station At present, based on the drawings, descriptions and 3D models we have seen, there are no mitigating measures planned around the construction of the HVAC booster station at Little Barningham and this is simply unacceptable. The potential height on its own would create an eyesore that could significantly undermine the quality of life of people living in, and passing through, the area. Not to mention the noise. There are very few rural services in North Norfolk and precious little economic activity beyond tourism. The quality of life and the beautiful natural environment we enjoy are what people get instead and this could be significantly eroded by the developers' plans if mitigation steps are not put in place. 97% of residents said that improving the natural habitat after construction was finished was "important" or "very important" - the strongest response of all the issues covered and the answer that had the greatest consensus (standard deviation: 0.56). 95% furthermore said that the natural environment has a lot to do with their quality of life.</p> <p>Visual The proposed 12.5m structure will be visible over hundreds of hectares, including from all neighbouring villages, and a significant length of the Holt road. We do not recognize the visualisations we have been shown by the developer based on our local knowledge, and we will undertake experiments ourselves to see the true distance over which the structure as currently planned would be seen. Significant height mitigations should be volunteered by the developer or required as a condition of the order, to reduce substantially the relative height to the extent that it would be similar in size to other aesthetically limited constructions in the local area: only churches remotely approach the height currently proposed. We urge the developers to consider ideas for this – a very small selection of which include: digging out the foundations so the building starts at a lower level; using the soil to create a bank around the construction and planting the scheme with trees.</p> <p>We note the lengthy disclaimers attached to the developer's visualisations and feel they are therefore an ineffective tool to understand the visual impact of the booster station from different viewpoints. Physical demonstrations would be required in order to understand the true visibility of the proposed construction.</p> <p>77% of residents said that ensuring the height of the booster station was kept to a minimum was "very important" and this is an area we hope the developers will consider seriously before making their application - at present no mitigations whatsoever are proposed and this is clearly unacceptable.</p> <p>We have been informed that flood lighting will be needed on site to provide safe working conditions at night in the event of emergency. We accept this, but do not understand why this lighting needs to be motion-sensitive. For the purposes of security we understand remote monitored, motion-sensitive, infrared cameras would be equally effective and request that any flood lighting be manually triggered either remotely or from on-site so as to prevent any eventuality where the night sky in this remote and rural area is illuminated unnecessarily.</p> <p>Noise and vibration Currently the developer proposes noise and vibration mitigation that reduces the noise impact of the booster station to "acceptable levels". We have seen no evidence that these levels are respectful of the fact that, at night in North Norfolk, the environment is virtually absent of any background noise or vibration interference whatsoever. Nor are we confident that background studies have been carried out at sites close to the proposed construction.</p> <p>We insist that the required noise and vibration levels within 500m of the proposed booster station are set at the current background levels at those locations on a clear night.</p> <p>We strongly urge the developers to provide detailed noise and vibration mitigation steps as part of their application, rather than leave any doubt whatsoever that the targets will be adequate. If local people are being dragged into a national infrastructure project with no way of knowing what the impact will be, and with no formal powers of recourse, then the enforcement of rights will only be able to be fought for post hoc by residents through protest and inconvenience once the DCO</p>	<p>I</p>	<p>Information pertaining to the site selection for the HVAC booster station is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives, whilst maximum dimensions are provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description.</p> <p>Through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive ecological receptors. For example, the orientation of the HVAC booster station has been optimised to minimise impacts on nearby field boundaries (hedgerows and trees) as well as maximise natural screening. Additional mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project are outlined in topic specific chapters, and include the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts on local road networks, ecological receptors (e.g. hedgerows) and hydrological features (e.g. main rivers); and landscape planting around the HVAC booster and HVDC converter/HVAC substation to minimise impacts. Details of the indicative landscaping proposals are provided in the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>63</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>has been granted. It benefits everyone for the precise specification of “acceptable levels” to be disclosed upfront – and at a level that is agreeable.</p> <p>We believe that the available mitigation options should be able to reduce noise and vibration well below statutory levels – and that the extraordinary nature of this development means it is quite appropriate for entirely subjective levels to be set.</p> <p>96% of residents said that ensuring the booster station couldn’t be heard nearby was “important” or “very important”, making it the highest rated issue relating to the booster station, and the booster-station related issue whose response had the greatest consensus (standard deviation: 0.67). As it stands, it is still unclear whether the current background noise levels were sampled in appropriate places, or by suitably independent third parties.</p> <p>Decommissioning</p> <p>We seek reassurance from the developers that any potential booster station will be adequately demolished and removed at the end of its working life and the land restored.</p> <p>The HVAC booster station will be of significant and long-term detriment to our area, and our area alone – and the best in class mitigation practices should be deployed, however costly. For the avoidance of doubt, our proposal in point two above should require the cost comparison to be inclusive of the cost of mitigations to the booster station in the case of HVAC.</p>		
<p>Edgefield, Bodham, Corpusty &amp; Saxthorpe, Hempstead and Plumstead Parish Councils (and others)</p>	<p>4. Community Investment:</p> <p>Where a local community is bearing a particular local burden resulting from the provision of national infrastructure, that local community should not only have its views represented but also receive some form of balancing payment.</p> <p>Many members of our community do not believe that financial compensation alone can provide adequate or appropriate reparation for the overall effects of the development. We urge the developers to consider alternative, innovative ideas – a very small selection of which include: (a) reduced electricity costs for people affected; (b) cash payment equivalent to reduced electricity cost over a period of years or while in occupation of the affected property; (c) the laying of ‘dark fibre’ along the full stretch of the route, with access points every few km – the only way that, free from the UK Government having appointed a single supplier to carry out broadband infrastructure upgrades, local communities can invest in their own properly high-capacity internet service provision – as has been done in the North of England by B4RN; (d) electric vehicle charging points at key points throughout the district; (e) installation of small cell technology to improve rural mobile phone coverage.</p> <p>We believe the sums involved in any of these initiatives would probably be small in relation to total overall cost (and point (d) could even provide the company with a future income stream); but also that the principle has wider application and, once established, could be used in other similar projects by affected parties.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>We have established voluntary Community Benefit Funds (CBFs) for a number of our projects, which are currently under construction. These funds can make a valuable contribution to the local area, by supporting projects such as community building improvements and recreation facilities, conservation and wildlife projects etc. Hornsea Project Three will review the interactions of the project, as the proposal is refined and consider an appropriate way to feed benefits back into the local community. However, any decision to establish a community benefit fund for Hornsea Three would be made post financial investment decision (FID).</p>
<p>River Glaven Conservation Group (RGCG) and CPRE Norfolk</p>	<p>SPECIFIC COMMENTS ON THE NON-TECHNICAL SUMMARY:</p> <p>The Non-Technical Summary makes a very useful overview, but also a ‘way in’ to reading the specialist chapters, which go in to considerable detail and length on a wide range of topics; and provide an overview of the specialist topics of particular interest. We make some comment on N-TS by referring to the numbered paragraph. We look to be brief and pick on points where we might either want to just note, support what we say above, and/or come back to later in the consultation process. We do this also with the ecology and nature conservation chapter, and the landscape chapter. We start with the NTS, and work down in order of paragraph number, and quote in full, abbreviate or paraphrase what Dong say to relate to the point we wish to make, or just note.</p> <p>3.5.1.1: The two primary transmission types are HVAC and HVDC for off-shore windfarms; the UK has traditionally used HVAC. With interconnectors between countries HVDC will become more technically and/or economically viable as such are used on a number of projects in Germany. We assume there are more problems in connecting the UK to a wider European system. We understand the need for Dong to take both systems through all planning stages, but hope by then they will be in a position to use HVDC. We also assume that as wind energy is more variable and</p>	<p>I</p>	<p>This response is noted.</p> <p>In respect to the comments made, through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive ecological receptors. Potential impacts which remain on ecological receptors are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation. This assessment considers the interactions between the project and ecological receptors, and is informed by the relationship between hydrogeology, hydrology and water-dependant habitats which are described in the Hydrological Characterisation Note which forms Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 2.4. This approach was discussed and agreed with the onshore ecology expert working group which comprised Natural England, the Wildlife Trust, Environment Agency and the RSPB amongst others.</p> <p>Mitigation measures have been identified to the creation of preferential pathways for groundwater flow, minimise flood risk, minimise the generation of silt and prevent runoff</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>63</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>less predictable than 'conventional' energy production, there is a greater need and opportunity for flexibility to 'chase' demand if inter-connection between countries is widespread.</p> <p>4.9.1.1: We note and welcome the statement: Hornsea Three will continue to develop and refine the project as it progresses towards a final application to Development Consent and beyond as it moves towards construction. The process will be informed by further stakeholder engagement and interpretation of the outputs from ongoing engineering, commercial and environmental investigations.</p> <p>5.1.1.1: In discussing the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Methodology dealing with the construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning of the project we have: Where significant effects are predicted, where possible it identifies mitigation to reduce the significance of these effects where that is practicable. The bold emphasis is ours, as this seems unduly negative in relation to what we say above. The technical term significant as associated with an EIA requires it must be determined in the Environmental Statement, but an issue deemed to be below this level gets less scrutiny. The word 'practicable' is capable of being interpreted in a range of ways, and can be taken as reluctance to deal with anything less than moderate/major adverse adverse significant.</p> <p>5.4.1.5: We welcome: Onshore surveys taken to date include ecological field surveys (bird, bat, badger, invertebrate and reptile), archaeological desktop and geophysical surveys, baseline noise surveys and landscape and visual assessments.</p> <p>5.4.1.6: We welcome: In addition to the surveys which have already been undertaken, a number of surveys are ongoing (such as aerial surveys of birds and marine animals, and onshore ecological surveys) or are proposed (e.g. geophysical survey of the nearshore extent of the Hornsea Three offshore cable corridor) and will inform the EIA presented in the Environmental Statement.</p> <p>5.5.1.1: We welcome: The Hornsea Three assessment uses an iterative approach. This has been employed in order to demonstrate mitigation of project-related impacts. The process of EIA has therefore been used as a means of informing the Hornsea Three design.</p> <p>5.6.1.2: We note: The PEIR sets out all aspects on the environment likely to be significantly affected by the project (as required by the EIA Directive). Only effects in general judged to be of moderate to major significance are 'significant' in EIA terms (where this differs for specific assessments, this is explained within the appropriate PEIR chapters). Where effects are considered significant in EIA terms, this will normally trigger additional analysis, consultation and possibly further mitigation measures, where practicable. When the determining authority makes a decision for consent, it therefore does so in the knowledge of all likely significant effects on the environment. We comment: In this context we include on the latter that this should include an ecological network factor.</p> <p>7.2.1.1: We note: The geology and ground conditions study area comprises of a 1 km buffer around the onshore elements of Hornsea Three. There are three geological SSSI within the search area; Weybourne Cliffs, Weybourne Town Pit, Kelling Heath.</p> <p>7.3.1.3: The hydrology and flood risk study area includes a number of catchments and associated surface watercourses. These include the rivers Yare, Tud, Wensum Bure River Glaven (Gunthorpe Stream). We comment: Gunthorpe Stream is not affected by the cabling route, but is one source of flooding and accompanied by arable run-off. Arable run-off is a major problem within the catchment, including the upper Glaven. We are concerned that this is not exacerbated by open trenching operations.</p> <p>7.3.1.6: The potential use of open cut trenching, Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD) and other site activities, may impact surface water quality due to increases in turbid (murky) run-off, spillages and leaks of fuel, oil etc and an alteration in surface in surface water pathways. With the inclusion of design measures such as the use of HDD at the Landfall the effects of these impacts have been assessed to be of minor adverse significance (not significant in EIA terms). We comment: this may be true for HDD at the Landfall, but in our view is NOT true for open cut trenching, particularly given the heterogeneity of the terrain throughout the Glaven catchment, and the long time that may elapse with excavated soil waiting to be back-filled. Turbid, mucky water</p>		<p>entering the watercourses. These measures are set out in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapters 1 and 2: Geology and Ground Condition and Hydrology and Flood Risk chapters respectively, as well as in the Outline Code of Construction Practice which forms part of the DCO application. Drainage provisions at the HVAC booster station and HVDC converter/HVAC substation will be further developed during detailed design in agreement with the Norfolk County Council as LLFA.</p> <p>The Glaven Valley Conservation Area is considered in Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 5.5: Screening Assessment - Onshore HVAC Booster Station, as well as annex 5.1: Desk Based Assessment.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>63</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>contains sediment, as repeated many times a major problem in the Glaven catchment (and many others, not least the Wensum SAC).</p> <p>7.4.1.3: Twenty statutory designated sites, including SSSIs, SACs and Ramsar sites were identified within 2 km of the development, with 126 non-statutory designated sites also identified. The desk top study and site specific surveys indicated the presence of protected or otherwise notable species including bluebell, holly-leaved naiad, sandy stillball, white-clayed crayfish, whorl snail species, common lizard, great crested newt, grass snake, slow worm, breeding birds, wintering birds, migratory birds, badger, otter bats and water vole. We comment: near all are present in the upper Glaven, some in abundance, We will be adding more to this list, and also see the attached paper on the upper Glaven Ecological Network.</p> <p>7.4.1.4: There are a number of possible impacts on onshore habitats with the open cut trenching required to install the export cable. The impacts include potential habitat loss, for example in designated sites, hedgerows and sensitive water courses, as well as disturbance to notable species. The significance of the effects of these impacts is assessed to be in the range moderate to major adverse. With the actions quoted it is claimed they would mitigate the effects of impacts on potentially sensitive habitats and species. Therefore, with the proposed mitigation in place the significance of these effects would be reduced to negligible or minor adverse (not significant in EIA terms). We comment: This is a sweeping and ill-considered statement, which generalises a wide number of situations; it would if taken at face value surely see an unacceptable impact on some species, some habitats, and most certainly result in considerable damage to the ecological network that is provided by the Glaven catchment.</p> <p>7.6.1.3: This paragraph relates to the Historic Environment and states that in the cable search area there are 13 scheduled monuments whose settings may be affected by the proposal there are 167 listed buildings, of which seven are listed at Grade I, 23 at Grade II* and 137 at Grade II. Many of these are in the North Norfolk district. There are 11 Conservation Areas, which in North Norfolk are Weybourne, Hempstead, Baconsthorpe Upper Sheringham and Glaven Valley. We comment: This is the only mention we can find of the Glaven Valley Conservation Area in the Dong documentation. It is a very large rural area, designated primarily on landscape grounds, but also the vernacular architecture and cultural associations such as the churches within it. The area is almost as large as the river catchment, and we will propose to the Council that the GVCA boundary of this could be overlain by the ecological network boundary, which essentially is the Glaven watershed boundary. This would recognise and bring together landscape and wildlife, to be incorporated in the Local Plan.</p> <p>7.11.1.2/3 and 4: This relates to the activities of the New Anglia Local Enterprise Partnership (NALEP) and other major developments that might interact with Hornsea Three. There is much activity in Greater Norwich as a Growth Area. As such the Northern Distributor Road (NDR) is to be completed next year. There is a proposal for a Norwich Western Link (NWL) road to take the NDR across the Wensum Valley to the A47 west, on which dualling will start in 2020, and a Food Hub site has been given consent for a site to the west of Easton Village, and the purpose of which is to bolster and justify the county council aspiration for a NWL road. The timescale for any NWL road would be beyond that for Hornsea Three, but the cabling route crosses the A47 and run through the middle of the Food Hub site, the Local Development Order being made within the context of the Greater Norwich Food Enterprise Zone (FEZ) in which the Hub is located.</p>		
Weybourne Parish Council	4. Finally if this project progresses the parish council requests that the community of Weybourne is compensated financially in some way !	N	Noted. We have established voluntary Community Benefit Funds (CBFs) for a number of our projects, which are currently under construction. These funds can make a valuable contribution to the local area, by supporting projects such as community building improvements and recreation facilities, conservation and wildlife projects etc. Hornsea Project Three will review the interactions of the project, as the proposal is refined and consider an appropriate way to feed benefits back into the local community. However, any decision to establish a community benefit fund for Hornsea Three would be made post financial investment decision (FID).



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>63</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Swannington with Alderford and Little Witchingham Parish Council	Time delays: coming back to areas already laid with fewer cables than the six proposed, due to any phasing of the project, will cause added burden on residents nearby: <b>what compensation will be given if this happens?</b>	N	<p>During the design refinement Hornsea Three has sought to minimise the duration of any disruption, and has reduced the total duration of the construction phase onshore to eight years. Within this, the maximum duration for construction of the onshore cable corridor is approximately 2.5 years, this therefore means that the maximum duration over which construction could occur would be 5.5 years incorporating two phases (assuming a three-year gap between the two phases). The work associated with each phase is expected to progress along the Hornsea Three onshore cable corridor with a typical active construction works duration of three months at any particular location.</p> <p>In respect to compensation, we will compensate landowners who are directly affected by the cable through their land. Compensation is paid for the freehold depreciation of the land affected by the easement and for all reasonable and substantiated losses arising from construction of the project.</p>
Swannington with Alderford and Little Witchingham Parish Council	Local compensation - benefit: in addition to compensation for any extended project timescale <b>more information is needed on how each locality affected will given funding for local benefit.</b>	N	<p>We have established voluntary Community Benefit Funds (CBFs) for a number of our projects, which are currently under construction. These funds can make a valuable contribution to the local area, by supporting projects such as community building improvements and recreation facilities, conservation and wildlife projects etc. Hornsea Project Three will review the interactions of the project, as the proposal is refined and consider an appropriate way to feed benefits back into the local community. However, any decision to establish a community benefit fund for Hornsea Three would be made post financial investment decision (FID).</p>
Kelling Parish Council (Barbara Young)	<b>Cable Corridor</b> - Kelling is a small but busy village. The tea-room near the war memorial is well used. Farm vehicles have to use the street on a regular basis. Bird watchers com in droves, when an unusual bird is blown ashore - and park in the street. The primary school is popular and the street is the only place for parents to park at the start and end of school. The barn (by Beck House) is a rehearsal and performance space.	I	<p>Where sensitive receptors are located in close proximity to the works i.e. at landfall, the Project will ensure that sensitive construction management measures, such as noise, dust and traffic control are considered. These are documented in an outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), which accompanies the DCO application. Impacts on sensitive receptors are landfall are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3).</p>
Kelling Parish Council (Barbara Young)	<b>Further Comments</b> - Green energy is important in protecting our planet. We should, likewise, try to protect areas of outstanding natural beauty. Our rural economy relies heavily on tourism and farming - these industries need respect and protection	I	<p>An assessment of impacts on the AONB is presented in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources. To inform this process, Hornsea Three has consulted with the Norfolk Coast Partnership, as well as local authorities, in regard to the identification of suitable viewpoints within the AONB.</p> <p>The potential for impacts to interact and impact tourism is addressed in Environmental Statement Volume 3, Chapter 10: Socio-economics and concludes that there would be no significant effects on tourism as a result of Hornsea Three.</p> <p>In respect to agricultural use, during the construction phase, there would be a permanent loss of land predominantly associated with the onshore HVAC booster station and onshore HVDC converter/HVAC substation, together with the temporary loss of the "best and most versatile" agricultural land along the Hornsea Three onshore cable corridor. Following the completion of the construction phase or phases and the restoration of temporarily affected land to its former agricultural use, as far as possible. An assessment of the effects of this on both agricultural land classification as well as farming operations are presented in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 6: Land Use and Recreation.</p>



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>63</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 42: Local Authorities (prescribed under section 43 of the Act)</b>			
Norfolk County Council	Additional Comments agreed at EDT Committee 1.1 DONG Energy should set out clearly in the following application stage (Section 56 submission) and the accompanying Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA): (a) how local communities impacted by the onshore construction (e.g. Cable Route, Booster Station and Substation) can have such impacts mitigated; and (b) the need for a "local community fund" to assist the wider community affected by the proposal.	I	Hornsea Three has, through site selection and route refinement sought to minimise impacts on environmental and social receptors. Where there are impacts associated with Hornsea Three, these are assessed within the Environmental Statement, along with mitigation identified to minimise them.  We have established voluntary Community Benefit Funds (CBFs) for a number of our projects, which are currently under construction. These funds can make a valuable contribution to the local area, by supporting projects such as community building improvements and recreation facilities, conservation and wildlife projects etc. Hornsea Project Three will review the interactions of the project, as the proposal is refined and consider an appropriate way to feed benefits back into the local community. However, any decision to establish a community benefit fund for Hornsea Three would be made post financial investment decision (FID).
Norfolk County Council	Additional Comments (Cont.) 2.1 DONG Energy should, given the potentially long timescales for construction (up to 11 years), address the cumulative impact/s on local businesses and communities and provide appropriate compensation for those businesses and communities adversely affected by the construction works	I	Impacts to socio-economics and tourism are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 10: Socio-Economics.  In respect to compensation, we will compensate landowners who are directly affected by the cable through their land. Compensation is paid for the freehold depreciation of the land affected by the easement and for all reasonable and substantiated losses arising from construction of the project.
Norfolk County Council	Socio-Economic Issues 2.16 The County Council strongly encourage, on economic development grounds and supporting the Norfolk economy, DONG Energy to use the Port facilities at Great Yarmouth for: • Construction; assembly and manufacture of windfarm components; and • operations and maintenance.	N	We will certainly explore the ability to use port facilities along the East Coast. We are likely to use more than one port during construction, and cannot yet ascertain where we would site an operations and maintenance base. A decision on which port to use will not be made until detailed discussions have taken place with potential suppliers, at a stage where we have a greater understanding of where the various components will come from and port capabilities. This will likely be post consent.
Norfolk County Council	7.7.1.9 Work in tourist sensitive areas in the summer.	I	Impacts on tourism are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 10: Socio-Economics
Great Yarmouth Borough Council	Policy CS6 of the adopted Great Yarmouth Core Strategy states that port related development proposals will be supported by encouraging a greater presence of higher value technology and energy-based industries in the Borough. It is, therefore, welcomed that Great Yarmouth is acknowledged as having the greatest potential to benefit from the proposed development given our supply chain capacity and capability. Great Yarmouth is the centre for the offshore energy industry in England, with a 50 year history of supporting the offshore oil and gas industry and the burgeoning offshore wind sector. The port of Great Yarmouth is currently involved in the construction of two new windfarms, Galloper and East Anglia 1 and is the operations and maintenance base for the original offshore windfarm at Scroby Sands and Statoil's new Dudgeon Windfarm. Great Yarmouth has developed a wide ranging supply chain of local companies to support the oil, gas and offshore wind sectors.	N	Acknowledged.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>63</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Broadland District Council	<p>It is understood that the length of the build programme is still to be finalised and in respect of the construction programme for the onshore export cables this could be up to 6 years in total, if more than a single phase build out programme is utilised. In the District Council's opinion a 6 year build programme would have very serious implications for the local tourism and agricultural economies. Further details in this respect, together with how the impacts will be mitigated are requested and the applicant is asked to liaise with relevant landowners to minimise the impact of the extended construction programme.</p>	Y	<p>During the design refinement Hornsea Three has sought to minimise the duration of any disruption, and has reduced the total duration of the construction phase onshore to eight years. Within this, the maximum duration for construction of the onshore cable corridor is approximately 2.5 years, this therefore means that the maximum duration over which construction could occur would be 5.5 years incorporating two phases (assuming a three-year gap between the two phases). The work associated with each phase is expected to progress along the Hornsea Three onshore cable corridor with a typical active construction works duration of three months at any particular location.</p> <p>Impacts on agricultural farm holdings, socio-economics and tourism are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapters 6: Land Use and Recreation and chapter 10: Socio-Economic respectively. Where appropriate, mitigation measures have also been identified within these chapters to minimise potential impacts.</p>
North Norfolk District Council	<p>In setting out the Council's position a report was produced for discussion by the Council's Cabinet. (A copy of the Cabinet report and draft minutes are attached with this letter) (SEE ATTACHMENT). Cabinet resolved on 05 September 2017 to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Endorse the content of the report as being the Council's formal position and response to the current round of consultation being undertaken in respect of DONG Energy's Hornsea Project Three offshore windfarm development, and</li> <li>2) Re-state the Council's ongoing commitment to discuss and negotiate with DONG Energy to achieve the best outcome for North Norfolk from this major development proposal.</li> <li>3) Seek advice regarding potential health implications to the local community.</li> <li>4) Request that DONG Energy further explore Direct Current transmission arrangements as the proposed development is refined in the coming months</li> </ol> <p>In respect of point 3) above and potential health implications, concerns were expressed that the proposal would involve the laying of cables carrying very high voltages across large areas of the District and, in respect of those cables, questions were asked whether the health implications associated with electromagnetic fields (EMF) along the intended cable route had been fully explored and were understood. The District Council would therefore request assurance from DONG Energy, through submission of appropriate technical reports, that the cables being laid (whether HVAC or HVDC) would not give rise to health risks to nearby residents or other sensitive receptors from EMF or from other effects associated with the transmission of high voltage electricity along buried cables.</p>	I	<p>Environmental Statement, volume 3, annex 3.3: EMF Compliance Statement comprises an assessment of the static and extremely low frequency (ELF) EMFs that will be generated by the Hornsea Project Three onshore transmission infrastructure (cabling), giving maximum predicted field strengths to assess compliance with health protection guidelines for public exposure to EMFs.</p> <p>Annex 3.3 concludes that the maximum magnetic field strength directly above a cable, using worst-case assumptions where required, is also well below the guideline public exposure limits set to protect health. The cables eventually selected for the project will be required to fall within the envelope assessed and meet the prescribed standards and hence will not generate greater EMF.</p> <p>Due to current uncertainty (see volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives), a decision on which transmission system (HVDC or HVAC) to adopt will not be made until post consent after extensive engagement with potential systems suppliers has taken place. As a result of this, we have conducted our assessments based on a realistic worst-case scenario, which could be either HVDC or HVDC technology depending on the receptor.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>63</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
North Norfolk District Council	<p>In respect of point 4) whilst the District Council recognises that DONG Energy may need at this stage to assess the potential of both HVDC and HVAC transmission Council is aware from public comments made through the current public consultation processes in respect of the Hornsea Project Three and other major offshore wind proposals seeking landfall and connections into the National Grid in Norfolk that the public have a strong preference to see HVDC transmission systems adopted. The Council understands that this is because HVDC technology would remove the need for onshore and offshore booster stations to be provided along the route of the export cables between the turbine field and the connection into the National Grid infrastructure, thereby minimising the impact of these developments on communities in North Norfolk once the construction of any cable corridor works were complete. The District Council has therefore prepared its comments on the PIER report based upon the potential of an HVAC transmission system being deployed, but would ask that DONG Energy continue to appraise both options in the hope that the less intrusive HVDC option might be chosen in the final scheme design. Without prejudice to the comments made above, the District Council is carefully following the debate which is taking place over the use by offshore wind development companies of HVAC and HVDC systems and reserves its position in respect of publically lobbying the Government to better understand the difference between the two transmission systems so that the least environmentally damaging option might be taken forward on this and other schemes.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the position outlined above, the District Council values the relationship which has been established with the DONG Energy team in the development of the Hornsea Project Three project proposal over the past 18 months and looks forward to continued dialogue with you in the coming months as the project proposals are refined so as to achieve the best possible outcome for communities in North Norfolk if the proposal receives Development Consent approval through NSIP and the Secretary of State.</p>	I	Due to current uncertainty (see volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives), a decision on which transmission system (HVDC or HVAC) to adopt will not be made until post consent after extensive engagement with potential systems suppliers has taken place. As a result of this, we have conducted our assessments based on a realistic worst-case scenario, which could be either HVDC or HVAC technology depending on the receptor.
<b>Section 42: Persons with an interest in the land (prescribed under section 44 of the Act)</b>			
Christopher Bond, Bidwells, on behalf of Evans-Lombe Trust & Great Melton Farms	<p>Algarsthorpe Farmhouse The original route will cross immediately in front of Algarsthorpe Farmhouse, a substantial eight bedroom property with views overlooking the River Yare Valley. The original route would sever the main access to Algarsthorpe Farmhouse which runs from the Bawburgh/Marlingford Road (approaching from the north). Algarsthorpe Barns, which include a recording studio, are used by the business of [REDACTED], a broadcaster and media producer. Therefore, any disturbance, particularly noise, will make it difficult for this business to function. Algarsthorpe Farm House is used by [REDACTED] for her business as a legal and business affairs consultant in the media; hence the need to reduce any disturbance to the property.</p>	Y	The alternative route proposed and adopted is now to the rear of the property with tree screening between the two. Concerns regarding potential noise impact during works noted. Access to property also noted in relation to potential impact.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>63</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
<p>Christopher Bond, Bidwells, on behalf of Evans-Lombe Trust &amp; Great Melton Farms</p>	<p>Great Melton Farms Christmas Tree Enterprise Great Melton Farms run a substantial Christmas tree business (Norfolk Christmas trees) selling approximately 10,000 trees per annum, both to the wholesale market and through a farm shop situated at Hall Farm, Great Melton. In 2016, 100% of the trees sold were homegrown. The original route will decimate the existing Nordman Fir Christmas tree plantations extending to approximately 20 hectares in total through which it will pass, of which approximately 4 ha being 15,000 trees will be lost due to the works. While it is accepted that some, if not all, of any trees lost could be replaced with brought in trees (approximate cost £378,000 at today's prices), the Great Melton Farms Christmas tree business has been built up over the past 25 years, with its goodwill/reputation based on home produced trees — if quality or the Farm's reputation suffer as a result of imported trees having to be used, damage to the Business' goodwill/reputation would be irreparable. If the original route is adopted, access to the balance of the plantations will be extremely difficult both for maintenance (spraying, etc) and harvesting and extraction which occurs in December.</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>The landowner's concerns were noted and the proposed cable route now avoids Christmas tree plantation.</p>
<p>Jonathan Rush, Brown &amp; Co on behalf of Kelling Estate</p>	<p>Economic Impact</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Estate is run as a commercial operation with enterprises including farming, sporting, property lettings and tourism/recreation.</li> <li>• Installation of the cables on the route will disrupt 6 arable fields and 2 grass fields leading to crop loss and disruption to the rotation of high value root crops.</li> <li>• The arable fields are used for high value root crops such as parsnips and potatoes which command a significant premium income over white straw cereals and oilseed crops.</li> <li>• The Estate benefits from irrigation, in which there has been considerable investment to allow these high value crops to be grown.</li> <li>• Installation of the cables has potential to significantly disrupt soil structure and alter soil temperature profile, thus potentially rendering the land unsuitable for the existing high value cropping profile.</li> <li>• The additional traffic movements through the village that are anticipated because of the road closures when the cables cross the Coast Road and Holgate Hill could result in complaints from occupants of Estate dwellings. This could result in claims for financial recompense and people not being prepared to stay in the Estate properties again.</li> <li>• Sporting activities on the Estate play a vital role in the employment of local staff on the Estate and the conservation of the property. The proposed cable works will significantly disrupt the environment on the eastern side of the Estate, which could jeopardise the effective operation of the sporting ventures during the construction period.</li> <li>• Disrupting the sporting activities has two-fold effect. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o It can damage the reputation of the Estate's sporting business. This can have knock on effects for future commercial operation resulting in negative long-term implications for conservation project and staffing.</li> <li>o It will significantly disrupt the owner's enjoyment of ownership</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Commercial operations, including several small businesses operate from the main complex at Kelling. Disruption to traffic flows in the area and disruption to the overall environment could lead to tenants removing from the main complex.</li> </ul> <p>The following questions arise:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Does DONG consider the economic disruption to the Estate to be less severe than that to other businesses that might be affected by the principle route proposal?</li> <li>2. Has DONG considered the long-term impact on the Estate economic resources over the shorter-term impact on other businesses that might be affected by the principle route proposal?</li> <li>3. How will DONG seek to minimise and mitigate any long and short term economic losses that arise if DONG adopts the route.</li> </ol>	<p>I</p>	<p>Hornsea Three noted Kelling Estate's concerns and addressed the questions as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The proposed alternative route was not proposed or adopted for economic reasons, but due to technical concerns and likely issues with the initially proposed route.</li> <li>2. As above, the proposed route is not based on an assessment of one economic factor above another, but on technical reasons.</li> <li>3. Orsted will pay compensation for any reasonable losses as a result of its works on a proven loss basis, should these losses continue once construction has completed, then claims should continue to be submitted on the basis of the incurred loss with sufficient supporting evidence.</li> </ol>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>63</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co (generic comments)	Generic comments 9: During installation of the cables there will be areas of land and possibly dwellings and buildings that become 'cut off'. o Please confirm that DONG will carry out a survey of all existing access routes and where necessary propose, or receive proposals for, alternative access routes that will be to a suitable standard? Where land is cut off and not viable to farm all lost crops or cropping opportunity must be compensated. Please confirm this?	I	Crossing points of the construction corridor will be provided, where possible and reasonable. Alternative access routes will be considered, if required. Any smaller areas that become unfarmable as a result of the construction corridor will be subject to payment of compensation on receipt of a claim and sufficient supporting evidence.
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co (generic comments)	Generic comments 8: Many fields have services underground including water and electricity supplied o Will full pre-works surveys be carried out to establish the infrastructure that is in place? o Can it be confirmed that any interruption to services and any associated losses incurred, if any, will be compensated at the time?	I	Full utility searches along the corridor have been undertaken, these records will be maintained and updated up to and during construction. Compensation will be paid on a proven loss basis and on receipt of a claim.
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co (generic comments)	Generic comments 10: The proposed corridor crosses areas that have realistic potential for development to alternative uses other than agriculture. Due to the current situation with housing supply shortage in a number of District Councils land that is outside of Settlement Boundaries is successfully being allocated for residential and commercial development o Will an uplift payment be made available where it can be shown that land has a reasonable prospect of being developed during the lifetime of the scheme but has otherwise been sterilised by the scheme? o Has the route of the corridor taken into consideration pre-planning option agreements and development proposals?	I	Should there be any evidence of likely development of land that is intersected by the proposed cable corridor, this should be presented during the negotiation of Heads of Terms for the Option Agreement in order for a development uplift clause to be considered. The cable corridor has taken into account existing development proposals, where this information is available.
Tom Corfield (on behalf of Lady M A Prince-Smith Morton Hall Estate)	vii) Shooting Morton Hall Estate runs a large, successful shoot each season and a number of drives will be affected as a result of the proposal. Compensation will need to be paid to reflect the disruption to the shoot which could be significant. At present there is no reference to shooting within the PEIR and no correspondence has been received as to how this will be dealt with. Clarification is required.	I	Impact to shooting will be mitigated where possible. Details on the shoot and location of the drives has been requested in order for this to be considered sufficiently. Compensation will be payable on a proven loss basis and on receipt of a claim.
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co (generic comments)	Generic comments 8: Many fields have services underground including water and electricity supplied o Will full pre-works surveys be carried out to establish the infrastructure that is in place? o Can it be confirmed that any interruption to services and any associated losses incurred, if any, will be compensated at the time?	I	Full utility searches along the corridor have been undertaken, these records will be maintained and updated up to and during construction. Compensation will be paid on a proven loss basis and on receipt of a claim.
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co (generic comments)	Generic comments 10: The proposed corridor crosses areas that have realistic potential for development to alternative uses other than agriculture. Due to the current situation with housing supply shortage in a number of District Councils land that is outside of Settlement Boundaries is successfully being allocated for residential and commercial development o Will an uplift payment be made available where it can be shown that land has a reasonable prospect of being developed during the lifetime of the scheme but has otherwise been sterilised by the scheme? o Has the route of the corridor taken into consideration pre-planning option agreements and development proposals?	I	Should there be any evidence of likely development of land that is intersected by the proposed cable corridor, this should be presented during the negotiation of Heads of Terms for the Option Agreement in order for a development uplift clause to be considered. The cable corridor has taken into account existing development proposals, where this information is available.



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>63</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co on behalf of Ringland Estate/Ebony Holdings	<p>Farming: The farm land is used to grow a full arable rotation including cereals, legumes, oilseeds and high value root crops, such as parsnips, potatoes and carrots. Disturbance to soil structure will compromise productive capacity and versatility of cropping.</p> <p>a. It is important that DONG carry out full soil surveys prior to entry to enable proper restoration to take place. Such tests should assess (as a minimum):</p> <p>i. Mineral and Nutrient content ii. Soil composition iii. Pathogen content</p> <p>b. Construction works can result in topsoil 'loss' due to compaction and wash. DONG will need to identify potential donor sites for soils of matching quality in advance of carrying out works.</p> <p>c. Disruption to cropping will result in losses in the works year and subsequent years. DONG will be required to compensate for all losses, both direct and indirect, arising from the works.</p> <p>d. Arable land is drained in places with plastic pipe and shingle underdrains. DONG will need to carry out a full pre-works schedule of drainage installations and undertake to repair and alter the schemes as required.</p> <p>e. Irrigation is supplied to the farm via a mains system that is fed from a reservoir located to the West of the proposed corridor. DONG will be required to protect the main from damage and where required provide, or cover the cost of, diverting the main to ensure cropping is not interrupted. Any losses arising from inability to effectively utilise irrigation to be compensated for by DONG.</p> <p>f. Areas of the farmland are occupied by a pig breeding and rearing company which operates a 2-year rotation system to keep land disease free. Unless there is careful planning ahead of proposed works the potential disruption to this enterprise will be significant. It is extremely hard to find replacement land for outdoor pig rearing units due to limited availability of the right soil types and 'clean' soils. DONG will need to liaise with the Estate at least 4 years in advance of planned works to allow for appropriate land use planning.</p> <p>g. The presence of the pig rearing enterprise and other high value root crops means that biosecurity is highly important. DONG will be required to adopt a high level of biosecurity management to ensure the soil health is not compromised.</p>	I	<p>Hornsea Three responded to the following points made by Ringland Estate:</p> <p>a. Soil surveys are not proposed to be undertaken prior to construction.</p> <p>b. Any additional topsoil required to be imported following completion of construction will be done so in liaison with the landowner and be of the appropriate type and condition.</p> <p>c. Compensation will be payable for direct loss or crop or inability to crop and subsequent losses on a proven losses basis and on receipt of a claim.</p> <p>d. An independent land drainage consultant will be appointed in order to consider and design pre and post drainage solutions where required.</p> <p>e. Routes or plans of irrigation systems in place are requested in order for this to be considered accordingly. Compensation will be payable for any losses or disruption on proven loss basis and on receipt of a claim.</p> <p>f. The earliest time that work could commence is 2020. Following award of the DCO, Ørsted will liaise with landowners regarding any update to this programme.</p> <p>g. Bio-security measures already in place for relevant land will be adopted as required.</p>
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co (generic comments)	<p>Generic comments 9: During installation of the cables there will be areas of land and possibly dwellings and buildings that become 'cut off'.</p> <p>o Please confirm that DONG will carry out a survey of all existing access routes and where necessary propose, or receive proposals for, alternative access routes that will be to a suitable standard?</p> <p>Where land is cut off and not viable to farm all lost crops or cropping opportunity must be compensated. Please confirm this?</p>	I	<p>Crossing points of the construction corridor will be provided, where possible and reasonable. Alternative access routes will be considered, if required.</p> <p>Any smaller areas that become unfarmable as a result of the construction corridor will be subject to payment of compensation on receipt of a claim and sufficient supporting evidence.</p>
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co (generic comments)	<p>Generic comments 8: Many fields have services underground including water and electricity supplied</p> <p>o Will full pre-works surveys be carried out to establish the infrastructure that is in place?</p> <p>o Can it be confirmed that any interruption to services and any associated losses incurred, if any, will be compensated at the time?</p>	I	<p>Full utility searches along the corridor have been undertaken, these records will be maintained and updated up to and during construction.</p> <p>Compensation will be paid on a proven loss basis and on receipt of a claim.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>63</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co (generic comments)	<p>Generic comments 10: The proposed corridor crosses areas that have realistic potential for development to alternative uses other than agriculture. Due to the current situation with housing supply shortage in a number of District Councils land that is outside of Settlement Boundaries is successfully being allocated for residential and commercial development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Will an uplift payment be made available where it can be shown that land has a reasonable prospect of being developed during the lifetime of the scheme but has otherwise been sterilised by the scheme?</li> <li>o Has the route of the corridor taken into consideration pre-planning option agreements and development proposals?</li> </ul>	I	Hornsea Three confirmed that should there be any evidence of likely development of land that is intersected by the proposed cable corridor, this should be presented during the negotiation of Heads of Terms for the Option Agreement in order for a development uplift clause to be considered. The cable corridor has taken into account existing development proposals, where this information is available.
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co on behalf of AV Youngs Ltd	<p>Farming: The farm land is used to grow a full arable rotation including cereals, legumes, oilseeds and high value root crops, such as parsnips, potatoes and carrots. Disturbance to soil structure will compromise productive capacity and versatility of crop.</p> <p>a. It is important that DONG carry out full soil surveys prior to entry to enable proper restoration to take place. Such tests should assess (as a minimum):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Mineral and Nutrient content</li> <li>ii. Soil composition</li> <li>iii. Pathogen content</li> </ul> <p>b. Construction works can result in topsoil 'loss' due to compaction and wash. DONG will need to identify potential donor sites for soils of matching quality in advance of carrying out works.</p> <p>c. Disruption to cropping will result in losses in the works year and subsequent years. DONG will be required to compensate for all losses, both direct and indirect, arising from the works.</p> <p>d. A proposal would be to move the cable corridor to that as shown on the inserted plan marked Blue.</p> <p>e. The proposed cable route passes through 3 principle blocks of land.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. The Northern block is circa 16.60 hectares of arable land with a pit in the middle. The route is show as passing to the east of the pit which is a narrow part of the field and adjacent to dwellings. It is suggested that the route is moved to the west side of the pit where there is more room and greater distance from dwellings.</li> <li>ii. The middle block of land is comprised of circa 47 hectares of arable land in 2 enclosures and a small parcel of grassland used for a campsite. The cable route is currently running through the middle of this field and does not even follow a longterm cropping divide in the field. The cable route is also close to, and partly over, the Baconsthorpe Meadows camp site (more detail below). Is it suggested that the cable route is move to the West of the block so it tracks the route of Back Lane. This will reduce the impact the cable has on the farming of the remainder of the land and will reduce impact on the camp site.</li> <li>iii. The southern block of land is a field of arable land extending to 7.7 hectares. The cable route will render this field mostly unusable during the works and the long-term impacts could be disproportionately high as so much of the field will be excavated. If the cable corridor follows the western side on the middle block this parcel could be untouched, particularly if the woodland at the southern end is drilled under.</li> </ul>	Y	<p>Hornsea Three responded to the points raised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Agricultural use of land was noted. Soil surveys are not proposed to be undertaken prior to construction.</li> <li>b. Any additional topsoil that needs to be imported following completion of construction will be done so in liaison with the landowner and be of the appropriate type and condition.</li> <li>c. Compensation will be payable for direct loss of crop or inability to crop and subsequent losses on a proven losses basis and on receipt of a claim.</li> <li>d. Proposed route corridor has now been moved further west in accordance with feedback received.</li> <li>e. Route on farm and potential impact noted, updated route should reduce this impact.</li> </ul>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>63</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co on behalf of AV Youngs Ltd	<p>Tourism and amenity: The proposed cable route will come within 200m of the principle farmstead of Pitt Farm where there are existing dwellings, proposals for creation of more dwellings in the farm buildings and a thriving campsite.</p> <p>a. To the West of Pitt Farm is a thriving campsite known as Baconsthorpe Meadows</p> <p>i. The campsite is open 1st March to 31st October and will expect to receive more than 1000 arrivals during that time.</p> <p>ii. Average stay is 3 nights with some staying up to 14 nights</p> <p>iii. The campsite is profitable and once the current season ends will be entering a phase of considerable development, investment and expansion of service provision.</p> <p>b. The proposed works corridor includes part of the campsite and therefore even if the cables are laid in the further west extremity of the proposed corridor there will be significant disruption to the campsite.</p> <p>c. The campsite is at a vulnerable stage where it must develop a reputation as a "go to" venue in a highly competitive local marketplace.</p> <p>d. Significant disturbance from cable installation works could lead to negative reviews and the campsite gaining a poor reputation.</p> <p>e. DONG will need to take steps to minimise disturbance including, and not limited to:</p> <p>i. Ensuring vehicular access is always available</p> <p>ii. Not disrupting occupants with noise, dust, smell or lights</p> <p>iii. Investigate moving the cable corridor to the western side of the farm</p> <p>iv. Considering restricted working hours and season in this part of the project.</p>	Y	Hornsea Three acknowledged the details regarding the campsite and the potential impact the cable route adjacent to this could have. The cable corridor was amended accordingly.
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co (generic comments)	<p>Generic comments 9: During installation of the cables there will be areas of land and possibly dwellings and buildings that become 'cut off'.</p> <p>o Please confirm that DONG will carry out a survey of all existing access routes and where necessary propose, or receive proposals for, alternative access routes that will be to a suitable standard?</p> <p>Where land is cut off and not viable to farm all lost crops or cropping opportunity must be compensated. Please confirm this?</p>	I	Crossing points of the construction corridor will be provided, where possible and reasonable. Alternative access routes will be considered, if required. Any smaller areas that become unfarmable as a result of the construction corridor will be subject to payment of compensation on receipt of a claim and sufficient supporting evidence.
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co (generic comments)	<p>Generic comments 10: The proposed corridor crosses areas that have realistic potential for development to alternative uses other than agriculture. Due to the current situation with housing supply shortage in a number of District Councils land that is outside of Settlement Boundaries is successfully being allocated for residential and commercial development</p> <p>o Will an uplift payment be made available where it can be shown that land has a reasonable prospect of being developed during the lifetime of the scheme but has otherwise been sterilised by the scheme?</p> <p>o Has the route of the corridor taken into consideration pre-planning option agreements and development proposals?</p>	I	Hornsea Three confirmed that should there be any evidence of likely development of land that is intersected by the proposed cable corridor, this should be presented during the negotiation of Heads of Terms for the Option Agreement in order for a development uplift clause to be considered. The cable corridor has taken into account existing development proposals, where this information is available.
Jonathan Rush, Brown & Co (generic comments)	<p>Generic comments 8: Many fields have services underground including water and electricity supplied</p> <p>o Will full pre-works surveys be carried out to establish the infrastructure that is in place?</p> <p>o Can it be confirmed that any interruption to services and any associated losses incurred, if any, will be compensated at the time?</p>	I	Full utility searches along the corridor have been undertaken, these records will be maintained and updated up to and during construction. Compensation will be paid on a proven loss basis and on receipt of a claim.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>63</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Timewell Properties (Jane Kenny)	The site is very complex and includes various challenges from environmental, infrastructure and commercial points. Her client does not feel suitably informed in order to provide constructive feedback or comments. Requested a meeting with Stuart Livesy and/or other engineers. Provided corrections to points on socio-economics within the PEIR.	Y	1. Meeting on site now not required due to route avoiding land in question. 2. Points regarding socio-economics have been reviewed by Orsted's Environment and Consents teams. Further details are documented in Environmental Statement, volume 3, chapter 10, Socio Economics.
<b>Section 47: Duty to consult local community</b>			
Paul Craske	Weybourne is set in a Conservation area of natural outstanding beauty, and YOU want to come along and disrupt our lives again for up to eleven years! What does the village gain from this.... nothing, we loose the income from holiday makers, which in turn means a loss of income to our already struggling pub and shop, that alone those residents trying to make an income from letting accommodation?	Y	Since the PEIR, a refined landfall location has been identified (western re-route around Kelling) and the area identified for landfall works has reduced. This was informed by a number of factors including community feedback in the area of Kelling and Weybourne, avoidance of the Kelling Heath SSSI/CWS and Holiday Park as well as engineering/technical considerations. Impacts associated with works at the landfall are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3).  Notwithstanding this it is noted that where sensitive receptors are in close proximity to onshore works, the Project will ensure that sensitive construction management measures, such as noise, dust and traffic control are considered. These are documented in an outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), which accompanies the DCO application.  Impacts on tourism are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 10: Socio-Economics.
Michael Horton	I am in favour of the scheme. I have a suggestion to make which I consider ought to be explored. You are going to digging a wide long trench through the Norfolk countryside. Whilst you are doing that, would you consider laying some fibre optic cables to improve the very poor broadband service in large parts of rural Norfolk? I get 1.5Mbits over adsl. We are a fair way away from an Openreach cabinet. Given the amount of digging you will be doing, you might well be able to install cabinets in places where openreach does not currently have them, or offer openreach this facility if you don't want to go into the broadband business.	I	Response is noted, however there are a number of complexities which would be associated with co-locating other cables or assets with the Hornsea Three cables, these are summarised below: - The OFTO owner is unlikely to be comfortable with the activity of laying an additional cable or asset within such close proximity to the Hornsea Three cables due to the extremely high insurance caps which could make the transmission asset unsaleable or jeopardise the business case and increase project risk; - The consent for the installation and operation of any other assets e.g. broadband cables, would need to be obtained by another party (it cannot be obtained as part of the Hornsea Three infrastructure as it has not been stated, consulted on, or incorporated into the Environmental Statement).; and - Finally, the owner/operator of any other assets would be required to source its own agreements with all landowners linearly along the onshore cable corridor route.  On the basis of the above, no such infrastructure is proposed as part of Hornsea Three.
Cllr Graham Everett (District Councillor for Reepham) - Broadland District Council	I wholeheartedly support the Hornsea Three Development and am a firm believer in renewable energy especially with the potential advantage to the end users of lower energy costs, also the great environmental benefits over alternative electricity generation methods.	N	Noted

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>63</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Cllr Graham Everett (District Councillor for Reepham) - Broadland District Council	<p>4) Although in the long term there could be significant benefit to Norfolk residents through cheaper electricity costs it must be remembered that there will be considerable inconvenience during the construction period.</p> <p>I would seek as much financial and commercial benefit as possible to be provided in Norfolk during the construction period with serious consideration being given to the use of the Port of Gt.Yarmouth as a priority over ports in Lincolnshire, accepting that more than one port may be required and used.</p> <p>I would wish to seek assurance that as much employment, use of local services and businesses as possible is provided to the local communities too.</p>	I	<p>We will work with the relevant Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs) and business groups to understand what can be supplied locally. Typically, we also hold supply chain events nearer to the construction phase with principal contractors, and will advertise these events locally. Even at this early stage in the project development, members of the Project team and our contractors will be visiting the area frequently and using local businesses and facilities.</p> <p>We will certainly explore the ability to use port facilities along the East Coast. We are likely to use more than one port during construction, and cannot yet ascertain where we would site an operations and maintenance base. A decision on which port to use will not be made until detailed discussions have taken place with potential suppliers, at a stage where we have a greater understanding of where the various components will come from and port capabilities. This will likely be post consent.</p>
Cllr Graham Everett (District Councillor for Reepham) - Broadland District Council	Having studied both HVAC and HVDC cabling methods I can see benefits and disadvantages with both systems and again I am confident that DONG energy will use whichever system is best suited at the appropriate time, bearing in mind the constant technology changes and advances.	N	Noted
David and Julie Brooks	In conclusion our impression is that this is the wrong area and landfall site to bring in offshore cables from Hornsea 3 and expect an 80 metre cable corridor construction to be implemented without major excessive disruption to local people/traffic/tourist trade/wildlife. This is on an altogether different scale to the Sheringham Shoal project which had a single trench of 2 metres width! Like many other older people we have recently retired to Weybourne to get away from the stresses of urban living and enjoy, in our later years, the peaceful environment of a small village on the coast, with accessible countryside on our doorstep. This would all be shattered if this massive landfall project goes ahead at Weybourne, especially if the eastern route(which is very close to residential areas of Weybourne) were to be used. For all the above reasons it could have a serious impact on our daily lives, and therefore on our health and wellbeing.	Y	Further information pertaining to the landfall location and route selection is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives. Where possible, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts to local residential receptors, either through site selection/route refinement (including taking forwards the alternative route further to the west of Weybourne) or through the identification of suitable mitigation measures. Where there are impacts to residential receptors, these are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3).
David and Julie Brooks	With a major project of this scale there will be unprecedented traffic problems with heavy vehicle movement on the country roads in and out of Weybourne which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and tourists. How will you mitigate these concerns? This appears to be a massive construction undertaking and with HGVs delivering cables, equipment and trucks to offload cables at the cable corridor will mean continual blocked roads and delays.	I	<p>Access routes will be required from the nearby road network at various places along the onshore cable route and at the HVAC substation to access the construction works as well as the various compounds along the route that may be set-up in advance of the cable laying. Vehicle movements will vary depending on their purpose but will include heavy goods vehicles as well as abnormal indivisible loads. However, during construction, temporary haul roads will be installed within the cable corridor to facilitate the movement of construction vehicles to the site and to allow trench excavation to take place. These haul roads will also help minimise interactions with the local road networks.</p> <p>Measures will be implemented to minimise dust, mud and debris associated with the movement of construction vehicles between the compounds and the route, the details of which will be provided in an outline Code of Construction Practice which forms part of the DCO application. Furthermore, prior to the commencement of traffic generating works, a Construction Traffic Management Plan(s) will be agreed with the relevant Local Highway Authority in consultation with the Highways Agency.</p> <p>Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport provides detailed assessment of potential traffic impacts on the local road network including the B1113 and concludes that there would be no significant effect.</p>
David and Julie Brooks	Construction work at the landfall site on Weybourne beach could cause major disruption as it is scheduled to last for 24 months and there will be excessive traffic travelling up and down Beach Lane. According to Annex 7.4 of the PEIR – HGV traffic movements being 600 and non HGV 1,200 movements. This will also impact on local and tourist traffic access to the beach car park and coastal path. Or will this be closed off for 2 years?	Y	Following design refinement, the area identified for landfall works has reduced and the beach lane car park is not under consideration as a construction compound. Further details on the proposed landfall, including access are set out in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description and volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport.



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>63</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
David and Julie Brooks	<p>What will be the effect on house prices in the area as it appears work will be ongoing for about 2 years (or more depending on whether it is a phased project) from Weybourne beach to the A148 , for a wind farm life of 20 years! Perhaps you can supply a detailed project schedule for the work to be carried out between Weybourne beach and the A148.</p> <p>There will be potentially a major effect on local B&amp;Bs/Shop/Pub with a detrimental impact on trade.</p>	I	<p>During the design refinement Hornsea Three has sought to minimise the duration of any disruption, and has reduced the total number of phases from three to two, and reduced the duration of the construction phase onshore from eleven to eight years. A full project construction schedule is available in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description.</p> <p>Potential impacts from Hornsea Three on socio-economic and tourism are identified and assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 10: Socio-Economics. Taking into consideration the mitigation designed into Hornsea Three, no significant adverse effects are predicted.</p>
Ray and Diane Pearce	<p>Whilst we acknowledge that we have had face to face meetings with the Project Manager, Stakeholder Relations Advisor and Project Engineer we still have grave and unprecedented concerns for the future of our home, health and business precipitated by the publication of the PEIR. However, questions relating to the crossing point of the Hornsea Three Project cables with those for Vattenfall's Vanguard and Boreas Projects are primary to our concerns, and, are inadequately addressed in the PEIR. Therefore, our aim with this letter is to have our questions and opinions included as part of the public response. Some of the details have been submitted to Dong Energy previously and some questions remain unanswered by both the PEIR and the project personnel we have met.</p>	I	<p>Noted. Cumulative effects, including those which may arise from Hornsea Three in combination with Norfolk Vanguard have been identified and assessed within the relevant topic chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3).</p> <p>NOTE: Dalcour Maclaren attended a site meeting on 4 August 2017 and feedback to DONG/Orsted all of the comments made at the meeting.</p>
Ray and Diane Pearce	<p><b>Cable Routing:</b> We have discussed this issue with Dong's representatives and National Grid plc but the answers are either elusive or inadequate. The PEIR does not sufficiently explain why the connection point at Walpole was disregarded and the public has been presented with a "fait accompli" regarding the allocated connection point, being at Norwich Main. The allocation of Norwich Main to Hornsea Three would cause the cables to have to cross other projects' cables, namely those of Vattenfall's Vanguard and Boreas projects. We will contest with the Planning Inspectorate that the allocation of connection points under a historic licence by National Grid plc is neither co-ordinated nor adequate for the future development of off-shore windfarms.</p> <p>The PEIR discusses the National Grid connection offer at Volume 1, Chapter 4, 4.8.3. A copy of our email to National Grid regarding the connection point is at Attachment 1 (SEE ATTACHMENT 1); National Grid's reply is at Attachment 2 (SEE ATTACHMENT 2). Consequently, we do not accept that the allocation of Norwich Main is the best and most commercially viable connection point for Hornsea Three. Also, with the aim being to consult and inform the Public, the options have neither been explored nor discussed sufficiently in the PEIR. We contest that Walpole is closer to Hornsea Three than Norwich Main, is, save for a short 6-mile land cable, mainly off-shore and with minimal environmental impact as there is the precedent of Dong Energy's Race Bank Project to routeing cables through the Wash. Therefore, the decision on connection point was made for other reasons not disclosed in the PEIR.</p> <p>As a 'Public Limited Company' National Grid has a vested interest to make a profit for its shareholders. Therefore, as the company will be able to bid for the operating licence of the transmission system from the Hornsea Three Project via the 'OFTO' process, and increase its asset base, it could be argued that the allocation of connection points, with an adverse consequential environmental impact, is made for commerciality and profitability. Connecting to the NETS at Norwich Main, via a 55km trench, 60 metres wide and up to 1.5 metres deep across the Norfolk countryside cannot be less expensive than a marine cable and cannot have less impact on the environment. The PEIR needs to qualify how this decision came about and offer alternatives for the public to consider.</p>	I	<p>Further information regarding the grid connection offer is provided in Environmental Statement, volume 3, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>63</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Ray and Diane Pearce	<p>Property: Our home (Reference 2), is in a unique position with regards to the project as it is situated within 80m of the proposed cable route and, more importantly, adjacent to the position where the Hornsea Three cables cross the Vanguard and Boreas cables. Therefore, in accordance with the PEIR Volume 6 Annex 4.6 regarding the 'Cumulative Effects Assessment', why was our property not included for assessment? The design, engineering and construction of the crossing point has not been considered and should not be underestimated as having a permanent impact on our residential property, Furnished Holiday Let (FHL) business and Bed and Breakfast (B&amp;B) business. The project has already had a 'High Impact' on our property as it has been blighted by the proximity of the plans, and, our business will suffer going forward by being disrupted with a prolonged and intrusive construction phase. The PEIR makes no reference to our situation despite other residences and businesses being individually referenced.</p>	I	The potential for impacts arising as a result of Hornsea Project Three to combine with other planned developments (including the Vattenfall projects) is assessed in each respective topic chapter, under the heading 'Cumulative Effect Assessment'.
Ray and Diane Pearce	<p>Non-Disclosure Agreement: We are aware that Dong Energy and Vattenfall have agreed a commercial NDA which will undoubtedly restrict what can be placed in the public domain. However, this will not be in the best interest of the environment or the residents of Norfolk.</p> <p>We contest that the imposition of a NDA is limiting Dong Energy from providing information on the design engineering of how the cables will cross and interact. Dong's representatives have claimed that they have had: "regular and detailed discussions" with Vattenfall on the crossing issue. Without the imposition of an NDA, these discussions could have, and should have, been made public within the PEIR, as exemplified by Dong's discussions with other inter-related bodies in the Marine Environment report. Therefore, for the on-shore environment, the PEIR is an incomplete and elusive document and we contest that Dong Energy has failed in its duty of care to the Public.</p> <p>We also question why the location and construction of cable bonding pits and their interaction with the environment is not evident in the PEIR.</p>	I	<p>NDA's are standard agreements entered into when two commercial parties initiate discussions on a wide range of issues. The cumulative assessments in the EIA process rely on data which is publicly available and hence the PEIR relied on publicly available information for the Vattenfall Vanguard project which, at that time was limited. More up to date information on the Vanguard project has been incorporated into the final cumulative assessments presented throughout the Environmental Statement.</p> <p>Information regarding proposed crossing methodologies is provided in the Environmental Statement to inform the assessment of potential cumulative effects which is reported in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3).</p> <p>Cable jointing pits will be required along the onshore cable corridor and information is provided in the Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description about the approximate length of cable that would be expected and hence how frequently jointing pits might be required. It is not possible at this point in time to confirm the final locations of these as this will be determined by the eventual cable design and the length of cable that can therefore be transported on each cable drum. Where appropriate, these pits are considered in the Environmental Statement.</p>
Ray and Diane Pearce	<p>Electro-Magnetic Fields (EMFs): (PEIR Reference: Volume 4 Annex 3.3) The EMF issue is difficult, highly technical and open to conjecture. In response to Dong Energy's provision of a set of FAQs, published prior to the PEIR, we asked our questions by email response as at Attachment 3 (SEE ATTACHMENT 3); we still await a detailed written response. Subsequently, we have discussed the figures in the PEIR with the Project Engineer for the Hornsea Three Project, accompanied by an EMF specialist from National Grid plc. Despite the depth of our discussion with the representatives, we still have grave reservations about the amount of exposure we will have to the Extra Low Frequency (ELF) EMFs generated by the Hornsea Three Project cables, with the cumulative effect from the Vanguard and Boreas cables, all passing in proximity to our home. We were advised that the theoretical figures in the PEIR are well within the Government's guidelines and we should not be concerned. However, having reviewed the questions we have previously posed regarding EMFs and having been advised that these would be answered by the PEIR, we contest that the PEIR should have been more comprehensive, informative and detailed. That is, we, as members of the public, should not have to seek information from Dong Energy's representatives when it should have been provided in the consultation documents.</p> <p>Of note is that the PEIR recognises that: "The evidence base for a causal link between ELF EMFs and childhood leukaemia remains inconclusive, as despite extensive research, no plausible mechanism for a weak magnetic field to cause the disease has been established." However, we</p>	I	<p>Environmental Statement, volume 3, annex 3.3: EMF Compliance Statement comprises an assessment of the static and extremely low frequency (ELF) EMFs that will be generated by the Hornsea Project Three onshore transmission infrastructure (cabling), giving maximum predicted field strengths to assess compliance with health protection guidelines for public exposure to EMFs.</p> <p>Annex 3.3 concludes that the maximum magnetic field strength directly above a cable, using worst-case assumptions where required, is also well below the guideline public exposure limits set to protect health. The cables eventually selected for the project will be required to fall within the envelope assessed and meet the prescribed standards and hence will not generate greater EMF.</p> <p>Relevant to this, it is noted that the view of health protection bodies, based on a wide-ranging health evidence base (including studies of reproductive and developmental effects, cardiovascular disease, neurodegenerative disorders, the immune system, and genotoxic effects), is that low-frequency EMF is not a cause of health risks and that the guideline exposure standards in place (based on well-established effects on the body) are appropriate to protect health.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>63</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>reiterate, there are studies where there is a “plausible mechanism” for a “causal link between ELF EMF’s” and developing cell damage as per the study at Reference 3; causal link is therefore plausible and we refute the argument.</p> <p>In our email (SEE ATTACHMENT 3) we established that the NRPB, the EU’s SCENHIR and the ICNIRP call for further research of EMFs effects on humans (of a “High Priority” study in the EU’s case) to be carried out to establish exposure guidelines and limitations by scientific experiment. Therefore, without further research we could still, potentially, be exposed to a higher than safe level of magnetic radiation, especially where the cables are planned to cross. The PEIR supports this argument at Annex 3.3 Para 1.2.2.16 where it is stated that:  “... the evidence examined remains inconclusive: some evidence of a possible increase in childhood leukaemia risk at long-term magnetic field exposure, in the order of 0.3–0.4 <math>\mu</math>T, continues to support the IARC classification of ELF EMFs as a possible carcinogen (e.g. (Kheifets, 2010) (Schüz, 2011) (Sermage- Faure, et al., 2013) (Zhao, et al., 2014)), but again evidence of a causal relationship or a mechanism to explain causation has not been established.”  Therefore, it is important even from the PEIR evidence that Dong Energy answers the following questions which we have repeatedly asked:  1. At what distance away from the Hornsea 3 cable trench, with cables buried at 1.2 metres and carrying 2.4 GW of power, will the measured magnetic field strength be equal to 0.4 <math>\mu</math>T?  2. What will be the cumulative EMF where Dong’s cables and the Vattenfall cables cross?  3. What would be the cumulative effect of HVDC cables’ EMF with the Earth’s local static field in a North to South or East to West orientation?  4. What will be the multiplying effect on the EMF of having both cable trenches, as per current plans, either side of our property (i.e. with our residence at the centre of any residual field)?  5. What is your reference document for the effects of an aligned EMF from the crossing of cables carrying 2.4 GW and 3.6 GW with a potential combined cumulative field strength of up to 6 GW of power?</p> <p>Quantifiably, 6 GW of power is sufficient to power approximately 5 million homes which is around 18% of the UK’s demand. However, this will uniquely be transmitted in proximity to private residences with this amount of power potentially flowing through where the cables cross. What is not made clear in the PEIR is that the distance between each cable is critical to the cumulative effect of the EMF from each cable and that EMF’s can be reduced by phase shifting the current in each cable to reduce the magnetic field effects.</p> <p>The DECC Code of Practice is a ‘Voluntary Code of Practice’ which means it holds no legal substance. Should Dong Energy install a transmission system that ‘theoretically’ meets the “voluntary guidelines” but, in practice, the measured field strengths exceed them, how would we, as members of the public, be able to challenge the developer? By way of example, the cladding on Grenfell Tower was installed with the installers and the developers following a “Voluntary Code of Practice” but the cladding was the likely cause of grievous harm and death. Furthermore, the Code of Practice requires the developer to provide: “A calculation or measurement of the maximum fields directly above the cable.” That is a ‘calculation’ and not just a list of figures which are not open to scrutiny. The mathematical constant for the magnetic permeability used in the calculation has not been provided and the PEIR is elusive as to how the provided figures were calculated. Therefore, the PEIR should describe the calculation by way of a worked example. The PEIR concludes that: “... it is considered that the levels of EMFs from the proposed development would be well below the guideline public exposure reference levels set to protect health.” However, without the specific design of the cable crossing point and a study of the interaction between both the Hornsea Three cables and those from Vanguard and Boreas this can neither be concluded nor supposed. Similarly, Dong Energy’s representatives maintain that: “... given the margin in the PEIR assessment for compliance with UK policy on EMFs, it is expected</p>		

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>63</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>that any cumulative impacts with the Vattenfall cables will fall well within recommended guideline levels." Again, when dealing with a potential public health issue nothing should be 'expected' and the PEIR should provide the firm evidence by research for the project's impact on the environment, especially for an environment which human beings could be forced to chronically endure. In conclusion to the EMF issue, the PEIR lacks any detail or acknowledgement for the effect of magnetic fields at the crossing point of the Hornsea Three, Vanguard and Boreas cables. The theoretical figures provided are not open to scrutiny. The argument that there is insufficient evidence to support any possible danger to public health is fundamentally flawed as exemplified by research not provided by the developer. The 'Code of Practice' is voluntary and therefore not necessarily legally binding. We reiterate that: where there is doubt, and importantly, lack of scientific evidence to support the argument, the Definitions of Precautionary Principle should be invoked. Within the principle, the World Commission on the Ethics of Scientific Knowledge and Technology under the auspices of UNESCO (amongst other World and European bodies) states: "When human activities may lead to morally unacceptable harm that is scientifically plausible but uncertain, actions shall be taken to avoid or diminish that harm ..." and goes onto say that: "The judgement of plausibility should be grounded in scientific analysis." Therefore, planning to create a potentially harmful environment, without plausible scientific research and analysis, could be deemed to be unethical and we will continue to challenge Dong Energy on this principle.</p>		
Marguerite Russel	<p><b>Comments on PEIR</b> - No - This is not an area I have knowledge of and nothing to compare it with. If the recent experiences with construction of the NDR and the total chaos this has caused is repeated then North Norfolk will come to a halt again, business's will suffer and tourists will avoid us. This would be a disaster.</p>	I	Impacts on socio-economic and tourism are addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 10: Socio-Economics.
David Young (NNDC Councillor)	<p><b>Refine 80m corridor</b> - Consider need for compensation to tourist businesses. If 3rd alternative route via Kelling is chosen, it will likely impact the Old Reasing-Room Gallery and Tea Room. An extended construction period would also have serious effects on holiday lets in the area.</p>	I	Impacts to socio-economics and tourism are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 10: Socio-Economics.
David Young (NNDC Councillor)	<p><b>Temporary construction</b> - See 8 regarding traffic - need to use A149 only. Landfall compound should not prevent access along the beach and coastal views east and west. Norfolk coastal path is a major tourist amenity. If 3rd route via Kelling is used, location of compound further west would be possible (theoretically) which would distance compound and works from housing. Effect on Muckleburgh tourism likely to be less than for 'eco' tourists.</p>	I	<p>Since the PEIR, a refined cable route near to landfall has been chosen (western re-route around Kelling) and the area identified for landfall works has reduced. This was informed by a number of factors including community feedback in the area of Kelling and Weybourne, avoidance of the Kelling Heath SSSI/CWS and Holiday Park as well as engineering/technical considerations. Where the onshore cable corridor crossed public rights of way, Hornsea Three has sought to avoid impacts through the use of HDD technology. Where this has not been possible and thus open cut, or HDD with a haul road over, is proposed, the routes will be temporarily diverted along existing tracks, for a maximum of one month per cable. In respect to beach access, a Beach Access Management Plan will be developed in consultation with, and agreed with Norfolk County Council. This Plan would include management measures to be put in place on the beach at either side of the construction working areas to guide walkers along the diverted coastal path, and would also set out the measures to be followed for the reinstatement of the coastal path following the completion of construction works. Information on these temporary changes to the route of the coastal path would be posted in the beach side car park to the north of Weybourne, together with general information of the construction activities.</p> <p>Impacts on Hornsea Three on tourism are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 10: Socio-Economics.</p>



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>63</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
David Young (NNDC Councillor)	<b>Mitigation Methods</b> - The effect on residents, wildlife and the local tourist economy requires the disruption to be kept to an absolute minimum. This is only compatible with a single phase operation, not a 2 or 3 phase operation over up to 11 years. If multi-phase, construct all possible TJBs in one go at outset to reduce effect of disruption/duration.	I	Following design refinement, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise the duration of any disruption during construction, reducing the total duration of the construction phase onshore to eight years in a maximum of two phases. Within this, the maximum duration for construction of the onshore cable corridor is approximately 2.5 years, this therefore means that the maximum duration over which construction of the onshore cable corridor could occur would be 5.5 years incorporating two phases (assuming a three-year gap between the two phases).  Hornsea Three has designed the project to avoid or minimise impacts on residents, wildlife and tourism. Specific measures are identified in the relevant topic chapters of the volume 3 of the Environmental Statement.
Philip Capon	<b>Further Comments</b> - Strongly in favour of renewable energy. Use of local businesses where possible.	N	Noted. We will work with the relevant Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs) and business groups to understand what can be supplied locally. Typically, we also hold supply chain events nearer to the construction phase with principal contractors, and will advertise these events locally.
Janet Curtis	<b>Local Matters Landfall Zone</b> - The area relies heavily on tourism, and use of the car park, obstruction of the coast path etc. would be extremely detrimental	Y	Impacts on tourism are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 10: Socio-Economics. The use of the car park is not proposed by the project and footpath diversions would be put in place at the coast as opposed to shutting this, as detailed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 6: Land Use and Recreation
David Henley	<b>Landfall Zone</b> - Considerable disruption to the holiday business in the area	I	Impacts on socio-economic and tourism are addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 10: Socio-Economics.
David Henley	<b>Temporary Construction</b> - Access to Beach road car park. Will the public still be able to walk and fish?	Y	Potential impacts to land use and recreation are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 6: Land Use and Recreation. Since the PEIR, a refined landfall location has been identified (western re-route around Kelling) and the area identified for landfall works has reduced. This was informed by a number of factors including community feedback in the area of Kelling and Weybourne, avoidance of the Kelling Heath SSSI/CWS and Holiday Park as well as engineering/technical considerations. Further details are provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives.
Patricia Dodge (Weybourne Village Hall)	<b>Landfall Zone</b> - The area is of special scientific interest and also a tourist area. It is important to keep the impact to a minimum as roads are narrow and winding particularly through the village and along the Coast Road.	I	Through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive designated sites. For example, Weybourne Cliffs and Kelling Heath SSSI have been avoided and no direct impacts are predicted on these designated sites from Hornsea Three.  Impacts on socio-economics and tourism are assessed within Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 10: Socio-economics.
Patricia Dodge (Weybourne Village Hall)	<b>Landfall Zone Local Matters</b> - The car park and Beach Road are used extensively by the public and regular walkers as part of the Norfolk coastal path. Station Road bridge is old and narrow and there are tight double bends in Holt Road and the coast road by the church	Y	The beach road car park is not under consideration as a construction compound. Furthermore it is noted that, since the PEIR, a refined landfall location has been identified (western re-route around Kelling) and the area identified for landfall works has reduced. This was informed by a number of factors including community feedback in the area of Kelling and Weybourne, avoidance of the Kelling Heath SSSI/CWS and Holiday Park as well as engineering/technical considerations. Further details are provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives.
Patricia Dodge (Weybourne Village Hall)	<b>Cable Corridor</b> - Concern for the holiday chalets to the west of the Maltings Hotel	I	Impacts on socio-economics and tourism are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 10: Socio-Economics.



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>63</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Dawn Moore	<b>Local Matters Landfall</b> - I was led to understand following the consultation that Beach lane is not going to be used. I expect this is still to be the case as otherwise it will affect tourism and businesses on that route	Y	Following design refinement, the area identified for landfall works has reduced and the beach lane car park is not under consideration as a construction compound. Further details on the proposed landfall, including access are set out in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description and volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport.
Valerie Stubbs	<b>Export Cable</b> - I am concerned about the impact on the seabed wildlife. This is also an important area for the local fishing industry, especially the crab/lobster boats that fish out of Weybourne, as the fact that this is still a working fishing village gives the village much of its character, as well as providing a living for local people.	I	Thank you for your comment. Please see in the Environmental Statement, volume 2, chapter 6 (Commercial Fisheries) where the impact assessment considers the level of impact to specific fisheries (including crab) activities and fleets.
Elaine Parkinson	<b>Offshore Array</b> - Minimise the visual impact from the coast line. Removal of building waste and debris. Impact on local livelihoods e.g. fishing	I	A site waste management plan forms part of the DCO application and sets out Hornsea Three's approach to waste management.  Impacts on socio-economics are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 10: Socio-Economics. In the Environmental Statement, section 6.11 of volume 2, chapter 6 (Commercial Fisheries) the impact assessment considers the level of impact to specific fisheries activities and fleets
Mark Cook	<b>Cable Corridor</b> - I think the corridor around the villages Weybourne and Kelling will have a big impact on the environment and landscape. This would be very serious for tourism, there are a number of small hotels and B+B's which rely on holiday makers. Once the project has started I believe it will discourage people from visiting this area and they will be unlikely to return. This effect will also be felt in the nearby market towns of Holt and Sheringham.	I	Potential impacts from Hornsea Three on socio-economic and tourism are identified and assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 10: Socio-Economics. Taking into consideration the mitigation designed into Hornsea Three, no significant adverse effects are predicted.
Mark Cook	<b>Proposal</b> - I think this whole proposal is flawed, it will have an untold effect on a rural area. North Norfolk relies heavily on tourism and this project in my opinion will damage this. People just will not visit the area, it will effect pubs, hotels. There won't be the visitors to Holt and Sheringham and many of the small shops will struggle. The building of the onshore booster station will create a noise issue to Edgefield and Little Barningham and Plumstead also. House prices will be knocked and the quality of life in these rural areas just won't be the same, at the moment it is a very peaceful area.	I	During the design refinement Hornsea Three has sought to minimise the duration of any disruption, and has reduced the total number of phases from three to two, and reduced the duration of the construction phase onshore from eleven to eight years.  Potential impacts from Hornsea Three on socio-economic and tourism are identified and assessed in Environmental Statement Volume 3, Chapter 10: Socio-Economics. Taking into consideration the mitigation designed into Hornsea Three, no significant adverse effects are predicted.
Mark Cook	<b>Further Comments</b> - I think that the serious issue of the effect of tourism needs looking at and how it will effect Holt and Sheringham. The impact this will have on Weybourne and Kelling and also the sites of SSSI and the wildlife.	I	It is noted that, since the PEIR, a refined landfall location has been identified (western re-route around Kelling) and the area identified for landfall works has reduced. This was informed by a number of factors including community feedback in the area of Kelling and Weybourne, avoidance of the Kelling Heath SSSI/CWS and Holiday Park as well as engineering/technical considerations.  Where impacts on tourism remain, these are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 10: Socio-Economics.
Neil Buxton	<b>Proposal</b> - Selecting Weybourne as the site for landfall is completely unacceptable. No work done or understanding how long term work with impact on the community. Inadequate infrastructure to allow HGVs to access the proposed construction site. No thought given to compensation for local business and residents. No economic gain for the locality e.g. long term jobs. Impact on the environment in an AONB	I	Impacts to socio-economics and tourism are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 10: Socio-Economics. In respect to compensation, we will compensate landowners who are directly affected by the cable through their land. Compensation is paid for the freehold depreciation of the land affected by the easement and for all reasonable and substantiated losses arising from construction of the project.  Impacts on the environment and the AONB are assessed within the topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3).

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>63</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Neil Buxton	<b>Local Matters Landfall Zone</b> - Transportation of cable into Weybourne - the road infrastructure is completely inadequate. Access to the beach and Norfolk coastal path. Lots of parking for visitors. Impact on the local economy.	I	Impacts relating to access are addressed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport. It is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this forms part of the DCO application.
Neil Buxton	<b>Further Comments</b> - I think the consultation will not take into account the views of individuals, I expect you will plough on with this development whatever local people say. I heard nothing at the consultation event to convince me otherwise. In fact there were many contradictory statements made by DONG staff on the day. No appropriate work done on the local environment or economic impact.	I	The community consultation events, as well as the wider Statutory Consultation presented an opportunity for members of the local community to view the latest plans, to speak directly with members of the project team where individuals required further clarity, and to comment on our proposal at a given stage. All the feedback received at and after the events has been carefully considered by the Project and will be incorporated where possible into the final design. A summary of this process is provided in the Consultation Report which forms part of the DCO application.
Neil Buxton	<b>Landfall</b> - I am extremely concerned about this. Weybourne is small quiet village in a AONB. The works proposed it will cause disruption for years and impact on business and residents. Proposed work over an 11 year period is unacceptable.	Y	Since the PEIR, a refined landfall location has been identified (western re-route around Kelling) and the area identified for landfall works has reduced. This was informed by a number of factors including community feedback in the area of Kelling and Weybourne, avoidance of the Kelling Heath SSSI/CWS and Holiday Park as well as engineering/technical considerations.  Where possible and practicable the cable corridor route selected seeks to avoid passing adjacent to properties. This is to reduce impacts associated with construction disturbance and to seek to minimise conflicts such as Heavy Goods Vehicle (HGV) traffic movements. However, it is not possible to avoid passing in close proximity to all properties on the route. Where properties are located in close proximity, the Project will ensure that sensitive construction management measures, such as noise, dust and traffic control are considered. These are documented in an outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), which accompanies the DCO application.  During the design refinement Hornsea Three has sought to minimise the duration of any disruption, and has reduced the total duration of the construction phase onshore to eight years. Impacts on socio-economics are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 10: Socio-Economics.
Neil Buxton	<b>EIA</b> - No real work done on the impact of local communities. I didn't see or hear anything at the consultation to offer any reassurance.	I	Impacts on local communities and residents are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3) and in particular in chapter 10: Socio-Economics.
Neil Buxton	<b>Mitigation Methods</b> - You have done nothing which takes into account the impact on small communities. The surveys and assessments undertaken are all very general and far too vague	I	The Hornsea Three EIA has employed a maximum design scenario approach, which reflects the Rochdale Envelope approach. By identifying, and assessing based on the maximum design scenario, it can therefore be concluded that the all issues have been addressed and any impacts will be no greater for any other design scenario. The full details of the EIA methodology are set out in Volume 1, chapter 5: EIA Methodology.  Impacts on local communities and residents are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3) and in particular in chapter 10: Socio-Economics.
John Mangan	<b>Offshore Array</b> - I would definitely support/favour/recommend that the UK manufactured equipment be sourced as far as possible. This is a huge project in the high tech engineering sector which is an area that Britain is particularly good at. As a UK tax pay, ultimately I will be paying for it. No comment on the location, other than praise for offshore windfarms - far more sensible in every way	I	We will work with the relevant Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs) and business groups to understand what can be supplied locally. Typically, we also hold supply chain events nearer to the construction phase with principal contractors, and will advertise these events locally. Even at this early stage in the project development, members of the Project team and our contractors will be visiting the area frequently and using local businesses and facilities.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>63</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
John Mangan	<b>Export Cable</b> - As above for the supply of materials. Re the routing - the undersea corridor I have no issue with but would wish to express concern over the choice of landfall as it is particularly reliant on tourism and the routing cuts straight through it. I would require a guarantee that the disturbance will be made good the status quo that exists at the moment	I	Environmental Statement, volume 3, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives sets out the process of identifying a grid connection location and associated landfall locations. In addition to the grid connection point, which informed the landfall location, as well as a suite of other considerations including technical feasibility and environmental constraints.  It is noted that, since the PEIR, a refined landfall location has been identified (western re-route around Kelling) and the area identified for landfall works has reduced. This was informed by a number of factors including community feedback in the area of Kelling and Weybourne, avoidance of the Kelling Heath SSSI/CWS and Holiday Park as well as engineering/technical considerations.  Impacts on socio-economics and tourism are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 10: Socio-Economics.
John Aisthorpe	I hope to hear from you shortly regarding my concerns and hope that you can ease my concerns, regarding my business and those of our 100+ holiday home owners.	I	Responses are provided to individual points. In respect to impacts on tourism and socio-economics, these are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 10: Socio-Economics.
Simon Clarke	<b>Offshore Export Cable Corridor</b> - I am worried about the impact on marine life, especially the local crab fishing industry	I	Thank you for your comment. Please see in the Environmental Statement, section 6.11 of volume 2, chapter 6 (Commercial Fisheries) where the impact assessment considers the level of impact to specific fisheries (including crab) activities and fleets
Graham & Susan Mette	<b>Support</b> - However Weybourne village will be seriously affected. Walkers, holiday makers, retired residents will all have to live with the long period of works, noise, traffic, etc etc. The village needs to be compensated, and residents immediately affected need to be compensated, and businesses need to be compensated. In particular the important crab/lobster industry. Personally, I need some assurances about protection from flood and maybe a combination of installing flood protection would be helpful.	I	Potential impacts from Hornsea Three on socio-economic and recreational receptors are identified and assessed in Environmental Statement Volume 3, Chapter 10: Socio-Economics and chapter 6: Land Use and Recreation respectively. Hornsea Project Three will review the interactions of the project, as the proposal is refined and consider an appropriate way to feed benefits back into the local community. However, any decision to establish a community benefit fund for Hornsea Three would be made post financial investment decision (FID).  In respect to flooding, appropriate mitigation measures have been designed-in to Hornsea Three to minimise impacts on drainage and flooding. Details are provided in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 2: Hydrology and Flood Risk (see Table 2.17). The Flood Risk Assessment which has been undertaken for the Project concludes that Hornsea Three meets the requirements of NPS EN-1 and the NPPF.
<b>Section 48: Duty to publicise</b>			
Douglas Walters (Norfolk Geographical Association)	<b>Offshore Array</b> - They seem quite a long way offshore but if this provides more local jobs and cheaper electricity - I think this is a good idea	I	Impacts on socio-economics, in particular job creation, are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 10: Socio-Economics.
Douglas Walters (Norfolk Geographical Association)	<b>Further Comments</b> - Just I hope it provides a boost to the local economy: in terms of jobs, improved skills and long term cheaper local energy. In general I think it is a good idea. Just have more days in Norwich for the consultation - 3/4 days for local people that couldn't make it today	I	Impacts on socio-economics, in particular job creation, are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 10: Socio-Economics.
Douglas Walters (Norfolk Geographical Association)	<b>Landfall zone</b> - I think it is a good location and hopefully will provide more jobs and an economic benefit for North Norfolk	I	Noted. Impacts on socio-economics, in particular job creation, are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 10: Socio-Economics.
Douglas Walters (Norfolk Geographical Association)	<b>HVAC Booster Station</b> - The booster location near Corpusty seems a good location - it will hopefully have initial impact on surrounding developments. Hopefully it will also provide local jobs - in construction and also in use	I	The HVAC booster station will be located at Little Barningham. The site selection process which has informed this decision is summarised in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives. Impacts on socio-economics (including job creation) associated with the HVAC booster station are outline in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 10: Socio-Economics.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>63</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Douglas Walters (Norfolk Geographical Association)	<b>Onshore Substation</b> - I think having an onshore substation near the Norwich main grid substation is a good idea. Again hopefully it will provide local jobs in its construction and maintenance. It seems a good location for it - slightly outside Norwich and the southern bypass.	I	Socio-Economic impacts associated with the onshore HVDC converter/HVAC substation are assessed within Environmental Statement, volume 3, chapter 10: Socio-economics.
Douglas Walters (Norfolk Geographical Association)	<b>Temporary Construction</b> - At Oulton it makes sense to have a construction compound on part of an old airfield. The other locations at Salle and Weston Longville look good and sites - away from big populations. Hopefully these won't be too much disturbance to local residents. Also again hopefully they will provide local jobs in their construction.	Y	The Main construction compound proposed near Weston Longville has not been taken forward to the application. The main construction compound for the project will be located at Oulton Airfield, accessed off the B1149.  Impacts relating to job creation are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 10: Socio-Economics.
George Carman, Geodirect Resources P/L	<b>Proposal</b> - Opposed on grounds of incomplete information and potential impact of operations of fragile North Norfolk rural landscape and direct impact on family amenity (residential (depreciation in property value), commercial, pasture, equine, arable, sporting amenity, camping and further 'unforeseen' uses in the future).	I	Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including landscapes, sensitive ecological receptors and land uses. Impacts which have been identified are assessed within the relevant topic chapter of the Environmental Statement (volume 3).

Table 3.30: Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Further Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.B) relating to socio-economics

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>64</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 42: Prescribed consultees (The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009: Schedule 1))</b>			
Estelle Hook, Norfolk Coast Partnership	The current 2014-19 Norfolk Coast AONB Management Plan has a Policy (PC5) to 'Support the development of renewable energy in the area in ways and locations that contribute to the area's local economy and jobs and maintain its natural beauty.' However, the National Planning Policy Framework emphasises that the impact of a proposed development is an important consideration, including the cumulative landscape and visual impacts. It states that 'Great weight should be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, which have the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty'. As renewable energy schemes, and particularly large wind power schemes, can have a highly significant impact on the natural beauty of the landscape, we approach each project on an individual basis.	N	Noted, see previous response.
Estelle Hook, Norfolk Coast Partnership	This area is important for tourism, with visitors valuing its natural wilderness and tranquillity, and all efforts should be made to minimise the visual impact and disruption of construction and operation.	I	Through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive ecological receptors. Impacts to socio-economics and tourism are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 10: Socio-Economics.
Estelle Hook, Norfolk Coast Partnership	Community The longshore economy is important to the Norfolk Coast Partnership and we suggest that any impacts on the local fishing industry, either those who are based at Weybourne itself or those who fish in the area affected by construction, is minimised.	I	The potential for impact from the construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning of Hornsea Three on commercial fisheries is considered in section 6.11 of volume 2, chapter 6: Commercial Fisheries.  As part of built in mitigation, Hornsea Three are committed to developing a fisheries co-existence and liaison plan, which would be produced in collaboration with the NFFO and other fisheries representatives.

<sup>64</sup> Y = Yes change made; N = No change made; I = Incorporated into or considered when producing the assessment or landowner voluntary agreement offer; N/A = Not applicable.



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>64</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Estelle Hook, Norfolk Coast Partnership	We recommend use of local products, suppliers and contractors and hope that this is maintained through-out the project life.	N	We will work with the relevant Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs) and business groups to understand what can be supplied locally. Typically, we also hold supply chain events nearer to the construction phase with principal contractors, and will advertise these events locally. Even at this early stage in the project development, members of the Project team and our contractors will be visiting the area frequently and using local businesses and facilities.
Estelle Hook, Norfolk Coast Partnership	We suggest that the wider community and landscape should benefit from the project and we note that Orsted has implemented community funding schemes in other areas, including an area at the western end of the Norfolk Coast AONB.	N	We have established voluntary Community Benefit Funds (CBFs) for a number of our projects, which are currently under construction. These funds can make a valuable contribution to the local area, by supporting projects such as community building improvements and recreation facilities, conservation and wildlife projects etc. Hornsea Project Three will review the interactions of the project, as the proposal is refined and consider an appropriate way to feed benefits back into the local community. Any decision to establish a community benefit fund for Hornsea Three would be made post financial investment decision (FID).
Estelle Hook, Norfolk Coast Partnership	We are interested in forming good, collaborative relationships with the businesses in our area and would welcome working with Orsted to deliver benefits to local communities and the local environment. We believe that we could provide a valuable local link, with on-the-ground knowledge and a history of effective partnership working across a wide range of interests. We could explore: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Orsted sponsorship of specific Norfolk Coast Partnership projects in the AONB (including the work in the Weybourne area and focussed on the pond and Spring Beck)</li> <li>• An Orsted/AONB grant scheme</li> <li>• An Orsted contribution to, or sponsorship of, our very successful and longstanding Sustainable Development Fund grants scheme (<a href="http://www.norfolkcoastaonb.org.uk/partnership/sustainable-development-fund/437">http://www.norfolkcoastaonb.org.uk/partnership/sustainable-development-fund/437</a>)</li> </ul>	N	Hornsea Project Three will review the interactions of the project, as the proposal is refined and consider an appropriate way to feed benefits back into the local community. However, any decision to establish a community benefit fund or other links to the local community in respect to Hornsea Three would be made post financial investment decision (FID).
Estelle Hook, Norfolk Coast Partnership	In addition, we recognise a very important gap relating to local children and young people, who do not receive information about the environmental importance of their local area or the opportunities available to them for a career in the environment sector. Some initial ideas for filling that gap include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An education programme for local schools, teaching children about their local environment and also about the value of Norfolk's protected landscapes. This could be combined with other topics, such as renewable energy.</li> <li>• An apprenticeship scheme, allowing local young people to gain experience in the environment sector. This could be combined with other topics, such as renewable energy.</li> <li>• An undergraduate/graduate scheme helping students to learn about the Norfolk environment and go on to gain their first jobs in the area/sector.</li> </ul>	N	Hornsea Project Three will review the interactions of the project, as the proposal is refined and consider an appropriate way to feed benefits back into the local community. However, any decision to establish a community benefit fund or other links to the local community in respect to Hornsea Three would be made post financial investment decision (FID).
<b>Section 42: Local Authorities (prescribed under section 43 of the Act)</b>			
No comments were received from the local authorities relating to socio-economics under Phase 2.B.			



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>64</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 42: Persons with an interest in the land (prescribed under section 44 of the Act)</b>			
Rullion Real Estate Ltd on behalf of Crusaders RFC, Little Melton	<p>1. Grounds for response</p> <p>We would suggest that amendments be made to your proposals to bypass the club completely, rendering it unaffected by your proposals.</p> <p>RFC is a community sports facility that has been in existence for 57 years. It is the freehold owner of this site, as shown in the attachment. It caters for various levels of age and ability, from senior club rugby, to girls rugby, youth teams and minis. The club serves around 350 local members, the vast majority being children from the age of 6 upwards, and has been expanding steadily year on year recently. To absorb this the club has plans to physically expand, with a planning application for extension of the clubhouse imminent, as well as plans to improve the overall playing facilities through the installation of a new drainage system to its main training pitch. Outside of the rugby season the club is used for youth cricket.</p> <p>The proposed impact of the ground works/ underground export cables poses a serious concern for the club, which utilises the facility 12 months a year, every year. Your plans show land required across both senior playing pitches, as well as the Mini's training pitch, which would rendering them unplayable, with no capacity onsite to re-provide an alternative.</p> <p>Even if the proposed works were to be carried out during the Rugby off-season, the pitches would not have sufficient time to re-surface sufficiently to enable safe play. The club does not want to consider a relocation, either temporarily or permanently. This would prove difficult logistically, would be at a significant cost to the club, and would likely have a negative impact on membership/ annual income. All work completed on growth initiatives to date, time spent on fundraising, clubhouse expansion, and pitch improvement would be rendered abortive.</p> <p>We would be happy to arrange for an inspection/ viewing of the facility and to open a dialogue with you on this matter.</p> <p>[Image included in response see original online]</p>	Y	Crusaders RFC was originally included within the proposed 80m wide cable corridor and would have clipped the northern part of the land ownership. However, it has now been deliberately clipped out of the scheme (by virtue of creating a pinch-point down to approx. 60m) to avoid the impacts noted here.
Ray & Diane Pearce	<p>3. The design, engineering and construction of the crossing point, with up to 54 cables carrying a total of 6 GW of power (1.8 GW for Vanguard, 1.8 GW for Boreas and 2.4 GW for Hornsea Three) was not adequately considered in either project's PEIR. We assert that the combined impact of the proposed plans should not be underestimated as having a permanent impact on our residential property, FHL and B&amp;B business. The project has already had a high impact on our property as its value has fallen. We have therefore been 'blighted' by the proximity of the planned cable routes; our businesses and our income will suffer going forward. We have raised these issues, amongst others, with Hornsea Three by letter and formal response to the PEIR. A copy of DONG (now Ørsted) Energy's reply to our issues is, for the record, at Attachment 2.</p>	I	<p>Impacts to socio-economics and tourism are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 10: Socio-Economics.</p> <p>Where properties are located in close proximity, the Project will ensure that sensitive construction management measures, such as noise, dust and traffic control are considered. These are documented in an outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), which accompanies the DCO application, and seek to minimise potential impacts on local businesses and residents.</p>
Ray & Diane Pearce	<p>15. The unique situation of our property, home, income and health in relation to the Hornsea Three project have not been taken into account, even with the opportunity offered by a 'Further Statutory Consultation.' Despite numerous discussions and correspondence on the very pertinent issues of EMFs and the disruption to our living environment, there are no references or mitigations in evidence. The impact and scale of the cable crossing point, with the Vanguard and Boreas project cables, has been understated in all respects by the project's documentation.</p>	I	Noted, responses provided in individual comments in relation to EMF, disruption impacts and cumulative impacts with Vanguard.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>64</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Ray & Diane Pearce	<p>16. As evidenced above, there is no transparency between the Vanguard and Hornsea Three projects and no details for the Public to scrutinise due to the imposition of a commercial NDA. The lack of detail regarding the cable crossing point is a failure of the Hornsea Three Project Team's duty of care and we would therefore expect a further statutory consultation process to be agreed to fill in the details prior to the EIA, or indeed DCO. We contest that the project is in a rush to meet the next CFD auction before the cost for the project becomes commercially unviable. We assert that it is cost alone which is driving the project with a consequential disregard for the detrimental impact the project will have on the Norfolk countryside and the people who currently enjoy its peaceful nature. The further consultation has done nothing to allay our concerns and has increased the uncertainty for our future.</p> <p>Attachments: - See FULL response on DECA 1. Maps of proposed cable crossing point. 2. DONG Energy Letter dated 12 October 2017. 3. Hornsea Three PEIR Figure 3.22.</p>	I	Noted, responses provided in individual comments in relation to EMF, disruption impacts and cumulative impacts with Vanguard.
<b>Section 47: Duty to consult local community</b>			
Councillor Jo Coplestone, Broadland District Council	<p>Secondly I would like to see an economic benefit to Norfolk. At your consultation I was told that the proposed offshore windfarm would be equidistant from both Humberside and Gt Yarmouth ports. I therefore ask that you should use Gt Yarmouth as your principle port in preference to Humberside. I understand that the Vattenfall Vanguard Project will be using the port of Gt Yarmouth and around 150 skill jobs will be created, I would like your project to also deliver a significant number of skilled jobs to Norfolk and where possible to employ local contractors.</p>	I	<p>Noted. We will work with the relevant Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs) and business groups to understand what can be supplied locally. Typically, we also hold supply chain events nearer to the construction phase with principal contractors, and will advertise these events locally.</p> <p>We will certainly explore the ability to use port facilities along the East Coast. We are likely to use more than one port during construction, and cannot yet ascertain where we would site an operations and maintenance base. A decision on which port to use will not be made until detailed discussions have taken place with potential suppliers, at a stage where we have a greater understanding of where the various components will come from and port capabilities. This will likely be post consent.</p>
Councillor Jo Coplestone, Broadland District Council	<p>Thirdly I believe Orsted should be engaging with schools and colleges in Norfolk, we now have a new University Technical College in Norwich which specialises in engineering, this college has 'business partners' within the local economy who engage &amp; encourage students and young adults into highly skilled engineering/science based jobs. I think that a large proportion of the Orsted community benefit fund should be used as an 'education legacy' over the next couple of decades to invest in young people locally, and I would like to know how this could be delivered.</p>	N	<p>Hornsea Project Three will review the interactions of the project, as the proposal is refined and consider an appropriate way to feed benefits back into the local community. However, any decision to establish a community benefit fund or other links to the local community in respect to Hornsea Three would be made post financial investment decision (FID).</p>
Dale Heaton	<p>As somebody who lives in Mulbarton (which is near to the on shore grid connection) my comments are; 1 Many who come to Norfolk are looking for an isolated country idyll. As someone breed and born here, this does not exist. Norfolk is a busy active industrialised area whether that be manufacturing industry, service companies or farming.</p>	N	<p>Through the design development process, Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including landscapes and sensitive ecological receptors. Additional mitigation measures which have been designed-into the project are outlined in topic specific chapters, and include the use of trenchless technologies to avoid or minimise impacts on local road networks, ecological receptors (e.g. hedgerows) and hydrological features (e.g. main rivers). Where impacts remain, these are reported in the relevant topic chapters of the Environmental Statement volume 3.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>64</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Mervyn and Maureen Bibb	Route 2 - we are vehemently opposed. The 80 metre corridor would run immediately adjacent to the gardens of 1, 3 and 4 Church Farm Barns, which are used regularly by all three resident families, including eight children and seven grandchildren (11 years and under). In addition to the disruption caused during construction, and while recognising that the proximity of the planned installation falls within current guidelines, it is not inconceivable that there may be some deleterious biological/developmental effect of long term exposure to low levels of electromagnetic radiation (we also note that Ørsted has not yet complied with the request of Little Melton Parish Council to respond to the proposal by George Strong that the company has markedly under-estimated the extent of the resulting electromagnetic field). Given these uncertainties, we believe that it is irresponsible to consider installing multiple high voltage cables in such close proximity to residences, particularly those with so many young children, when there is a viable alternative (Route 3). Moreover, although we understand that Ørsted is not aware of any detrimental impact of the installation of high voltage cables on the market value of properties located in close proximity, the company has not provided any evidence to support this view. Given that such installations have been in existence for some time, we believe that it is incumbent on the company to provide the data to support their contention. It is not acceptable to simply say that it is not aware of a negative impact on property prices. While there may be no logical reason for such an installation to have a detrimental effect on the market value of nearby residential property, public perception does not always follow logic.	Y	This option has not been taken forward by Hornsea Three based on community feedback, as well as technical and environmental constraints including for example, close proximity to Listed Buildings. Further information is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives.
<b>Section 48: Duty to publicise</b>			
<i>No comments were received in response to the Public Notice relating to socio-economics under Phase 2.B.</i>			

### 3.12 Inter-related onshore

Table 3.31: Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.A) relating to inter-related onshore

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>65</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 42: Prescribed consultees (The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009: Schedule 1))</b>			
Natural England	<p>1.38 Vol. 3 Chapter 11 Table 11.3 Geology, hydrology, ecology and nature conservation topics have been included in the table that lists 'PEIR topics excluded from further inter-related effects assessment'. The only two receptor groups brought forward for inter-related impacts assessment are: 1) 'closest long-term receptors - people living at dwellings within 350 m of construction activities', and 2) 'closest intermittent receptors - people using PProWs'. We challenge this approach in the light of insufficient data that has been presented in relevant geology, hydrology and ecology chapters. We advise that onshore inter-related effects are re-assessed for the final application once fit for purpose evidence is available.</p>	I	The relationship between geology, hydrology and nature conservation is considered in the Hydrological Characterisation Note, which forms Environmental Statement volume 6, annex 2.4. Interaction between ground and surface water is considered in volume 3, chapter 1: Geology and Ground Conditions and chapter 2: Hydrology and Flood Risk, and effects on ecological receptors affected by changes in surface water quality are considered in chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation.
<b>Section 42: Local Authorities (prescribed under section 43 of the Act)</b>			
<i>No comments were received from the local authorities relating to inter-related onshore under Phase 2.A.</i>			
<b>Section 42: Persons with an interest in the land (prescribed under section 44 of the Act)</b>			
Jane Kenny, Savills (general comments)	<p>Cumulative Effect Assessment – CEA's have been addressed in the PEIR, however the detail is exceedingly broad and there is no mention about Vattenfall Boreas project.</p>	I	Potential impacts from Hornsea Three on socio-economic and tourism are identified and assessed in Environmental Statement Volume 3, Chapter 10: Socio-Economics. Taking into consideration the mitigation designed into Hornsea Three, no significant adverse effects are predicted.
<b>Section 47: Duty to consult local community</b>			

<sup>65</sup> Y = Yes change made; N = No change made; I = Incorporated into or considered when producing the assessment or landowner voluntary agreement offer; N/A = Not applicable.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>65</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Ray & Diane Pearce	<p>Not with standing the above, either, in your rush to submit the PEIR without addressing all the environmental issues, or, in a deliberate attempt to mislead, you have omitted the very crucial information regarding your project's interaction and "inter-relationship" regarding Vattenfall's Vanguard and Boreas projects; this is information you are dutifully and legally required to provide. We draw your attention to the Planning Inspectorates directive, as follows:</p> <p>"... the Overarching NPS [National Policy Statement] for Energy (EN-1) paragraph 4.2.5 states that "When considering cumulative effects, the ES [Energy Supplier] should provide information on how the effects of the applicant's proposal would combine and interact with the effects of other development (including projects for which consent has been sought or granted, as well as those already in existence)".</p>	I	<p>For any significant environmental impacts, cumulative assessments are undertaken where the impacts that result from incremental changes caused by other past, present or reasonably foreseeable actions together with the project in question could lead to a significant impact. When combined, cumulative EMF sources do not create incremental changes i.e. two equal EMF sources do not double the field strength, rather peak EMFs in effect over lay on one another. Therefore, the combination of Hornsea Project Three with any other EMF source does not result in an incremental change and therefore combined it is forecast to continue to be well below established standards.</p> <p>Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 11: Inter-related effects of the PEIR provides an assessment of the likely effects should the same type of impact affect the same receptor group during each of the three key project phases (i.e. construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning), and therefore have the potential to combine and result in an overall effect of greater significance. It also provides an assessment of the likely effects should multiple impact types occur on the same receptor group (e.g. noise and landscape and visual impacts may affect the same residential properties); impacts may individually be considered insignificant, but when considered together, could amount to a significant cumulative effect. The potential for impacts arising as a result of Hornsea Project Three to combine with other planned developments (including the Vattenfall projects) is assessed in each respective topic chapter, under the heading 'Cumulative Effect Assessment'. In relation to geology and ground conditions, the cumulative effect assessment is therefore included in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 1, section 1.12.</p>



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>65</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Friends of North Norfolk	<p>17. PEIR Volume 3, which deals with onshore impacts. We have great concerns that the additional cables, very large offshore and onshore Reactive Compensation Installations and works which would be required if HVAC Transmission is used would have a major adverse impact on very sensitive Receptors taken cumulatively with other major developments, either recently completed or proposed. Both the Dudgeon and Sheringham Shoal Wind Farms make landfall at Weybourne; and if HVAC Transmission is utilised it will mean more and very much greater works over a prolonged period both to the East and West affecting a key part of the Norfolk Coast AONB, Norfolk Heritage Coast and the Norfolk/ English National Trail.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Chapter 4 Landscape and Visual Resources.</li> <li>- Chapter 5 Historic Environment.</li> <li>- Chapter 6 Land Use and Recreation.</li> <li>- Chapter 8 Noise and Vibration.</li> <li>- Chapter 11 Inter Related Effects.</li> </ul>	I	<p>An assessment of impacts on the AONB is presented in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources. To inform this process, Hornsea Three has consulted with the Norfolk Coast Partnership, as well as local authorities, in regard to the identification of suitable viewpoints within the AONB.</p> <p>Where the onshore cable corridor crossed public rights of way, Hornsea Three has sought to avoid impacts through the use of HDD technology. Where this has not been possible and thus open cut, or HDD with a haul road over, is proposed, the routes will be temporarily diverted along existing tracks, for a maximum of one month per cable. Following the completion of the construction works all areas of access land, recreational resources, PRoWs and other linear routes affected by the onshore works would be re-instated to their current condition and/or along their current alignments. There would be no physical effects on these resources arising from the operation or maintenance of Hornsea Three. The measures to be taken to ensure the continued use of all linear recreational resources during the construction phase of the project have been discussed with Norfolk County Council and are set out in the Outline CoCP. This dialogue will continue during the detailed design process. The assessment of impacts on individual public rights of way (where appropriate) are set out in Environmental Statement, volume 3, chapter 6: Land Use and Recreation.</p> <p>Following the completion of the construction works all areas of access land, recreational resources, PRoWs and other linear routes affected by the onshore works would be re-instated to their current condition and/or along their current alignments. There would be no physical effects on these resources arising from the operation or maintenance of Hornsea Three. The measures to be taken to ensure the continued use of all linear recreational resources during the construction phase of the project have been discussed with Norfolk County Council and are set out in the Outline CoCP. This dialogue will continue during the detailed design process.</p> <p>The potential for cumulative effects as a result Hornsea Three in combination with other major developments is assessed in each of the topic chapters of the Environmental Statement (see volume 3).</p>
Dr. William Brian Ankers (on behalf of Yvette Gibson)	<p>Volume 3 - Onshore Chapters, Chapter 11: Inter-related Effects (Onshore), page 22, para 11.9.1.3 reports "Due to concurrent multiple activities, the construction phase presents the most likely opportunity for effects combining on occupiers of the nearest dwellings. During the construction phase there could potentially be properties within 300 m of trenchless installation (HDD) locations which could experience moderate noise effects and major visual effects, both being significant. These temporary significant effects could combine with concurrent negligible and minor traffic effects and other noise and visual effects."</p> <p>Clearly the serious concerns regarding the adverse impact of noise at the Pond Hills site in my representation of March 2017 in Section 15 were fully justified.</p>	I	<p>An updated assessment of Inter-related effects, which takes into consideration the mitigation committed to by Hornsea Three is provided in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 11: Inter-related Effects. This is informed by the assessments contained within the topic specific chapters of Environmental Statement volume 3, including chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport, and chapter 8: Noise and Vibration.</p>
Ray and Diane Pearce	<p>Whilst we acknowledge that we have had face to face meetings with the Project Manager, Stakeholder Relations Advisor and Project Engineer we still have grave and unprecedented concerns for the future of our home, health and business precipitated by the publication of the PEIR. However, questions relating to the crossing point of the Hornsea Three Project cables with those for Vattenfall's Vanguard and Boreas Projects are primary to our concerns, and, are inadequately addressed in the PEIR. Therefore, our aim with this letter is to have our questions and opinions included as part of the public response. Some of the details have been submitted to Dong Energy previously and some questions remain unanswered by both the PEIR and the project personnel we have met.</p>	I	<p>Noted. Cumulative effects, including those which may arise from Hornsea Three in combination with Norfolk Vanguard have been identified and assessed within the relevant topic chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3).</p> <p>NOTE: Dalcour Maclaren attended a site meeting on 4 August 2017 and fed back to DONG/Orsted all of the comments made at the meeting.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>65</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Ray and Diane Pearce	<p>Conclusion:</p> <p>The PEIR for the Hornsea Three Project is an incomplete and flawed document. The allocation of the connection point for the developer to connect to the UK NETS is arbitrary and has been left to another 'for profit' company, namely National Grid plc, to make a nationally important decision which has far reaching consequences and dubious commercial intent. There is a lack of detail and discussion surrounding how and why it is necessary for two competing projects to cross their transmission systems. Most importantly, the PEIR gives no consideration for any cumulative effects, interrelated effects, or, more importantly, any environmental impact for the cable crossing point. We implore the Planning Inspectorate to reconsider and co-ordinate the routing of off-shore wind farm transmission cables before rural Norfolk is subjected to a prolonged, damaging and disruptive programme of cable laying by successive developers intent on profiteering from permissive legislation.</p>	I	<p>Environmental Statement, volume 3, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives sets out the process of identifying a grid connection location. The aim of the grid connection option appraisal was to identify the most economic and efficient design option for the connection of a project. Although both National Grid and Orsted input into the appraisal process (in respect to economic and strategic factors), the eventual grid connection offer is determined by National Grid. In May 2016, Hornsea Three was formally offered a grid connection at Norwich Main Substation as a result of this appraisal process.</p> <p>Volume 3, Chapter 11: Inter-related effects of the Environmental Statement provides an assessment of the likely effects should the same type of impact affect the same receptor group during each of the three key project phases (i.e. construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning), and therefore have the potential to combine and result in an overall effect of greater significance. It also provides an assessment of the likely effects should multiple impact types occur on the same receptor group (e.g. noise and landscape and visual impacts may affect the same residential properties); impacts may individually be considered insignificant, but when considered together, could amount to a significant cumulative effect. The potential for impacts arising as a result of Hornsea Project Three to combine with other planned developments (including the Vattenfall projects) is assessed in each respective topic chapter, under the heading 'Cumulative Effect Assessment'.</p>
Ray and Diane Pearce	<p>Cross Referencing:</p> <p>The cross referencing and detail within the PEIR document is misleading and fundamentally flawed. For instance, PEIR Volume 3, Chapter 1 - 1.14.1.2 states that: "A description of the likely inter-related effects arising from Hornsea Three geology and ground conditions is provided in volume 3, chapter 12: Inter-Related Effects (onshore)" ... but there is no chapter 12 and the onshore inter-related effects in chapter 11 do not mention Vanguard or Boreas.</p> <p>In PEIR Volume 3, Chapter 1, Table 1.3 (Page 7), as a result of the Scoping Opinion Dong Energy was directed by the Planning Inspectorate - as follows:</p> <p>"Careful consideration should be given to the potential for overlapping cable corridors with the Norfolk Vanguard offshore wind farm and any resultant cumulative impacts."</p> <p>Your response in the PEIR to the issue raised is as follows:</p> <p>"Cumulative impacts are discussed in section 1.12."</p> <p>However, there is no mention in Section 1.12 of the PEIR, whatsoever, of the "...overlapping cable corridors..." despite having been specifically directed by the Planning Inspectorate to take it into "careful consideration".</p>	I	<p>Errors in cross referencing have been corrected within the Environmental Statement.</p> <p>As noted in previous comments relating to cumulative effects vs. inter-related effects, Volume 3, Chapter 11: Inter-related effects of the Environmental Statement provides an assessment of the likely effects should the same type of impact affect the same receptor group during each of the three key project phases (i.e. construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning), and therefore have the potential to combine and result in an overall effect of greater significance. It also provides an assessment of the likely effects should multiple impact types occur on the same receptor group (e.g. noise and landscape and visual impacts may affect the same residential properties); impacts may individually be considered insignificant, but when considered together, could amount to a significant cumulative effect. The potential for impacts arising as a result of Hornsea Project Three to combine with other planned developments (including the Vattenfall projects) is assessed in each respective topic chapter, under the heading 'Cumulative Effect Assessment'.</p>
Ray and Diane Pearce	<p>Electro-Magnetic Fields (EMFs):</p> <p>(PEIR Reference: Volume 4 Annex 3.3)</p> <p>The EMF issue is difficult, highly technical and open to conjecture. In response to Dong Energy's provision of a set of FAQs, published prior to the PIER, we asked our questions by email response as at Attachment 3 (SEE ATTACHMENT 3); we still await a detailed written response. Subsequently, we have discussed the figures in the PEIR with the Project Engineer for the Hornsea Three Project, accompanied by an EMF specialist from National Grid plc.</p> <p>Despite the depth of our discussion with the representatives, we still have grave reservations about the amount of exposure we will have to the Extra Low Frequency (ELF) EMFs generated by the Hornsea Three Project cables, with the cumulative effect from the Vanguard and Boreas cables, all passing in proximity to our home. We were advised that the theoretical figures in the</p>	I	<p>Environmental Statement, volume 3, annex 3.3: EMF Compliance Statement comprises an assessment of the static and extremely low frequency (ELF) EMFs that will be generated by the Hornsea Project Three onshore transmission infrastructure (cabling), giving maximum predicted field strengths to assess compliance with health protection guidelines for public exposure to EMFs.</p> <p>Annex 3.3 concludes that the maximum magnetic field strength directly above a cable, using worst-case assumptions where required, is also well below the guideline public exposure limits set to protect health. The cables eventually selected for the project will be required to fall within the envelope assessed and meet the prescribed standards and hence will not generate greater EMF.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>65</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>PEIR are well within the Government's guidelines and we should not be concerned. However, having reviewed the questions we have previously posed regarding EMFs and having been advised that these would be answered by the PEIR, we contest that the PEIR should have been more comprehensive, informative and detailed. That is, we, as members of the public, should not have to seek information from Dong Energy's representatives when it should have been provided in the consultation documents.</p> <p>Of note is that the PEIR recognises that: "The evidence base for a causal link between ELF EMFs and childhood leukaemia remains inconclusive, as despite extensive research, no plausible mechanism for a weak magnetic field to cause the disease has been established." However, we reiterate, there are studies where there is a "plausible mechanism" for a "causal link between ELF EMF's" and developing cell damage as per the study at Reference 3; causal link is therefore plausible and we refute the argument.</p> <p>In our email (SEE ATTACHMENT 3) we established that the NRPB, the EU's SCENHIR and the ICNRIP call for further research of EMFs effects on humans (of a "High Priority" study in the EU's case) to be carried out to establish exposure guidelines and limitations by scientific experiment. Therefore, without further research we could still, potentially, be exposed to a higher than safe level of magnetic radiation, especially where the cables are planned to cross. The PEIR supports this argument at Annex 3.3 Para 1.2.2.16 where it is stated that:</p> <p>"... the evidence examined remains inconclusive: some evidence of a possible increase in childhood leukaemia risk at long-term magnetic field exposure, in the order of 0.3–0.4 <math>\mu</math>T, continues to support the IARC classification of ELF EMFs as a possible carcinogen (e.g. (Kheifets, 2010) (Schüz, 2011) (Sermage- Faure, et al., 2013) (Zhao, et al., 2014)), but again evidence of a causal relationship or a mechanism to explain causation has not been established."</p> <p>Therefore, it is important even from the PEIR evidence that Dong Energy answers the following questions which we have repeatedly asked:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. At what distance away from the Hornsea 3 cable trench, with cables buried at 1.2 metres and carrying 2.4 GW of power, will the measured magnetic field strength be equal to 0.4 <math>\mu</math>T?</li> <li>2. What will be the cumulative EMF where Dong's cables and the Vattenfall cables cross?</li> <li>3. What would be the cumulative effect of HVDC cables' EMF with the Earth's local static field in a North to South or East to West orientation?</li> <li>4. What will be the multiplying effect on the EMF of having both cable trenches, as per current plans, either side of our property (i.e. with our residence at the centre of any residual field)?</li> <li>5. What is your reference document for the effects of an aligned EMF from the crossing of cables carrying 2.4 GW and 3.6 GW with a potential combined cumulative field strength of up to 6 GW of power?</li> </ol> <p>Quantifiably, 6 GW of power is sufficient to power approximately 5 million homes which is around 18% of the UK's demand. However, this will uniquely be transmitted in proximity to private residences with this amount of power potentially flowing through where the cables cross. What is not made clear in the PEIR is that the distance between each cable is critical to the cumulative effect of the EMF from each cable and that EMF's can be reduced by phase shifting the current in each cable to reduce the magnetic field effects.</p> <p>The DECC Code of Practice is a 'Voluntary Code of Practice' which means it holds no legal substance. Should Dong Energy install a transmission system that 'theoretically' meets the</p>		<p>Relevant to this, it is noted that the view of health protection bodies, based on a wide-ranging health evidence base (including studies of reproductive and developmental effects, cardiovascular disease, neurodegenerative disorders, the immune system, and genotoxic effects), is that low-frequency EMF is not a cause of health risks and that the guideline exposure standards in place (based on well-established effects on the body) are appropriate to protect health.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>65</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>“voluntary guidelines” but, in practice, the measured field strengths exceed them, how would we, as members of the public, be able to challenge the developer? By way of example, the cladding on Grenfell Tower was installed with the installers and the developers following a “Voluntary Code of Practice” but the cladding was the likely cause of grievous harm and death. Furthermore, the Code of Practice requires the developer to provide: “A calculation or measurement of the maximum fields directly above the cable.” That is a ‘calculation’ and not just a list of figures which are not open to scrutiny. The mathematical constant for the magnetic permeability used in the calculation has not been provided and the PEIR is elusive as to how the provided figures were calculated. Therefore, the PEIR should describe the calculation by way of a worked example.</p> <p>The PEIR concludes that: “... it is considered that the levels of EMFs from the proposed development would be well below the guideline public exposure reference levels set to protect health.” However, without the specific design of the cable crossing point and a study of the interaction between both the Hornsea Three cables and those from Vanguard and Boreas this can neither be concluded nor supposed. Similarly, Dong Energy’s representatives maintain that: “... given the margin in the PEIR assessment for compliance with UK policy on EMFs, it is expected that any cumulative impacts with the Vattenfall cables will fall well within recommended guideline levels.” Again, when dealing with a potential public health issue nothing should be ‘expected’ and the PEIR should provide the firm evidence by research for the project’s impact on the environment, especially for an environment which human beings could be forced to chronically endure.</p> <p>In conclusion to the EMF issue, the PEIR lacks any detail or acknowledgement for the effect of magnetic fields at the crossing point of the Hornsea Three, Vanguard and Boreas cables. The theoretical figures provided are not open to scrutiny. The argument that there is insufficient evidence to support any possible danger to public health is fundamentally flawed as exemplified by research not provided by the developer. The ‘Code of Practice’ is voluntary and therefore not necessarily legally binding. We reiterate that: where there is doubt, and importantly, lack of scientific evidence to support the argument, the Definitions of Precautionary Principle should be invoked. Within the principle, the World Commission on the Ethics of Scientific Knowledge and Technology under the auspices of UNESCO (amongst other World and European bodies) states: “When human activities may lead to morally unacceptable harm that is scientifically plausible but uncertain, actions shall be taken to avoid or diminish that harm ...” and goes onto say that: “The judgement of plausibility should be grounded in scientific analysis.” Therefore, planning to create a potentially harmful environment, without plausible scientific research and analysis, could be deemed to be unethical and we will continue to challenge Dong Energy on this principle.</p>		
<p><b>Section 48: Duty to publicise</b></p>			
<p><i>No comments were received in response to the Public Notice relating to inter-related onshore under Phase 2.A.</i></p>			



Table 3.32: Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Further Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.B) relating to inter-related onshore

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>66</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 42: Prescribed consultees (The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009: Schedule 1))</b>			
<i>No comments were received from the prescribed consultees relating to inter-related onshore under Phase 2.B.</i>			
<b>Section 42: Local Authorities (prescribed under section 43 of the Act)</b>			
<i>No comments were received from the local authorities relating to inter-related onshore under Phase 2.B.</i>			
<b>Section 42: Persons with an interest in the land (prescribed under section 44 of the Act)</b>			
Ray & Diane Pearce	<p>9. There is nowhere in either Norfolk Vanguard's or Hornsea Three's PEIRs detailing how the cable crossing point will be constructed. It is important for the EIA as there will be a significant difference for the environment (worse case HVAC) if there are 36 cables from Vanguard and Boreas buried deeper than the 18 from Hornsea Three, of vice-versa. Whilst we accept that HDD could be deployed, neither project has any indication of utilising HDD at the crossing point. Indeed, the imposition of a commercial Non-Disclosure Agreement (NDA) on the discussions between the Norfolk Vanguard Project and Hornsea Project Three displays a degree of deceit as there is no transparency for the design of the cable crossing point. Therefore, importantly, it is questionable as to what other information has been hidden from the Public or excluded from the EIA process?</p> <p>Inter-related Effects "Inter-related effects are those which may occur as a result of impacts associated only with Hornsea Three which have the potential to combine to create impacts of a greater significance (e.g. those which occur at each key phase of the project, construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning).</p>	I	<p>Information relating to the construction methodology which may be applied at a crossing point is set out in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description.</p> <p>NDAs are standard agreements entered into when two commercial parties initiate discussions on a wide range of issues. In relation to the cumulative assessments, these are based on publicly available information as outlined in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 5: EIA Methodology. This is to ensure that the information presented is based on that assessed by the developer of the relevant project as opposed to each developer trying to re-assess impacts from another project. At the time of production of the PEIRs for each project, there was limited information available about the other's development and hence only limited information could be included within the PEIR cumulative assessments. For Hornsea Three, the assessments in the Environmental Statement have been updated to take account of the latest publicly available information for Norfolk Vanguard which is currently the PEIR for that project.</p>
Ray & Diane Pearce	<p>10. Within the definition of the project's 'inter-related effects' above, positioning the main construction compound within 20m of our boundary for an indeterminate period but certainly during the construction phase, the increased use of the B1145 from the central main construction compound for the duration of the construction phase and the yet to be disclosed engineering and construction of the crossing point during the construction phase would, in our humble opinion, constitute a combined impact of greater significance. Indeed, there is an "inter-related effect" at this consultation stage; our property has been blighted and way of life has already been impacted. The impacts the project will have, for the current published plan, without mitigation, on our property are significant and it is astonishing that the project team refuses to recognise the significance or address any of the issues.</p> <p>Cumulative Effects "Cumulative effects comprise the combined effects generated from Hornsea Three with other planned developments (including the Vattenfall projects)".</p>	I	<p>Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 11: Inter-related effects (and corresponding chapter in the PEIR) provides an assessment of the likely effects should the same type of impact affect the same receptor group during each of the three key project phases (i.e. construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning), and therefore have the potential to combine and result in an overall effect of greater significance. It also provides an assessment of the likely effects should multiple impact types occur on the same receptor group (e.g. noise and landscape and visual impacts may affect the same residential properties); impacts may individually be considered insignificant, but when considered together, could amount to a significant cumulative effect.</p>
<b>Section 47: Duty to consult local community</b>			
<i>No comments were received from the local community relating to inter-related onshore under Phase 2.B.</i>			

<sup>66</sup> Y = Yes change made; N = No change made; I = Incorporated into or considered when producing the assessment or landowner voluntary agreement offer; N/A = Not applicable.



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>66</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 48: Duty to publicise</b>			
<i>No comments were received in response to the Public Notice relating to inter-related onshore under Phase 2.B.</i>			

### 3.13 Landowner Related

Table 3.33: Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.A) relating to landowner queries

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>67</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 42: Prescribed consultees (The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009: Schedule 1))</b>			
<b>Section 42: Local Authorities (prescribed under section 43 of the Act)</b>			
<b>Section 42: Persons with an interest in the land (prescribed under section 44 of the Act)</b>			
Jane Kenny, Savills (general comments)	Cumulative Effect Assessment – CEA's have been addressed in the PEIR, however the detail is exceedingly broad and there is no mention about Vattenfall Boreas project.	I	Potential impacts from Hornsea Three on socio-economic and tourism are identified and assessed in Environmental Statement Volume 3, Chapter 10: Socio-Economics. Taking into consideration the mitigation designed into Hornsea Three, no significant adverse effects are predicted.
<b>Section 47: Duty to consult local community</b>			
Ray & Diane Pearce	Notwithstanding the above, either, in your rush to submit the PEIR without addressing all the environmental issues, or, in a deliberate attempt to mislead, you have omitted the very crucial information regarding your project's interaction and "inter-relationship" regarding Vattenfall's Vanguard and Boreas projects; this is information you are dutifully and legally required to provide. We draw your attention to the Planning Inspectorates directive, as follows: "... the Overarching NPS [National Policy Statement] for Energy (EN-1) paragraph 4.2.5 states that "When considering cumulative effects, the ES [Energy Supplier] should provide information on how the effects of the applicant's proposal would combine and interact with the effects of other development (including projects for which consent has been sought or granted, as well as those already in existence)"."	I	For any significant environmental impacts, cumulative assessments are undertaken where the impacts that result from incremental changes caused by other past, present or reasonably foreseeable actions together with the project in question could lead to a significant impact. When combined, cumulative EMF sources do not create incremental changes i.e. two equal EMF sources do not double the field strength, rather peak EMFs in effect overlay on one another. Therefore, the combination of Hornsea Project Three with any other EMF source does not result in an incremental change and therefore combined it is forecast to continue to be well below established standards.  Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 11: Inter-related effects of the PEIR provides an assessment of the likely effects should the same type of impact affect the same receptor group during each of the three key project phases (i.e. construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning), and therefore have the potential to combine and result in an overall effect of greater significance. It also provides an assessment of the likely effects should multiple impact types occur on the same receptor group (e.g. noise and landscape and visual impacts may affect the same residential properties); impacts may individually be considered insignificant, but when considered together, could amount to a significant cumulative effect. The potential for impacts arising as a result of Hornsea Project Three to combine with other planned developments (including the Vattenfall projects) is assessed in each respective topic chapter, under the heading 'Cumulative Effect Assessment'. In relation to geology and ground conditions, the cumulative effect assessment is therefore included in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 1, section 1.12.

<sup>67</sup> Y = Yes change made; N = No change made; I = Incorporated into or considered when producing the assessment or landowner voluntary agreement offer; N/A = Not applicable.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>67</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Friends of North Norfolk	<p>17. PEIR Volume 3, which deals with onshore impacts. We have great concerns that the additional cables, very large offshore and onshore Reactive Compensation Installations and works which would be required if HVAC Transmission is used would have a major adverse impact on very sensitive Receptors taken cumulatively with other major developments, either recently completed or proposed. Both the Dudgeon and Sheringham Shoal Wind Farms make landfall at Weybourne; and if HVAC Transmission is utilised it will mean more and very much greater works over a prolonged period both to the East and West affecting a key part of the Norfolk Coast AONB, Norfolk Heritage Coast and the Norfolk/ English National Trail.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Chapter 4 Landscape and Visual Resources.</li> <li>- Chapter 5 Historic Environment.</li> <li>- Chapter 6 Land Use and Recreation.</li> <li>- Chapter 8 Noise and Vibration.</li> <li>- Chapter 11 Inter Related Effects.</li> </ul>	I	<p>An assessment of impacts on the AONB is presented in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources. To inform this process, Hornsea Three has consulted with the Norfolk Coast Partnership, as well as local authorities, in regard to the identification of suitable viewpoints within the AONB.</p> <p>Where the onshore cable corridor crossed public rights of way, Hornsea Three has sought to avoid impacts through the use of HDD technology. Where this has not been possible and thus open cut, or HDD with a haul road over, is proposed, the routes will be temporarily diverted along existing tracks, for a maximum of one month per cable. Following the completion of the construction works all areas of access land, recreational resources, PRoWs and other linear routes affected by the onshore works would be re-instated to their current condition and/or along their current alignments. There would be no physical effects on these resources arising from the operation or maintenance of Hornsea Three. The measures to be taken to ensure the continued use of all linear recreational resources during the construction phase of the project have been discussed with Norfolk County Council and are set out in the Outline CoCP. This dialogue will continue during the detailed design process. The assessment of impacts on individual public rights of way (where appropriate) are set out in Environmental Statement, volume 3, chapter 6: Land Use and Recreation.</p> <p>Following the completion of the construction works all areas of access land, recreational resources, PRoWs and other linear routes affected by the onshore works would be re-instated to their current condition and/or along their current alignments. There would be no physical effects on these resources arising from the operation or maintenance of Hornsea Three. The measures to be taken to ensure the continued use of all linear recreational resources during the construction phase of the project have been discussed with Norfolk County Council and are set out in the Outline CoCP. This dialogue will continue during the detailed design process.</p> <p>The potential for cumulative effects as a result Hornsea Three in combination with other major developments is assessed in each of the topic chapters of the Environmental Statement (see volume 3).</p>
Dr. William Brian Ankers (on behalf of Yvette Gibson)	<p>Volume 3 - Onshore Chapters, Chapter 11: Inter-related Effects (Onshore), page 22, para 11.9.1.3 reports "Due to concurrent multiple activities, the construction phase presents the most likely opportunity for effects combining on occupiers of the nearest dwellings. During the construction phase there could potentially be properties within 300 m of trenchless installation (HDD) locations which could experience moderate noise effects and major visual effects, both being significant. These temporary significant effects could combine with concurrent negligible and minor traffic effects and other noise and visual effects."</p> <p>Clearly the serious concerns regarding the adverse impact of noise at the Pond Hills site in my representation of March 2017 in Section 15 were fully justified.</p>	I	<p>An updated assessment of Inter-related effects, which takes into consideration the mitigation committed to by Hornsea Three is provided in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 11: Inter-related Effects. This is informed by the assessments contained within the topic specific chapters of Environmental Statement volume 3, including chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Resources, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport, and chapter 8: Noise and Vibration.</p>
Ray & Diane Pearce	<p>Whilst we acknowledge that we have had face to face meetings with the Project Manager, Stakeholder Relations Advisor and Project Engineer we still have grave and unprecedented concerns for the future of our home, health and business precipitated by the publication of the PEIR. However, questions relating to the crossing point of the Hornsea Three Project cables with those for Vattenfall's Vanguard and Boreas Projects are primary to our concerns, and, are inadequately addressed in the PEIR. Therefore, our aim with this letter is to have our questions and opinions included as part of the public response. Some of the details have been submitted to Dong Energy previously and some questions remain unanswered by both the PEIR and the project personnel we have met.</p>	I	<p>Noted. Cumulative effects, including those which may arise from Hornsea Three in combination with Norfolk Vanguard have been identified and assessed within the relevant topic chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3).</p> <p>NOTE: Dalcour Maclaren attended a site meeting on 4 August 2017 and feedback to DONG/Orsted all of the comments made at the meeting.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>67</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Ray & Diane Pearce	<p>Conclusion: The PEIR for the Hornsea Three Project is an incomplete and flawed document. The allocation of the connection point for the developer to connect to the UK NETS is arbitrary and has been left to another 'for profit' company, namely National Grid plc, to make a nationally important decision which has far reaching consequences and dubious commercial intent. There is a lack of detail and discussion surrounding how and why it is necessary for two competing projects to cross their transmission systems. Most importantly, the PEIR gives no consideration for any cumulative effects, interrelated effects, or, more importantly, any environmental impact for the cable crossing point. We implore the Planning Inspectorate to reconsider and co-ordinate the routing of off-shore wind farm transmission cables before rural Norfolk is subjected to a prolonged, damaging and disruptive programme of cable laying by successive developers intent on profiteering from permissive legislation.</p>	I	<p>Environmental Statement, volume 3, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives sets out the process of identifying a grid connection location. The aim of the grid connection option appraisal was to identify the most economic and efficient design option for the connection of a project. Although both National Grid and Orsted input into the appraisal process (in respect to economic and strategic factors), the eventual grid connection offer is determined by National Grid. In May 2016, Hornsea Three was formally offered a grid connection at Norwich Main Substation as a result of this appraisal process.</p> <p>Volume 3, Chapter 11: Inter-related effects of the Environmental Statement provides an assessment of the likely effects should the same type of impact affect the same receptor group during each of the three key project phases (i.e. construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning), and therefore have the potential to combine and result in an overall effect of greater significance. It also provides an assessment of the likely effects should multiple impact types occur on the same receptor group (e.g. noise and landscape and visual impacts may affect the same residential properties); impacts may individually be considered insignificant, but when considered together, could amount to a significant cumulative effect. The potential for impacts arising as a result of Hornsea Project Three to combine with other planned developments (including the Vattenfall projects) is assessed in each respective topic chapter, under the heading 'Cumulative Effect Assessment'.</p>
Ray & Diane Pearce	<p>Cross Referencing: The cross referencing and detail within the PEIR document is misleading and fundamentally flawed. For instance, PEIR Volume 3, Chapter 1 - 1.14.1.2 states that: "A description of the likely inter-related effects arising from Hornsea Three geology and ground conditions is provided in volume 3, chapter 12: Inter-Related Effects (onshore)" ... but there is no chapter 12 and the onshore inter-related effects in chapter 11 do not mention Vanguard or Boreas.</p> <p>In PEIR Volume 3, Chapter 1, Table 1.3 (Page 7), as a result of the Scoping Opinion Dong Energy was directed by the Planning Inspectorate - as follows: "Careful consideration should be given to the potential for overlapping cable corridors with the Norfolk Vanguard offshore wind farm and any resultant cumulative impacts." Your response in the PEIR to the issue raised is as follows: "Cumulative impacts are discussed in section 1.12." However, there is no mention in Section 1.12 of the PEIR, whatsoever, of the "...overlapping cable corridors..." despite having been specifically directed by the Planning Inspectorate to take it into "careful consideration".</p>	I	<p>Errors in cross referencing have been corrected within the Environmental Statement.</p> <p>As noted in previous comments relating to cumulative effects vs. inter-related effects, Volume 3, Chapter 11: Inter-related effects of the Environmental Statement provides an assessment of the likely effects should the same type of impact affect the same receptor group during each of the three key project phases (i.e. construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning), and therefore have the potential to combine and result in an overall effect of greater significance. It also provides an assessment of the likely effects should multiple impact types occur on the same receptor group (e.g. noise and landscape and visual impacts may affect the same residential properties); impacts may individually be considered insignificant, but when considered together, could amount to a significant cumulative effect. The potential for impacts arising as a result of Hornsea Project Three to combine with other planned developments (including the Vattenfall projects) is assessed in each respective topic chapter, under the heading 'Cumulative Effect Assessment'.</p>
Ray & Diane Pearce	<p>Electro-Magnetic Fields (EMFs): (PEIR Reference: Volume 4 Annex 3.3) The EMF issue is difficult, highly technical and open to conjecture. In response to Dong Energy's provision of a set of FAQs, published prior to the PIER, we asked our questions by email response as at Attachment 3 (SEE ATTACHMENT 3); we still await a detailed written response. Subsequently, we have discussed the figures in the PEIR with the Project Engineer for the Hornsea Three Project, accompanied by an EMF specialist from National Grid plc. Despite the depth of our discussion with the representatives, we still have grave reservations about the amount of exposure we will have to the Extra Low Frequency (ELF) EMFs generated by the Hornsea Three Project cables, with the cumulative effect from the Vanguard and Boreas cables, all passing in proximity to our home. We were advised that the theoretical figures in the PEIR are well within the Government's guidelines and we should not be concerned. However, having reviewed the questions we have previously posed regarding EMFs and having been advised that these would be answered by the PEIR, we contest that the PEIR should have been more comprehensive, informative and detailed. That is, we, as members of the public, should not have to seek information from Dong Energy's representatives when it should have been provided</p>	I	<p>Environmental Statement, volume 3, annex 3.3: EMF Compliance Statement comprises an assessment of the static and extremely low frequency (ELF) EMFs that will be generated by the Hornsea Project Three onshore transmission infrastructure (cabling), giving maximum predicted field strengths to assess compliance with health protection guidelines for public exposure to EMFs.</p> <p>Annex 3.3 concludes that the maximum magnetic field strength directly above a cable, using worst-case assumptions where required, is also well below the guideline public exposure limits set to protect health. The cables eventually selected for the project will be required to fall within the envelope assessed and meet the prescribed standards and hence will not generate greater EMF.</p> <p>Relevant to this, it is noted that the view of health protection bodies, based on a wide-ranging health evidence base (including studies of reproductive and developmental effects, cardiovascular disease, neurodegenerative disorders, the immune system, and genotoxic effects), is that low-frequency EMF is not a cause of health risks and that the guideline</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>67</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>in the consultation documents.</p> <p>Of note is that the PEIR recognises that: "The evidence base for a causal link between ELF EMFs and childhood leukaemia remains inconclusive, as despite extensive research, no plausible mechanism for a weak magnetic field to cause the disease has been established." However, we reiterate, there are studies where there is a "plausible mechanism" for a "causal link between ELF EMF's" and developing cell damage as per the study at Reference 3; causal link is therefore plausible and we refute the argument.</p> <p>In our email (SEE ATTACHMENT 3) we established that the NRPB, the EU's SCENHIR and the ICNIRP call for further research of EMFs effects on humans (of a "High Priority" study in the EU's case) to be carried out to establish exposure guidelines and limitations by scientific experiment. Therefore, without further research we could still, potentially, be exposed to a higher than safe level of magnetic radiation, especially where the cables are planned to cross. The PEIR supports this argument at Annex 3.3 Para 1.2.2.16 where it is stated that:</p> <p>"... the evidence examined remains inconclusive: some evidence of a possible increase in childhood leukaemia risk at long-term magnetic field exposure, in the order of 0.3–0.4 <math>\mu</math>T, continues to support the IARC classification of ELF EMFs as a possible carcinogen (e.g. (Kheifets, 2010) (Schüz, 2011) (Sermage- Faure, et al., 2013) (Zhao, et al., 2014)), but again evidence of a causal relationship or a mechanism to explain causation has not been established."</p> <p>Therefore, it is important even from the PEIR evidence that Dong Energy answers the following questions which we have repeatedly asked:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. At what distance away from the Hornsea 3 cable trench, with cables buried at 1.2 metres and carrying 2.4 GW of power, will the measured magnetic field strength be equal to 0.4 <math>\mu</math>T?</li> <li>2. What will be the cumulative EMF where Dong's cables and the Vattenfall cables cross?</li> <li>3. What would be the cumulative effect of HVDC cables' EMF with the Earth's local static field in a North to South or East to West orientation?</li> <li>4. What will be the multiplying effect on the EMF of having both cable trenches, as per current plans, either side of our property (i.e. with our residence at the centre of any residual field)?</li> <li>5. What is your reference document for the effects of an aligned EMF from the crossing of cables carrying 2.4 GW and 3.6 GW with a potential combined cumulative field strength of up to 6 GW of power?</li> </ol> <p>Quantifiably, 6 GW of power is sufficient to power approximately 5 million homes which is around 18% of the UK's demand. However, this will uniquely be transmitted in proximity to private residences with this amount of power potentially flowing through where the cables cross. What is not made clear in the PEIR is that the distance between each cable is critical to the cumulative effect of the EMF from each cable and that EMF's can be reduced by phase shifting the current in each cable to reduce the magnetic field effects.</p> <p>The DECC Code of Practice is a 'Voluntary Code of Practice' which means it holds no legal substance. Should Dong Energy install a transmission system that 'theoretically' meets the "voluntary guidelines" but, in practice, the measured field strengths exceed them, how would we, as members of the public, be able to challenge the developer? By way of example, the cladding on Grenfell Tower was installed with the installers and the developers following a "Voluntary Code of Practice" but the cladding was the likely cause of grievous harm and death. Furthermore, the Code of Practice requires the developer to provide: "A calculation or measurement of the maximum fields directly above the cable." That is a 'calculation' and not just a list of figures which are not open to scrutiny. The mathematical constant for the magnetic permeability used in the calculation has not been provided and the PEIR is elusive as to how the provided figures were calculated. Therefore, the PEIR should describe the calculation by way of a worked example. The PEIR concludes that: "... it is considered that the levels of EMFs from the proposed</p>		<p>exposure standards in place (based on well-established effects on the body) are appropriate to protect health.</p>



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>67</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>development would be well below the guideline public exposure reference levels set to protect health.” However, without the specific design of the cable crossing point and a study of the interaction between both the Hornsea Three cables and those from Vanguard and Boreas this can neither be concluded nor supposed. Similarly, Dong Energy’s representatives maintain that: “... given the margin in the PEIR assessment for compliance with UK policy on EMFs, it is expected that any cumulative impacts with the Vattenfall cables will fall well within recommended guideline levels.” Again, when dealing with a potential public health issue nothing should be ‘expected’ and the PEIR should provide the firm evidence by research for the project’s impact on the environment, especially for an environment which human beings could be forced to chronically endure. In conclusion to the EMF issue, the PEIR lacks any detail or acknowledgement for the effect of magnetic fields at the crossing point of the Hornsea Three, Vanguard and Boreas cables. The theoretical figures provided are not open to scrutiny. The argument that there is insufficient evidence to support any possible danger to public health is fundamentally flawed as exemplified by research not provided by the developer. The ‘Code of Practice’ is voluntary and therefore not necessarily legally binding. We reiterate that: where there is doubt, and importantly, lack of scientific evidence to support the argument, the Definitions of Precautionary Principle should be invoked. Within the principle, the World Commission on the Ethics of Scientific Knowledge and Technology under the auspices of UNESCO (amongst other World and European bodies) states: “When human activities may lead to morally unacceptable harm that is scientifically plausible but uncertain, actions shall be taken to avoid or diminish that harm ...” and goes onto say that: “The judgement of plausibility should be grounded in scientific analysis.” Therefore, planning to create a potentially harmful environment, without plausible scientific research and analysis, could be deemed to be unethical and we will continue to challenge Dong Energy on this principle.</p>		
<b>Section 48: Duty to publicise</b>			
No comments were received in response to the Public Notice relating to landowner queries under Phase 2.A.			

Table 3.34: Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Further Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.B) relating to landowner queries

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>68</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 42: Prescribed consultees (The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009: Schedule 1))</b>			
LEEP Electricity Networks Ltd	Leep Utilities have nothing in this area	N/A	Ørsted noted that LEEP Electricity Networks Ltd had no assets affected by Hornsea Three and no further action was taken.
Department for Transport	In order that I might re-direct this to the correct section for response it would be helpful if you could provide Land Registry title numbers and plans for the land believed to be in the ownership of the Secretary of State, including as tenant, occupier, licensee etc.	N/A	Hornsea Three confirmed that title numbers were provided in earlier correspondence, future correspondence will be addressed to the relevant contact within the DFT.

<sup>68</sup> Y = Yes change made; N = No change made; I = Incorporated into or considered when producing the assessment or landowner voluntary agreement offer; N/A = Not applicable.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>68</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Forestry Commission	<p>Thank you for consulting the Forestry Commission on this application. We do not believe these changes will impact on the Ancient Woodland in the area and therefore we have <u>no comments</u> to make.</p> <p>For future planning application which are within 500 metres of an Ancient Woodland we would like to refer you in the first instance to the Standing Advice prepared by the Forestry Commission and Natural England <a href="https://www.gov.uk/guidance/ancient-woodland-and-veteran-trees-protection-surveys-licences">https://www.gov.uk/guidance/ancient-woodland-and-veteran-trees-protection-surveys-licences</a></p> <p>Please note – we have received several duplicate notices about this consultation please can you ensure your mailing list is up to date. Forest Services is the part of the Forestry Commission which is the Government advisers on forestry and are the statutory consultees on National Strategic Infrastructure Plans. Should you have plans that impact on the Public Forest Estate we will pass them on to the relevant department within Forest Enterprise.</p> <p>All planning related matters which affect the East and East Midlands should be sent to: East and East Midlands Forest Area Enquiries eandem( @ )forestry.gsi.gov.uk or if hard copy/disc etc then to: Forestry Commission, Forest Services, Santon Downham, Brandon, Suffolk. IP27 0TJ</p>	N	Noted.
Anglian Water	<p><b>Statutory Detailed Overview Plans</b></p> <p>There are a number of existing water mains and foul sewers in the boundary of the proposed cable route. In addition there is any existing sewer outfall within the proposed cable route. These are essential assets which allow us to serve our existing customers and should be considered as part of the above project.</p> <p>Following a meeting with Orsted in September 2017 we understand that it is proposed that the cable route will cross a number of existing assets in the Anglian Water's ownership. The proposed crossings are not identified on the detailed onshore plans which form part of this consultation.</p> <p>There is also an existing borehole for a public water source in the vicinity of the proposed cable route. It is essential to protect the public water supply sources from contamination from any activities that might cause pollution.</p> <p>Anglian Water would wish to have the opportunity to comment further on the location and proposed method of crossing specific assets to ensure that we can continue to serve our customers. We would welcome further discussions with Orsted to discuss the potential impact on Anglian Water's existing assets prior to the submission of the DCO application to the Planning Inspectorate.</p>	N/A	Hornsea Three note Anglian Water's response and continue to engage with Anglian Water to discuss any potential impacts to all relevant Anglian Water assets prior to DCO submission. Bespoke protective provisions are being negotiated for inclusion in the final DCO.
Network Rail - Ben Medlock	<p>The project includes power to take temporary possession of land however, National Rail requires that no private level crossings to be used for construction and maintenance without our consent. Network Rail to be consulted, and supervision arrange if thought necessary, if level crossings are to be used for works.</p> <p>Network Rail land &amp; Clearance Process This is subject to NRs internal clearance process and any regulatory consents. In addition the applicant will enter into various agreements.</p>	I	Hornsea Three has been in dialogue with Network Rail regarding crossings and proximity of assets. Plans have also been submitted relating to potential lease requirements and Hornsea Three is awaiting receipt of standard Network Rail Heads of Terms. Bespoke protective provisions are also being negotiated for inclusion within the DCO application.
<b>Section 42: Local Authorities (prescribed under section 43 of the Act)</b>			
No comments were received from the local authorities relating to landowner queries under Phase 2.B.			

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>68</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 42: Persons with an interest in the land (prescribed under section 44 of the Act)</b>			
C F Bond, Bidwells (on behalf of clients) on behalf of Nicholas Edward Evans-Lombe, Frances Marilyn Evans-Lombe & Great Melton Farms Limited	We write as agents on behalf of our clients detailed below. We have shown the relevant consultation plan number in brackets. Nicholas Edward Evans-Lombe, [REDACTED] [REDACTED] (Map 7 of 9) Please note any correspondence relating to this response or representation should be sent to Bidwells at the above address, reference C F Bond.	N/A	Hornsea Three acknowledged the relevant client information and noted the appropriate correspondence address
Santander	"Returned correspondence" – Unfortunately have been unable to deal with request/enquiry as have been unable to locate mortgage account number. Please verify and confirm.	N/A	Hornsea Three re-sent the letter with the relevant details provided
NatWest	Unable to identify the particular property/properties over which the Bank has an interest. In the circumstances we are returning the letter herewith, and must ask you please to resubmit your letter with a note of the full address of the specific property/properties over which the Bank has an interest and the name and address of the property owner(s). A note of the HM Land Registry number for each property will also help.	N/A	Hornsea Three re-sent the letter with the relevant details provided
J.R.S. Stilwell	I have already told you/your company more than once that I no longer have any interest in any of the land affected by your project and ask you/it to remove my name from all mailing lists etc connected with it, yet I am still receiving documents from you. Please desist.	N/A	Hornsea Three noted the response and the records were updated as requested.
Nigel R Rogers & Deborah A Rogers	Please do not send correspondence addresses to Reginald Henry Young, John Howard Rowley and Aileen Margery Rowley to Warren House Farm (these are believed to be the previous owners 20-40 years ago) [Previous response 0069]	N/A	Hornsea Three noted the response and confirmed that this is because the names still appear on the title register (as interests in the land) and Ørsted is legally obliged to inform all legal interests.
Santander	"Returned correspondence" – Unfortunately have been unable to deal with request/enquiry as have been unable to locate mortgage account number. Please verify and confirm.	N/A	Hornsea Three re-sent the letter with the relevant details provided
North Norfolk Railway	The North Norfolk Railway plc has no objection to either the 'west' or 'east' route as your proposed cable crosses Kelling Heath. However, we would prefer the 'west' route based on our experience of the SCIRA cable route installed by Carillion in 2010. On that occasion the HDD was drilled uphill from the north side of the track (as it would be on your 'east' route). The bore suffered multiple fracouts of bentonite, uphill from the railway and also loss of bentonite back into the launch put leading to the collapse of our earthworks into the void, with a resulting 94mm settlement of the rails with potentially serious operational consequences. I appreciate that this is not the norm in HDD works, but we do not wish to attract that risk again and so prefer the 'flat' crossing of the 'west' route. See previous response for engineering conditions that shall be applied to the proposed crossing of the North Norfolk Railway for Hornsea Project Three onshore cables.	Y	Comments and detail regarding previous issues encountered with Sherringham Shoal project are gratefully received and noted. The west route option has now been adopted in order to maintain a 'flat' crossing as suggested.
Department for Transport	In order that I might re-direct this to the correct section for response it would be helpful if you could provide Land Registry title numbers and plans for the land believed to be in the ownership of the Secretary of State, including as tenant, occupier, licensee etc.	N/A	Hornsea Three confirmed that title numbers were provided in earlier correspondence, future correspondence will be addressed to the relevant contact within the DFT.
Lloyds Banking plc	We are in receipt of a letter for Ref: 1078116-s42MissDoc-20171204-680488 for Lloyds Bank PLC. Please can you advise which team this is in relation to as when checked on the systems I am unable to locate a client under the name of "Hornsea 3 Offshore Wind Farm" or "Ørsted".	N/A	The enquiry passed on to WSP, who responded to Lloyds, by email on 8 January 2018, to confirm the relevant mortgage accounts that the enquiry related to.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>68</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Barclays Bank PLC	<p>Thank you for your letter of 5 December 2017. Unfortunately, we are unable to locate a customer record from the details you have provided. We would be grateful if you could obtain the correct mortgage account number from our customer and the customers full name and address and resubmit your request and also if possible provide us with copy of the Title information document.</p> <p>If you have a previous letter from the Bank in relation to this account we would be grateful if you could provide us with a copy of such letter which may also assist us in making sure your request is sent to the correct department.</p> <p>If you have any questions, call our customers helpline on 0800 022 4022.</p>	N/A	The enquiry was passed on to WSP, who responded to confirm the relevant mortgage accounts that the enquiry related to.
HSBC	Please provide us with contact name or department for delivery.	N/A	Enquiry passed on to WSP, who responded to confirm the relevant mortgage accounts that the enquiry related to.
Sarah Dyer	General enquiry for more information on what will be done on her land, following receipt of a Landowner Information Questionnaire (LIQ).	N/A	The enquiry was passed on to WSP who followed up the LIQ response. Ms Dyer owns adjacent land therefore Hornsea Three are in dialogue with her to clarify that her response was a misunderstanding.
Clapham and Collinge Solicitors (on behalf of David William Dearn)	One of her clients (David William Dearn) who is now deceased had received a letter regarding the consultation. She has previously sent an email to the email address noted on the letter (hornseaprojectthree@wsp.com) regarding this and wanted to know what the letter means and why it was sent.	N/A	David William Dearn had 5 interests for rights related to transfers dated 28th May and 10th May 2002. He is now marked as Deceased on records and will no longer receive any correspondence.
McDonalds Restaurants Limited	We have just had a call to the HOW3 information Line from a representative of McDonalds legal team, enquiring as to why one of their restaurants has received a consultation letter. They were not able to give a specific location of the restaurant but I assume it must lie somewhere along the cable route which is what I advised on the initial call. Is it worth directing her towards the online map?	N/A	<p>Hornsea Three made contact with Mc Donald's Restaurant Limited to explain that they had been included in the consultation as they were picked up as having a beneficiary interest (in respect of option to purchase) in land parcel 3505 in relation to HMLR title number NK328721. Hornsea Thre explained that a Land Interest Questionnaire (LIQ) (Document &gt; 1073913-LIQ-20170526-680596) was sent to Mc Donald's Restaurant Limited on the 26th May 2017 to confirm this interest. It was note that this LIQ was issued as DONG Energy, now known as Ørsted.</p> <p>Hornsea Three explained that upon further research it would appear that we purchased this title on the 05 Jan and the register was updated on the 05 Jan therefore HMLR would not had this updated. The change in the title being that the option to purchase area was removed and now forms the freehold title NK464813. Hornsea Three requested that Mc Donald's Restaurant Limited complete the LIQ to confirm that they no longer have an interest in land parcel 3505.</p>
<b>Section 47: Duty to consult local community</b>			
D & J Perry-Warnes	Further to correspondence which we receive from yourselves from time to time and to a report this week in the local paper (Eastern Daily Press) it occurred to ourselves that our Unit Seven Acre Farm, [REDACTED] which has 5 modern livestock buildings (building 4 and 5 being erected this year and the first three erected three years ago) and which site your proposed cable will run alongside will actually go across two of our fields (enclosed is a copy of your plan sent to us with Seven Acre Farm marked and our plan showing the buildings) you may be able to utilize our livestock buildings for your purposes i.e. to house storage batteries and/or your Relay Station if the proposed site at Edgefield proves difficult to get approval on. Our site might not be in the right position for your purposes but if you think it may be a viable option we would be happy to discuss it with you.	N	This alternative was considered by the project, but it is not suitable for the booster site in terms of location along the route or available space.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>68</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Mr Julian Pilkington	Hiya I have just received your community newsletter dated October 2017. I live in Alderford [REDACTED], which is one of the areas highlighted in the booklet and have an empty 2 acre field which I would be happy to rent out for extra storage for you if you needed it. It has access from the road and is securely gated. Might be a help and another long term storage solution for you. Please let me know if this is of use to you and if not who I would need to contact to discuss.	N	This alternative was considered by the project, but the main construction compound for the project will be located at Oulton Airfield, accessed off the B1149.
Mr Brian Boydell	RICGR called on 27 November and left a voicemail. He then called again on 12 December at approx.. 7pm and spoke to Mr Boydell. Mr Boydell lives very close at Warren Farm Barns and had seen the consultation on the proposed new access route along Warren Road (Map 2 of the Further Supplementary Information Plans) and inquired about how it would be used and for how long. RICGR explained what type of construction traffic would use it and that it has been designed to avoid coming too close to the residential properties. Mr Boydell was satisfied with the responses and said that he was grateful for both the call and the efforts to minimise disruption on the properties and had nothing further to add to his original verbal conversation at the community consultation events in September.	N/a	The landowner response was noted and no further action was required.
Mervyn and Maureen Bibb	Route 1 - given the lack of clarity of the location of the final 80 metre corridor, and for the reasons stated for route 2, we must also object strongly to route 1. In principle, it could be located immediately adjacent to the gardens of 2 and 4 Church Farm Barns (six children and two grandchildren under the age of 11 years).	Y	This option has not been taken forward by Hornsea Three based on community feedback, as well as technical and environmental constraints including for example, close proximity to Listed Buildings. Further information is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives.
P.M. Head on behalf of Thickthorn Residents (1992) Ltd	We have received some letters from concerning the above. It is not clear but its seems you will be constructing a cable and substation across Norfolk. If I am wrong please explain in a few words what it is you are doing. In particular please explain if and how we are affected and if you will be constructing any substations at or near us. This company owns the freehold and that interest in owned by the 7 residents who live in the flats at Thickthorn Hall which has a curtilage of about four acres around it. I can send you a sketch if you cannot find it on your maps : our post code [REDACTED] and front on the old Norwich Road B1172 about half a mile from the Thickthorn Roundabout on the A11.	Y	A proposed underground cable route option was previously routed through land adjoining the building. This has since been discounted and a route significantly further west is now proposed and it no longer impacts this land.
P.M. Head on behalf of Thickthorn Residents (1992) Ltd	You are presumably aware of the Highway Agency's proposals for a road crossing the Norwich Road near us as a consequence of the alterations to the Thickthorn Roundabout.	N/A	Hornsea Three confirmed that it is aware of these proposals.
Frances Tudor	Rights (2) Access Rights  The shaded area suggests access to the freehold properties, as outlined above, might be affected, possibly limited (see Plan saved under ID code). The shaded area overlaps the road to the right-hand side of the properties, as you look at them from the road. This needs to be clarified and assurance of uninterrupted access provided.	I	Hornsea Three confirmed that there may be some form of traffic control to ensure health and safety but access to the properties will remain unrestricted.



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>68</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 48: Duty to publicise</b>			
Frances Tudor	<p>Rights (1) Protection of the borehole and the associated groundwater</p> <p>My freehold property [REDACTED] has the Right to the use of a bore hole well, shared with my neighbour [REDACTED]. See Map. We have the ownership and Right of use. It is our only water supply. It is on the perimeter in very close proximity to the shaded area (indicated on the map Parcel Number 2290) and unquestionably takes water (groundwater) from the shaded area.</p> <p>The Right in question is to take daily, clean water from the well, in respect of right granted by a transfer dated 5 April 2007 (Reference to Property Deeds).</p> <p>This groundwater - water pumped from the well - is accessed from underground aquifers. Groundwater is intimately linked to both surface water and soil, so polluting substances can get into groundwater from either. See map which outlines surface water sources for the bore hole. The main issue affecting groundwater is change of use to the groundwater sources. For example, there is a risk of pollution where a polluting activity or release is close to this source.</p> <p>Groundwater is vulnerable to contamination and difficult to clean if contamination occurs and would need treatment before it is used. This could be too expensive or too difficult to do and the resource could be lost.</p> <p>To date (3/1/18) "the work proposed beyond the 200 metre wide cable corridor search area" which directly affects the land, Parcel Number 2290, has not been disclosed.</p> <p>I wish to know what the proposed work is which will inevitably involve a change of use. This is of some considerable concern.</p> <p>If the quality of the water becomes contaminated or if the apparatus for supplying the water is no longer functional because of the proposed work, then my Right and my neighbour's Right to a clean water supply will be denied.</p> <p>The well water has been recently and positively tested by the Environmental Agency, South Norfolk Council. I have a full breakdown of its chemical content, which certifies its clean and pure quality. More frequent tests might be needed before, during and after the "proposed work" to monitor the quality of the water which could be contaminated by the change of use of the land. These tests are expensive.</p> <p>To this end, and of immediate transparency, I need to know the exact meaning of the "proposed work" and the change of use of land.</p> <p>During the proposed work, The Hornsea Project 3 Offshore Wind Farm authorities will need to accept responsibility for the quality of the water supply before, during and after the work, as well as the protection of the bore hole apparatus.</p> <p>Would like information sent via email and hard copy to [REDACTED]</p>	I	The potential impacts of Hornsea Three in terms of disruption of groundwater flow and the yields and quality of groundwater abstractions have been included in the assessment presented in Environmental Statement Volume 3, chapter 1: Geology and Ground Conditions.

Table 3.35: Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Focused Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.C) relating to landowner queries

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>69</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 42: Prescribed consultees (The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009: Schedule 1))</b>			
Cadent Gas Ltd	Searches based on your enquiry have identified that there is apparatus in the civility of your enquiry which may be affected by the activities specified. Cadent and or National Grid therefore formally object to these activities pending further consultation. Cadent and or National Grid objects to the Order on the grounds that the level of protection currently afforded to the apparatus it has in the subject land may be diminished notwithstanding Paragraph 4, Schedule 12, Part II of the Highways Act 1980. We request that you do not commence work or take further action with regards to your proposal until you hear from us. We will endeavour to contact you within 21 days from the date of this response. Is there a plan available showing the cable route that you could send me please? We have 4 enquires, numbered 040062 - 040065 from you, so something covering all 4 of those would be handy.	N/A	Cadent's response is noted and discussions are ongoing with Cadent to agree protective provisions within the DCO application and a side agreement to provide adequate protection to their assets.
National Grid	We have assessed your enquiry and are writing to let you know that you can proceed using normal safe systems of work. To help you proceed with your work please find enclosed as built drawings of our assets that are located in the immediate vicinity.	N/A	National Grid's response was noted, no further action was required
<b>Section 42: Local Authorities (prescribed under section 43 of the Act)</b>			
No comments were received from the local authorities relating to inter-related onshore under Phase 2.C.			
<b>Section 42: Persons with an interest in the land (prescribed under section 44 of the Act)</b>			
Bidwells (Christopher Bond) on behalf of Edward Christopher Evans-Lombe & Great Melton Farms Ltd	Further to the email received from Orsted Hornsea Project Here on 12th February 2018 with the attached web link to the interactive map, I write with further comments on behalf of my clients, on a without prejudice basis as follows: Edward Christopher Evans-Lombe [REDACTED] [REDACTED] We note that access to the working width is still via the mail drive to Algarsthorpe Farmhouse and, bearing in mind the comments we submitted in our representation on 20th December 2017, can we please discuss the practicalities of how this will work.	N	The access along the track to Algarsthorpe Farm is required in order to access the area to the south of the River Yare in relation to the proposed HDDs under the adjacent woodland and river. Where possible, access will be taken to these areas from the public roads either side of the section of the route in order to avoid impact to the users of this track. Once a construction contractor is appointed and prior to commencement of the work it is suggested a meeting is held on site to assess the potential traffic interference here and how this can be managed.
Bidwells (Christopher Bond) on behalf of Edward Christopher Evans-Lombe & Great Melton Farms Ltd	We note and support the proposed HDD for the route immediately south of the Bawburgh-Marlingford Road and the wood immediately west of Algarsthorpe Farmhouse. Would it be possible to HDD the intervening section (not open cut) so that the full length of the route from the Bawburgh-Marlingford Road to the south of the wood is installed by HDD, particularly bearing in mind that the HDD plant will already be on site.	N	The suggested HDD would be over 500m in length raising technical concerns, especially given the proximity to the River Yare and wet land either side. There is also a slight bend in the route here which, although not impossible to achieve, would add further complexities to the HDD, in addition to the change in topography leading down towards the river. At this stage of the project, it is too early to commit to a complete HDD of this section given there is suitable land available to support two shorter HDD's.

<sup>69</sup> Y = Yes change made; N = No change made; I = Incorporated into or considered when producing the assessment or landowner voluntary agreement offer; N/A = Not applicable.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>69</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Bidwells (Christopher Bond) on behalf of Charles Watt	<p>Charles Jonathan Watt, [REDACTED]</p> <p>As referred to in the representation submitted on 20th December 2017, we note that one of proposed accesses to Mr. Kemp's land still leads off the Norwich Road directly opposite the Lodge - Clearly a traffic hazard which would lead to traffic using the Lodge drive as a run off area which is totally unacceptable. We, therefore, request that this access route in not used.</p> <p>Please come bac to me if any further explanation on the above points or if a site meeting is required</p>	N	Response noted. An alternative access route into the field in question has been added following receipt of earlier feedback. The proposed access in question remains as an alternative option, should this be required, with the western access being the preferred point of entry.
Jane Kenny (Savills) - On behalf of Salle Estate	<p>I am writing on behalf of our client, Salle Estate, who are Landowners affected by the third consultation "Focused Statutory Consultation" There has been no discussion with our client or myself, as agent, with regard to access point across the holding from the road to the onshore cable route corridor. In addition the appropriate notification of this change via s.42 has not been received by our client or myself as agent. It has always been understood that access to the cable route would be obtained from the compounds/mobilization zones which in turn would be sited with suitable access to them so avoiding using the narrow country roads and access gained along the working corridor. Our client understands that the requirement for this access is required to access the southern part of the corridor as Marriott's Way is being HDD. This route is not acceptable as there is not an uninterrupted access to the corridor due to the Christmas Tree plantation to the North of the access across Marriott's Way. Please see attached snapshot with the area of concern circled in red. An alternative access has been offered from the Booton Road which would be a much better location in terms of better highways and away from the village Reephram. Furthermore it will remove unavoidable safety issues relating to the crossing of Marriott's Way by Construction traffic and users of the footpath.</p>	N	Throughout discussions with landowners to date it has been stated that access to the construction corridor will be taken from the adjoining public highways where possible. Where this is not possible, additional access routes will be required from the nearest public highway in order to reach the construction corridor. Any interaction with the landowner's access to their Christmas tree business would be suitably managed in conjunction with them in order to avoid any unnecessary impact or disruption. The access across Marriott's Way is required in order to allow suitable access to either side, and the adjacent Horizontal Direction Drills (HDDs) without creating unnecessary impact of increased traffic on the haul road either side, and additional traffic through Reephram itself. The crossing of any vehicles or plant across Marriott's Way will be properly and safely managed with regard to other private and public users of this area.
Jane Kenny (Savills) - On behalf of Salle Estate	<p>It is also noted that the plan is still showing both cable routes over the Salle Estate. Can you please confirm that the West option is only under consideration and arrange for the plan to be updated accordingly - See attached Map 3. I trust you find this self-explanatory but should you have any queries please do not hesitate to contact me otherwise I look forward to having the opportunity to discuss this change.</p>	N/A	The western route option is the only route being considered and taken forward as part of the DCO application.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>69</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Bidwells (Christopher Bond) - On behalf of Charles Watt	<p>Further to your letter and enclosures dated 27th February 2018 concerning the above matter, we write as agents on behalf of our clients detailed below. We have shown the relevant consultation plan number for each client brackets.</p> <p>Charles Johnathan Watt, [REDACTED] [REDACTED] (Map 5 of 6)</p> <p>Benjamin Robert Goodfellow, c/o Birketts [REDACTED] [REDACTED] (Map 5 of 6)</p> <p>Please note any correspondence relating to this response or representation should be sent to Bidwells at the above address, reference CF Bond. We now response and comment on the proposed addition access routes shown within the consultation plans, on a without prejudice basis as follows:</p> <p>1. Charles Jonathan Watt [REDACTED] [REDACTED] (Map 5 of 6)</p> <p>We note a Potential Access Route (New) to Mr. Kemp's land to the North of the Norwich Road which we support</p> <p>We presume the proposed access to Mr. Kemp's land which leads off the Norwich Road directly opposite the Lodge - clearly, a traffic hazard which would lead to traffic using the Lodge drive as a run off area will not now be required - could this please be confirmed (as referred to in our previous representation dated 20/12/2017)</p>	N	The proposed access in question remains as an alternative option, should this be required, with the western access being the preferred point of entry.
Bidwells (Christopher Bond) - On behalf of Benjamin Goodfellow and Philip Day	<p>Benjamin Robert Goodfellow, c/o Birketts, [REDACTED] [REDACTED] (Map 5 of 6)</p> <p>The proposed Potential Access Route (New) is approved in principle but may involve moving the Anglian Water monitoring Kiosk and also cross the manholes that give access to the balancing tank situated beneath the proposed access. We request a site meeting to agree the exact route as soon as possible.</p> <p>We assume that the alternative route coloured purple on the plan across the meadows will no longer be required - can this be confirmed?</p> <p>Christopher Bond would be prepared to meet on site with Orsted representatives to address individual client concerns.</p>	N	Both routes shown will remain as options, with the more recently added southern option being the preferred point of entry. Hornsea Three has suggested that a meeting takes place on site once a construction contractor has been appointed and prior to work commencing in order to discuss and agree any specific details relating to this access. Should any amendments to the existing Anglian Water assets be required, Hornsea Three will liaise with them accordingly.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>69</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Savills - (Jane Kenny) on behalf of Church Farm (Booton)	<p>I am writing on behalf of our client, Church Farm (Booton) who are landowners affected by the third consultation "Focused Statutory Consultation". There has been no discussion with our client or us as agents, with regards to access point across the holding from the road to the onshore cable route corridor. In addition the appropriate notification of this change via a S.42 has not been received by our client or us as agent. Our client notes the route that you have selected across Church Farm (Booton). This is not acceptable. Our clients preferred route is the original proposal with it extending further south before coming east so that it runs as close as possible to the boundaries to minimise the impact on the croppable area of the fields. I have attached a plan showing this route hatched red. The reasons for this are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It is likely the area of woodland the route would pass through will be felled by the time you commence works.</li> <li>2. it will affect less land drains.</li> <li>3. It will avoid the grain store, the associated infrastructure and underground cabling.</li> <li>4. There will be less disruption to farming as it will only affect two arable fields rather than four.</li> <li>5. It will avoid Moor Farm and the associated impact on the occupants.</li> </ol> <p>The proposed access route is also not acceptable. Our client would like to propose the route that I have marked on the plan coloured blue, subject to the proposed access to the north of Marriott's Way being acceptable to the Salle Estate. Please note the track you have selected as an access route is actually a permissive path provided by our client, for the villagers of Reepham to access Marriott's Way.</p> <p>It is also not clear that the road between our clients land to the north and the woodland to the south will be directionally drilled however, this is a requirement and mitigate the disturbance to the area. I have shown yellow on the attached plan.</p> <p>Our client would consider the use of their new access road from Booton by the contractors, if deemed helpful, and on the appropriate terms. I have marked this in brown on the attached plan. It is also proposed a compound has been designated on our clients land. Again this has been down with no consultation / discussions with our client or us as the agent. Our client is not against the compound however before making any commitments needs to understand what it is required for, the visual impact and the length of time required.</p> <p>A meeting to discuss these changes has been requested but we have heard no further. I trust you find this self - explanatory but should you have any queries please do not hesitate to contact me otherwise we look forward to having the opportunity to meet and discuss these changes at your earliest convenience. In the meantime please can you acknowledge safe receipt of this email.</p>	N	<p>The notices issued to your respective clients, as consultation on the access and cable route amendments referred to, were done so via contact addresses on record and to which earlier correspondence has been sent with no issues raised. Should these contact addresses be incorrect, we would be grateful if these could be confirmed by providing completed LIQ forms. Copies of S42 notices issued for your clients have since been provided upon request.</p> <p>The objection to the two proposed routes across the landowner's land are noted, despite the eastern option being added to proposals following earlier feedback from the landowner to recent consultation. The new requested alternative route option to the west would run adjacent to residential receptors and listed buildings, in addition to Booton Common SSSI. The existing eastern route option would not have any direct impact on access to Moor Farm, whereas a western alternative route could impact the road to Moor Farm if the cables were installed here by direct burial. This route would also avoid the landowner's new barn development and would not impact the associated infrastructure.</p> <p>The suggested possible use of the landowner's new access road off Church Road is noted and appreciated. The temporary compound mentioned would be required for the temporary storage of materials and equipment to assist with the cable route construction and also the two proposed adjacent Horizontal Directional Drills (HDDs).</p>



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>69</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Tom Corfield (Ireland Arnold Keys) On behalf of Lady Prince Smith	<p>On behalf of Lady Prince Smith we wish to object to the planned Construction and Storage Compound immediately to the south of the A1067 at Morton on the Hill. This is not a suitable site for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Marl Hill is a particularly busy road which currently carries up to 4000 cars a day and this particular junction is extremely busy and an accident black spot.</li> <li>2. The junction with the A1067 regularly floods and this winter this particular junction was under two feet of water for approximately two weeks during the months of December and January.</li> <li>3. There is an Anglian Water mains water pipe, constructed of the old weaker material, just under the entrance to your suggested Compound. This water main has a history of bursting on Marl Hill and I doubt that it will take the pressure of continual lorry movements out of and into the site.</li> <li>4. It will be much more difficult to reinstate this particular area owing to the amount of water that regularly flow down Marl Hill whenever it rains. The overflow pipe from the road drain also passes under the proposed entrance.</li> </ol> <p>For the above reasons it is my clients view that this is a very unsuitable site which would be much better sited on the other side of the A1067 on land off The Street - this can be accessed from the old A1067 which can be accessed from both directions from the new A1067. If this is not possible, you are already showing two construction and storage compounds to the south and west of Ringland Land at Weston Longville and it would be much better to rely on these two areas which are situated on dry, move "forgiving" land. I trust these comments will be taken into consideration as plans continue to develop.</p>	N	<p>Lady Prince Smith's comments in relation to the proposed storage area adjacent to the A1067 were noted and have been taken on board and will be considered by Hornsea Three. This area has been identified to provide a storage area for work relating to the proposed Horizontal Directional Drill (HDD) under the A1067 &amp; The Street.</p> <p>With regard to points 1, 2 &amp; 3, access to the proposed storage area is NOT to be taken directly off the A1067, rather it is via the proposed access further down Marl Hill, as opposed to from the junction of the two roads.</p> <p>The comments are noted regarding the water and will be taken into account in the design process. Should the ground conditions here not be suitable for use as a compound at the time, then additional materials could be used to create a more robust surface which should in turn assist with reinstatement of the land back to agricultural use.</p> <p>Hornsea Three is aware of the location of the Anglian Water pipeline as it runs along Marl Hill and the edge of the landowner's field from records they have provided, which has been considered in relation to Hornsea Three's proposals.</p> <p>The proposed storage compound consists of a small area of agricultural land (approx. 1.2 acres) which would likely be sterilised and unfarmable during the construction period. The proposal to utilise this area for storage, if required, should therefore alleviate the requirement for any additional agricultural land to be taken out of production. As discussed above, the choice of materials for the storage compound will reflect the specific requirements of the site at the time of construction.</p> <p>The other proposed storage areas mentioned (towards Weston Longville) will still be required, and have been identified mainly due to additional areas potentially required for soil and material storage, due to the height restrictions under the existing overhead electricity tower line. There is also a proposed storage area to the north of The Street which has been identified mainly to support the proposed HDD under the River Wensum and adjacent meadows.</p>
Bidwells (Christopher Bond) on behalf of Edward Christopher Evans-Lombe & Great Melton Farms Limited	<p>We note that access to the working width is still via the main drive to Algarsthorpe Farmhouse and, bearing in mind the comments we submitted in our representation of 20 December 2017, can we please discuss the practicalities of how this will work.</p> <p>§ We note and support the proposed HDD for the route immediately south of the Bawburgh-Marlingford Road and the wood immediately west of Algarsthorpe Farmhouse. Would it be possible to HDD the intervening section (not open cut) so that the full length of the route from the Bawburgh-Marlingford Road to the south of the wood is installed by HDD, particularly bearing in mind that the HDD plant will already be on site.</p>	N	<p>The access along the track to Algarsthorpe Farm is required in order to access the area to the south of the River Yare in relation to the proposed HDDs under the adjacent woodland and river. Where possible, access will be taken to these areas from the public roads either side of the section of the route in order to avoid impact to the users of this track. Once a construction contractor is appointed and prior to commencement of the work it is suggested a meeting is held on site to assess the potential traffic interference here and how this can be managed.</p> <p>The suggested HDD would be over 500m in length raising technical concerns, especially given the proximity to the River Yare and wet land either side. There is also a slight bend in the route here which, although not impossible to achieve, would add further complexities to the HDD, in addition to the change in topography leading down towards the river. At this stage of the project, it is too early to commit to a complete HDD of this section given there is suitable land available to support two shorter HDD's.</p>
Bidwells (Christopher Bond) on behalf of Charles Jonathan Watt	<p>As referred to in the representation submitted on 20 December 2017, we note that one of proposed accesses to Mr Kemp's land still leads off the Norwich Road directly opposite the Lodge – clearly a traffic hazard which would lead to traffic using the Lodge drive as a run off area which is totally unacceptable. We, therefore, request that this access route is not used.</p>	N	<p>Response noted. An alternative access route into the field in question has been added following receipt of earlier feedback. The proposed access in question remains as an alternative option, should this be required, with the western access being the preferred point of entry.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>69</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Section 47: Duty to consult local community			
John Hurst (copied in Lady Ann Prince-Smith - Landowner on route)	I am the landowner immediately to the north of Marl Hill at Morton on the Hill and although I will not be directly affected by your proposals to establish a Construction and Storage Compound immediately to the south of the A1067 at Morton on the Hill in my opinion this is not a suitable site for the following reasons: 1) Marl Hill is a particularly busy road which currently carries up to 4000 cars a day and this particular junction is extremely busy and is an accident black spot. The A1067 was closed due to an accident at this junction for a couple of hours only this week.	N	Hornsea Three noted Lady Prince Smith's comments in relation to the proposed storage area adjacent to the A1067 which have been taken on board and will be considered by the project. This area has been identified to provide a storage area for work relating to the proposed Horizontal Directional Drill (HDD) under the A1067 & The Street.  Access to the proposed storage area is NOT to be taken directly off the A1067, rather it is via the proposed access further down Marl Hill, as opposed to the junction of the two roads.
John Hurst (copied in Lady Ann Prince-Smith - Landowner on route)	2) The junction with the A1067 regularly floods and this winter this particular junction was under two feet of water for approximately four weeks during the months of December and January.	N	Lady Prince Smith's comments were noted regarding the water and will be taken into account in the design process. Should the ground conditions here not be suitable for use as a compound at the time, then additional materials could be used to create a more robust surface which should in turn assist with reinstatement of the land back to agricultural use.
John Hurst (copied in Lady Ann Prince-Smith - Landowner on route)	3) There is an Anglian Water mains water pipe, constructed of the old weaker material, just under the entrance to your suggested Compound. This water main has a history of bursting up Marl Hill and I doubt that it will take the pressure of continual lorry movements out of and into the site.	N	Hornsea Three is aware of the location of the Anglian Water pipeline as it runs along Marl Hill and the edge of the landowner's field from records they have provided. This has been considered in relation to Hornsea Three's proposals.
John Hurst (copied in Lady Ann Prince-Smith - Landowner on route)	4) It will be much more difficult to reinstate this particular area owing to the amount of water that regularly flows down Marl Hill whenever it rains. The overflow pipe from the road drain also passes under the proposed entrance.	N	The proposed storage compound consists of a small area of agricultural land (approx. 1.2 acres) which would likely be sterilised and unfarmable during the construction period. The proposal to utilise this area for storage, if required, should therefore alleviate the requirement for any additional agricultural land to be taken out of production. The choice of materials for the storage compound will reflect the specific requirements of the site at the time of construction. The positioning of any overflow pipes will also be taken into consideration.
John Hurst (copied in Lady Ann Prince-Smith - Landowner on route)	For the reasons above it is in my opinion (having lived here for over thirty years) a very unsuitable site and the storage compound would be better suited on the other side of the A1067 on land off the Street as this can be accessed from the old A1067 which can be accessed from both directions from the new A1067. If this is not possible for any reason, you are already showing two construction and storage compounds to the south and west of Ringland Lane at Weston Longville and it would be better to rely on these two areas which are situated on dry land and which will be much easier to reinstate. I have photographs of the winter's flooded road which I can send to you if you wish.	N	The other proposed storage areas mentioned (towards Weston Longville) will still be required, and have been identified mainly due to additional areas potentially required for soil and material storage, due to the height restrictions under the existing overhead electricity tower line. There is also a proposed storage area to the north of The Street which has been identified mainly to support the proposed HDD under the River Wensum and adjacent meadows.
<b>Section 48: Duty to publicise</b>			
No comments were received in response to the Public Notice relating to landowner queries under Phase 2.C.			

### 3.14 DCO

Table 3.36: Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.A) relating to DCO

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>70</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 42: Prescribed consultees (The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009: Schedule 1))</b>			
Bidwells on behalf of Edward Christopher Evans-Lombe & Great Melton Farms Ltd	Further to the email received from Orsted Hornsea Project Here on 12th February 2018 with the attached web link to the interactive map, I write with further comments on behalf of my clients, on a without prejudice basis as follows: Edward Christopher Evans-Lombe [REDACTED] [REDACTED] We note that access to the working width is still via the mail drive to Algarsthorpe Farmhouse and, bearing in mind the comments we submitted in our representation on 20th December 2017, can we please discuss the practicalities of how this will work.	N	The access along the track to Algarsthorpe Farm is required in order to access the area to the south of the River Yare in relation to the proposed HDDs under the adjacent woodland and river. Where possible, access will be taken to these areas from the public roads either side of the section of the route in order to avoid impact to the users of this track. Once a construction contractor is appointed and prior to commencement of the work it is suggested a meeting is held on site to assess the potential traffic interference here and how this can be managed.
Bidwells on behalf of Edward Christopher Evans-Lombe & Great Melton Farms Ltd	We note and support the proposed HDD for the route immediately south of the Bawburgh-Marlingford Road and the wood immediately west of Algarsthorpe Farmhouse. Would it be possible to HDD the intervening section (not open cut) so that the full length of the route from the Bawburgh-Marlingford Road to the south of the wood is installed by HDD, particularly bearing in mind that the HDD plant will already be on site.	N	The suggested HDD would be over 500m in length raising technical concerns, especially given the proximity to the River Yare and wet land either side. There is also a slight bend in the route here which, although not impossible to achieve, would add further complexities to the HDD, in addition to the change in topography leading down towards the river. At this stage of the project, it is too early to commit to a complete HDD of this section given there is suitable land available to support two shorter HDD's.
Bidwells on behalf of Charles Watt	Charles Jonathan Watt, [REDACTED] [REDACTED] As referred to in the representation submitted on 20th December 2017, we note that one of proposed accesses to Mr. Kemp's land still leads off the Norwich Road directly opposite the Lodge - Clearly a traffic hazard which would lead to traffic using the Lodge drive as a run off area which is totally unacceptable. We, therefore, request that this access route in not used. Please come bac to me if any further explanation on the above points or if a site meeting is required	N	Response noted. An alternative access route into the field in question has been added following receipt of earlier feedback. The proposed access in question remains as an alternative option, should this be required, with the western access being the preferred point of entry.

<sup>70</sup> Y = Yes change made; N = No change made; I = Incorporated into or considered when producing the assessment or landowner voluntary agreement offer; N/A = Not applicable.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>70</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Jane Kenny (Savills) - On behalf of Salle Estate	I am writing on behalf of our client, Salle Estate, who are Landowners affected by the third consultation "Focused Statutory Consultation" There has been no discussion with our client or myself, as agent, with regard to access point across the holding from the road to the onshore cable route corridor. In addition the appropriate notification of this change via s.42 has not been received by our client or myself as agent. It has always been understood that access to the cable route would be obtained from the compounds/mobilization zones which in turn would be sited with suitable access to them so avoiding using the narrow country roads and access gained along the working corridor. Our client understands that the requirement for this access is required to access the southern part of the corridor as Marriott's Way is being HDD. This route is not acceptable as there is not an uninterrupted access to the corridor due to the Christmas Tree plantation to the North of the access across Marriott's Way. Please see attached snapshot with the area of concern circled in red. An alternative access has been offered from the Booton Road which would be a much better location in terms of better highways and away from the village Reepham. Furthermore it will remove unavoidable safety issues relating to the crossing of Marriott's Way by Construction traffic and users of the footpath.	N	Throughout discussions with landowners to date it has been stated that access to the construction corridor will be taken from the adjoining public highways where possible. Where this is not possible, additional access routes will be required from the nearest public highway in order to reach the construction corridor. Any interaction with the landowner's access to their Christmas tree business would be suitably managed in conjunction with them in order to avoid any unnecessary impact or disruption. The access across Marriott's Way is required in order to allow suitable access to either side, and the adjacent Horizontal Direction Drills (HDDs) without creating unnecessary impact of increased traffic on the haul road either side, and additional traffic through Reepham itself. The crossing of any vehicles or plant across Marriott's Way will be properly and safely managed with regard to other private and public users of this area.
Tampnet	·A crossing by one or more of the export cables, and one or more of your inter-array cables, of our fibre optic cable is in general accepted, pending our agreement and acceptance of a suitable crossing design. A Crossing Agreement based on standard industry format will be preferred. We are open to include more than one crossing in a single Agreement if that is preferable. Our main goal in Crossing Agreements is to maintain our ability to repair our cable, and make sure that the crossing happens in a safe way.	I	Crossing and proximity agreements are discussed in section 11.7.15 of volume 2, chapter 11: Infrastructure and Other Users.  Hornsea Three has engaged with Tampnet to discuss crossings and agreed a high level approach for engagement.
Tampnet	The placement of wind-turbines or sub-stations (or any other infrastructure) in close proximity of our fibre optic cable may be a problem for us. We need to be able to repair our cable if it is cut or damaged, and a cable repair ship will need some space to perform such a repair. As such we will request that an agreed safety zone is put in place around our cable, based on an agreed distance from our cable, and that no turbines, or other structures that may limit the movement a cable repair ship will require, within this zone. This is excluding crossings, as explained above	I	Crossing and proximity agreements are discussed in section 11.7.15 of volume 2, chapter 11: Infrastructure and Other Users.  Hornsea Three has engaged with Tampnet and noted their concerns regarding safety zones around assets. Suitable buffers have been applied when considering turbine layouts.
Anglian Water Services Ltd	It is considered that protective provisions specifically for the benefit of Anglian Water should be included as part of the wording of the Draft DCO. These protective provisions are in addition to that for utility companies as set out in the model provisions for DCO applications. Appendix 1 of this letter outlines the recommended wording for inclusion in the Draft DCO.	I	Protective Provisions for the benefit of Anglian Water will be included within the DCO. Discussions continue with Anglian Water on the specific wording of the Protective Provisions and Hornsea Three seeks to reach agreement on the final wording as soon as possible.
Anglian Water Services Ltd	Anglian Water would welcome further discussions with DONG Energy prior to the submission of the Draft DCO for examination. In particular it would be helpful if we could discuss the following Wording of the Draft DCO including protective provisions for the benefit of Anglian Water. Requirement for wastewater and/or water services. Impact of development on Anglian Water's assets and the need for mitigation. Pre-construction surveys and ground investigations.	I	Ørsted organised a meeting with Anglian Water to discuss impacts to all relevant Anglian Water assets and the requirements for services to new infrastructure.
Anglian Water Services Ltd	The onshore statutory consultation plan There are a number of existing water mains and foul sewers in the boundary of the proposed cable route. In addition there is an existing sewer outfall within the proposed cable route. These are essential assets which allow us to serve our existing customers and should be considered as part of the above project.	I	Ørsted acknowledged the importance of the Anglian Water assets and the services they provide. Ørsted organised a meeting with Anglian Water, where consultation plans were discussed along with the potential impacts to Anglian Water assets.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>70</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Anglian Water Services Ltd	If it is not possible to incorporate existing water mains and/or sewers as part of the site layout there may be a need to divert these asset(s). We have a duty to divert existing water mains and sewers where requested to do so although it would be at the applicant's expense.	I	Ørsted recognises the potential need for diversion of assets and that this expense would fall to Hornsea Three. The process for any diversion was discussed with Anglian Water in a follow up meeting.
Anglian Water Services Ltd	If a diversion(s) is required a formal application would need to be made to Anglian Water for this purpose. Further details of the application process are available to view at the following addresses: <a href="http://www.anglianwater.co.uk/developers/diversion-of-a-water-main.aspx">http://www.anglianwater.co.uk/developers/diversion-of-a-water-main.aspx</a> <a href="http://www.anglianwater.co.uk/developers/diverting-a-public-sewer.aspx">http://www.anglianwater.co.uk/developers/diverting-a-public-sewer.aspx</a>	I	Ørsted recognises the potential need for diversion of assets and that this expense would fall to Hornsea Three. The process for any diversion was discussed with Anglian Water in a follow up meeting.
Anglian Water Services Ltd	A number of construction compounds are identified in the vicinity of the proposed onshore cable route on this plan. It would be helpful to understand whether there is a requirement for water and/or waste water services to be provided by Anglian Water.	N/A	Hornsea Three confirmed that at this stage it does not anticipate any water and/or waste water services that need to be provided directly by Anglian Water at the construction compounds.
Marine Management Organisation	<b>1. General comments</b> 1.1. The MMO notes that a draft DCO and accompanying DMLs were not included as part of the consultation documentation and would welcome sight of these documents at the earliest opportunity.	N	A draft DCO and accompanying DMLs are provided as part of the application (application document reference A3.1).
Marine Management Organisation	1.2. It is currently unclear within the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) the extent to which operations and maintenance activities (O&M activities) have been assessed. It is entirely at DONG Energy's discretion as to whether O&M activities are included within the DCO application. It should be acknowledged, however that applying for a separate marine licence from the MMO for these works post-DCO carries an additional consenting risk, particularly in light of the environmental sensitivities of the export cable route. The MMO therefore recommends that all proposed O&M activities are clearly outlined and assessed within the Environmental Statement (ES).	Y	Further to the advice from the MMO further details of anticipated licensable O&M activities have been added to Environmental Statement Volume 1 Chapter 3 Project Description and these have been assessed throughout the offshore chapters of the environmental statement.
Jane Kenny (Savills) - On behalf of Salle Estate	It is also noted that the plan is still showing both cable routes over the Salle Estate. Can you please confirm that the West option is only under consideration and arrange for the plan to be updated accordingly - See attached Map 3. I trust you find this self-explanatory but should you have any queries please do not hesitate to contact me otherwise I look forward to having the opportunity to discuss this change.	N/A	The western route option is the only route being considered and taken forward as part of the DCO application.



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A? <sup>70</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Bidwells - On behalf of Charles Watt	<p>Further to your letter and enclosures dated 27th February 2018 concerning the above matter, we write as agents on behalf of our clients detailed below. We have shown the relevant consultation plan number for each client brackets.</p> <p>Charles Johnathan Watt, [REDACTED] (Map 5 of 6)</p> <p>Benjamin Robert Goodfellow, c/o Birketts, [REDACTED] (Map 5 of 6)</p> <p>Please note any correspondence relating to this response or representation should be sent to Bidwells at the above address, reference CF Bond. We now response and comment on the proposed addition access routes shown within the consultation plans, on a without prejudice basis as follows:</p> <p>1. Charles Jonathan Watt, [REDACTED] (Map 5 of 6)</p> <p>We note a Potential Access Route (New) to Mr. Kemp's land to the North of the Norwich Road which we support</p> <p>We presume the proposed access to Mr. Kemp's land which leads off the Norwich Road directly opposite the Lodge - clearly, a traffic hazard which would lead to traffic using the Lodge drive as a run off area will not now be required - could this please be confirmed (as referred to in our previous representation dated 20/12/2017)</p>	N	The proposed access in question remains as an alternative option, should this be required, with the western access being the preferred point of entry.
Bidwells - On behalf of Benjamin Goodfellow and Philip Day	<p>Benjamin Robert Goodfellow, c/o Birketts, [REDACTED] (Map 5 of 6)</p> <p>The proposed Potential Access Route (New) is approved in principle but may involve moving the Anglian Water monitoring Kiosk and also cross the manholes that give access to the balancing tank situated beneath the proposed access. We request a site meeting to agree the exact route as soon as possible.</p> <p>We assume that the alternative route coloured purple on the plan across the meadows will no longer be required - can this be confirmed?</p> <p>Christopher Bond would be prepared to meet on site with Orsted representatives to address individual client concerns.</p>	N	Both routes shown will remain as options, with the more recently added southern option being the preferred point of entry. Hornsea Three has suggested that a meeting takes place on site once a construction contractor has been appointed and prior to work commencing in order to discuss and agree any specific details relating to this access. Should any amendments to the existing Anglian Water assets be required, Hornsea Three will liaise with them accordingly.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A? <sup>70</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Savills - (Jane Kenny) on behalf of Church Farm (Booton)	<p>I am writing on behalf of our client, Church Farm (Booton) who are landowners affected by the third consultation "Focused Statutory Consultation". There has been no discussion with our client or us as agents, with regards to access point across the holding from the road to the onshore cable route corridor. In addition the appropriate notification of this change via a S.42 has not been received by our client or us as agent. Our client notes the route that you have selected across Church Farm (Booton). This is not acceptable. Our clients preferred route is the original proposal with it extending further south before coming east so that it runs as close as possible to the boundaries to minimise the impact on the croppable area of the fields. I have attached a plan showing this route hatched red. The reasons for this are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It is likely the area of woodland the route would pass through will be felled by the time you commence works.</li> <li>2. it will affect less land drains.</li> <li>3. It will avoid the grain store, the associated infrastructure and underground cabling.</li> <li>4. There will be less disruption to farming as it will only affect two arable fields rather than four.</li> <li>5. It will avoid Moor Farm and the associated impact on the occupants.</li> </ol> <p>The proposed access route is also not acceptable. Our client would like to propose the route that I have marked on the plan coloured blue, subject to the proposed access to the north of Marriott's Way being acceptable to the Salle Estate. Please note the track you have selected as an access route is actually a permissive path provided by our client, for the villagers of Reepham to access Marriott's Way.</p> <p>It is also not clear that the road between our clients land to the north and the woodland to the south will be directionally drilled however, this is a requirement and mitigate the disturbance to the area. I have shown yellow on the attached plan.</p> <p>Our client would consider the use of their new access road from Booton by the contractors, if deemed helpful, and on the appropriate terms. I have marked this in brown on the attached plan. It is also proposed a compound has been designated on our clients land. Again this has been down with no consultation / discussions with our client or us as the agent. Our client is not against the compound however before making any commitments needs to understand what it is required for, the visual impact and the length of time required.</p> <p>A meeting to discuss these changes has been requested but we have heard no further. I trust you find this self - explanatory but should you have any queries please do not hesitate to contact me otherwise we look forward to having the opportunity to meet and discuss these changes at your earliest convenience. In the meantime please can you acknowledge safe receipt of this email.</p>	N	<p>The notices issued to your respective clients, as consultation on the access and cable route amendments referred to, were done so via contact addresses on record and to which earlier correspondence has been sent with no issues raised. Should these contact addresses be incorrect, we would be grateful if these could be confirmed by providing completed LIQ forms. Copies of S42 notices issued for your clients have since been provided upon request.</p> <p>The objection to the two proposed routes across the landowner's land are noted, despite the eastern option being added to proposals following earlier feedback from the landowner to recent consultation. The new requested alternative route option to the west would run adjacent to residential receptors and listed buildings, in addition to Booton Common SSSI. The existing eastern route option would not have any direct impact on access to Moor Farm, whereas a western alternative route could impact the road to Moor Farm if the cables were installed here by direct burial. This route would also avoid the landowner's new barn development and would not impact the associated infrastructure.</p> <p>The suggested possible use of the landowner's new access road off Church Road is noted and appreciated. The temporary compound mentioned would be required for the temporary storage of materials and equipment to assist with the cable route construction and also the two proposed adjacent Horizontal Directional Drills (HDDs).</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A? <sup>70</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
Tom Corfield (Ireland Arnold Keys) On behalf of Lady Prince Smith	<p>On behalf of Lady Prince Smith we wish to object to the planned Construction and Storage Compound immediately to the south of the A1067 at Morton on the Hill. This is not a suitable site for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Marl Hill is a particularly busy road which currently carries up to 4000 cars a day and this particular junction is extremely busy and an accident black spot.</li> <li>2. The junction with the A1067 regularly floods and this winter this particular junction was under two feet of water for approximately two weeks during the months of December and January.</li> <li>3. There is an Anglian Water mains water pipe, constructed of the old weaker material, just under the entrance to your suggested Compound. This water main has a history of bursting on Marl Hill and I doubt that it will take the pressure of continual lorry movements out of and into the site.</li> <li>4. It will be much more difficult to reinstate this particular area owing to the amount of water that regularly flow down Marl Hill whenever it rains. The overflow pipe from the road drain also passes under the proposed entrance.</li> </ol> <p>For the above reasons it is my clients view that this is a very unsuitable site which would be much better sited on the other side of the A1067 on land off The Street - this can be accessed from the old A1067 which can be accessed from both directions from the new A1067. If this is not possible, you are already showing two construction and storage compounds to the south and west of Ringland Land at Weston Longville and it would be much better to rely on these two areas which are situated on dry, move "forgiving" land. I trust these comments will be taken into consideration as plans continue to develop.</p>	N	<p>Lady Prince Smith's comments in relation to the proposed storage area adjacent to the A1067 were noted and have been taken on board and will be considered by Hornsea Three. This area has been identified to provide a storage area for work relating to the proposed Horizontal Directional Drill (HDD) under the A1067 &amp; The Street.</p> <p>With regard to points 1, 2 &amp; 3, access to the proposed storage area is NOT to be taken directly off the A1067, rather it is via the proposed access further down Marl Hill, as opposed to from the junction of the two roads.</p> <p>The comments are noted regarding the water and will be taken into account in the design process. Should the ground conditions here not be suitable for use as a compound at the time, then additional materials could be used to create a more robust surface which should in turn assist with reinstatement of the land back to agricultural use.</p> <p>Hornsea Three is aware of the location of the Anglian Water pipeline as it runs along Marl Hill and the edge of the landowner's field from records they have provided, which has been considered in relation to Hornsea Three's proposals.</p> <p>The proposed storage compound consists of a small area of agricultural land (approx. 1.2 acres) which would likely be sterilised and unfarmable during the construction period. The proposal to utilise this area for storage, if required, should therefore alleviate the requirement for any additional agricultural land to be taken out of production. As discussed above, the choice of materials for the storage compound will reflect the specific requirements of the site at the time of construction.</p> <p>The other proposed storage areas mentioned (towards Weston Longville) will still be required, and have been identified mainly due to additional areas potentially required for soil and material storage, due to the height restrictions under the existing overhead electricity tower line. There is also a proposed storage area to the north of The Street which has been identified mainly to support the proposed HDD under the River Wensum and adjacent meadows.</p>
Bidwell on behalf of Edward Christopher Evans-Lombe & Great Melton Farms Limited	<p>We note that access to the working width is still via the main drive to Algarsthorpe Farmhouse and, bearing in mind the comments we submitted in our representation of 20 December 2017, can we please discuss the practicalities of how this will work.</p> <p>§ We note and support the proposed HDD for the route immediately south of the Bawburgh-Marlingford Road and the wood immediately west of Algarsthorpe Farmhouse. Would it be possible to HDD the intervening section (not open cut) so that the full length of the route from the Bawburgh-Marlingford Road to the south of the wood is installed by HDD, particularly bearing in mind that the HDD plant will already be on site.</p>	N	<p>The access along the track to Algarsthorpe Farm is required in order to access the area to the south of the River Yare in relation to the proposed HDDs under the adjacent woodland and river. Where possible, access will be taken to these areas from the public roads either side of the section of the route in order to avoid impact to the users of this track. Once a construction contractor is appointed and prior to commencement of the work it is suggested a meeting is held on site to assess the potential traffic interference here and how this can be managed.</p> <p>The suggested HDD would be over 500m in length raising technical concerns, especially given the proximity to the River Yare and wet land either side. There is also a slight bend in the route here which, although not impossible to achieve, would add further complexities to the HDD, in addition to the change in topography leading down towards the river. At this stage of the project, it is too early to commit to a complete HDD of this section given there is suitable land available to support two shorter HDD's.</p>
Bidwell on behalf of Charles Jonathan Watt	<p>As referred to in the representation submitted on 20 December 2017, we note that one of proposed accesses to Mr Kemp's land still leads off the Norwich Road directly opposite the Lodge – clearly a traffic hazard which would lead to traffic using the Lodge drive as a run off area which is totally unacceptable. We, therefore, request that this access route is not used.</p>	N	<p>Response noted. An alternative access route into the field in question has been added following receipt of earlier feedback. The proposed access in question remains as an alternative option, should this be required, with the western access being the preferred point of entry.</p>

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>70</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 42: Local Authorities (prescribed under section 43 of the Act)</b>			
No comments were received from the local authorities relating to DCO under Phase 2.A.			
<b>Section 42: Persons with an interest in the land (prescribed under section 44 of the Act)</b>			
Anglian Water Services Ltd	It is considered that protective provisions specifically for the benefit of Anglian Water should be included as part of the wording of the Draft DCO. These protective provisions are in addition to that for utility companies as set out in the model provisions for DCO applications. Appendix 1 of this letter outlines the recommended wording for inclusion in the Draft DCO. SEE APPENDIX 1 FOR RECOMMENDED PROTECTIVE PROVISIONS FOR ANGLIAN WATER	I	Protective Provisions for the benefit of Anglian Water will be included within the DCO. Discussions continue with Anglian Water on the specific wording of the Protective Provisions and Hornsea Three seeks to reach agreement on the final wording as soon as possible.
Anglian Water Services Ltd	Anglian Water would welcome further discussions with DONG Energy prior to the submission of the Draft DCO for examination. In particular it would be helpful if we could discuss the following Wording of the Draft DCO including protective provisions for the benefit of Anglian Water. Requirement for wastewater and/or water services. Impact of development on Anglian Water's assets and the need for mitigation. Pre-construction surveys and ground investigations.	I	Ørsted organised a meeting with Anglian Water to discuss impacts to all relevant Anglian Water assets and the requirements for services to new infrastructure.
Anglian Water Services Ltd	The onshore statutory consultation plan There are a number of existing water mains and foul sewers in the boundary of the proposed cable route. In addition there is an existing sewer outfall within the proposed cable route. These are essential assets which allow us to serve our existing customers and should be considered as part of the above project.	I	Ørsted acknowledged the importance of the Anglian Water assets and the services they provide. Ørsted organised a meeting with Anglian Water, where consultation plans were discussed along with the potential impacts to Anglian Water assets.
Anglian Water Services Ltd	If it is not possible to incorporate existing water mains and/or sewers as part of the site layout there may be a need to divert these asset(s). We have a duty to divert existing water mains and sewers where requested to do so although it would be at the applicant's expense.	I	Ørsted recognises the potential need for diversion of assets and that this expense would fall to Hornsea Three. The process for any diversion was discussed with Anglian Water in a follow up meeting.
Anglian Water Services Ltd	If a diversion(s) is required a formal application would need to be made to Anglian Water for this purpose. Further details of the application process are available to view at the following addresses: <a href="http://www.anglianwater.co.uk/developers/diversion-of-a-water-main.aspx">http://www.anglianwater.co.uk/developers/diversion-of-a-water-main.aspx</a> <a href="http://www.anglianwater.co.uk/developers/diverting-a-public-sewer.aspx">http://www.anglianwater.co.uk/developers/diverting-a-public-sewer.aspx</a>	I	Ørsted recognises the potential need for diversion of assets and that this expense would fall to Hornsea Three. The process for any diversion was discussed with Anglian Water in a follow up meeting.
Anglian Water Services Ltd	A number of construction compounds are identified in the vicinity of the proposed onshore cable route on this plan. It would be helpful to understand whether there is a requirement for water and/or waste water services to be provided by Anglian Water.	N/A	Hornsea Three confirmed that at this stage it does not anticipate any water and/or waste water services that need to be provided directly by Anglian Water at the construction compounds.
<b>Section 47: Duty to consult local community</b>			
Michael Davey	What is the current status of the project - when are you going for DCO?	N	At the time this comment was made, Hornsea Project Three was in the pre-application phase for a DCO. The DCO application was submitted in quarter 2 2018.
<b>Section 48: Duty to publicise</b>			
Michael Davey	What is the current status of the project - when are you going for DCO?	N	At the time this comment was made, Hornsea Project Three was in the pre-application phase for a DCO. The DCO application was submitted in quarter 2 2018.

Table 3.37: Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Further Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.B) relating to DCO

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>71</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 42: Prescribed consultees (The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009: Schedule 1))</b>			
Anglian Water	<p><b>Draft Development Consent Order Application</b> Please find attached protective provisions specifically for the benefit of Anglian Water. We would wish to see included in the wording of the Draft DCO to be submitted to the Planning Inspectorate. We would welcome further discussions with Orsted to agree the proposed wording of the draft DCO which is of relevance to Anglian Water prior to the application being submitted. [see full response from protective provisions].</p>	N/A	Protective Provisions for the benefit of Anglian Water will be included within the DCO. Discussions will continue with Anglian Water on the specific wording of the Protective Provisions and Hornsea Three will seek to reach agreement on the final wording for inclusion within the DCO.
<b>Section 42: Local Authorities (prescribed under section 43 of the Act)</b>			
No comments were received from the local authorities relating to DCO under Phase 2.B.			
<b>Section 42: Persons with an interest in the land (prescribed under section 44 of the Act)</b>			
No comments were received from persons with an interest in land relating to DCO under Phase 2.B.			
Mr & Mrs Bullimore	<p>You buy a nice plot of land for £40,000 utility and amenity not agricultural for 10 years summer house, store sheds, pony 180 trees, pony, wildlife, camping parties, stay for days have water put on fence if spend another £5,000 on it. 8 gardens plots at Kelling or 1 sugar beet field that makes sense! Multimillion job like this has to go and cross the beet fields not our little gardens. The buzz from the cables will drive wildlife away, drive my pony crazy and give you cancer. We live in our field sleep camp eat nobody lives in a beet field get it!!! You have give me hassle for 2 years and more to come NO NO CABLES UNDER ACROSS OR ANYBODY ON MY LAND OR I WILL TAKE ACTION LEGAL AND OBSTRUCTIVE.</p>	N	Land has not been and will not be accessed without prior consent or authority. The project has confirmed that the intention is to directional drill under all of the land in this vicinity, rather than open-cut trench.
<b>Section 47: Duty to consult local community</b>			
No comments were received from the local community relating to DCO under Phase 2.B.			
<b>Section 48: Duty to publicise</b>			
No comments were received in response to the Public Notice relating to DCO under Phase 2.B.			

<sup>71</sup> Y = Yes change made; N = No change made; I = Incorporated into or considered when producing the assessment or landowner voluntary agreement offer; N/A = Not applicable.



### 3.15 Consultation / Local Engagement

Table 3.38: Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.A) relating to consultation/local engagement

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>72</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 42: Prescribed consultees (The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009: Schedule 1))</b>			
Northern Gas Networks	This does not concern Northern Gas Networks as it is south of our network	N/A	Ørsted acknowledged that Total UK had no assets impacted by the proposed work. No further action was required.
Total UK Limited	As previously advised (see below) following your letter of 19 June, Total UK Limited does not own any land, property, apparatus or equipment etc in Norfolk. Please therefore remove our details from all future mailings regarding this project.  Please do not publish this email - it is not a consultation response, merely an attempt to stop the deluge of paper that accompanies all such Projects.	N/A	Ørsted acknowledged that Total UK had no assets impacted by the proposed work. No further action was required.
Amphibian and Reptile Conservation	We have received a letter asking to take part in the statutory consultation for the Hornsea Project Three Offshore Wind Farm. As a conservation NGO looking after amphibians, reptiles, and their habitats, we'd like to take a look at our records for the area around the PEIR boundary to see whether this proposed development might affect any known populations. I have received two maps, one showing the proposed onshore cable line and the other showing the subsea electricity cable line. Do you have any GIS shapefiles available for these boundaries that can help me limit my data search? Alternatively, do you have a detailed PDF or JPG file that I can georeference?	N/A	Ørsted shared a shapefile with Amphibian and Reptile Conservation group to help inform their response to the consultation.
Total UK Limited	I refer to your email below and to your letters of 19 June and 25 July. As previously advised by email on 20 June and 26 July, Total UK Limited does not own any land, property, apparatus or equipment etc in Norfolk. Please therefore remove our details from all future mailings regarding this project. Please do not publish this email - it is not a consultation response, merely an attempt to stop the deluge of paper that accompanies all such Projects.	N	Ørsted acknowledged that Total UK had no assets impacted by the proposed work. No further action was required
Health & Safety Executive	Thank you for sending the correspondence on the above to both the NSIP email account and address below which is correct for HSE. We will respond, within the deadline given. However, it was also sent to at least two other HSE email accounts. Please could you just send any further electronic communication on this project directly to the HSE's designated e-mail account for NSIP applications. Alternatively any hard copy correspondence should be sent to: Mr Dave Adams NSIP.applications( @ )hse.gov.uk	I	Ørsted acknowledged this response and verified contact details on distribution list.
Shell/Essar Pipelines	I can confirm that the Shell/Essar Pipelines from the Stanlow complex will not be affected by the proposed works.	I	The response is noted and has been included in Table 11.4 of volume 2, chapter 11: Infrastructure and Other Users.
Wintershall	Thank you for the notification. Would it be possible to send us the coordinates (in ED50 or ETRS89) of the planned Wind Farm? I notice the maps included in the PEIR but I could not find the exact coordinates.	N	Ørsted provided a shapefile of the Hornsea Three Agreement for Lease (AfL) area to Wintershall Noordzee B.V for information.

<sup>72</sup> Y = Yes change made; N = No change made; I = Incorporated into or considered when producing the assessment or landowner voluntary agreement offer; N/A = Not applicable.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>72</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
CLH Pipeline System (CLH-PS) Ltd	My client CLH-PS has received the attached and as appointed agent, I confirm they will not be affected by your project that runs from Cromer to Norwich. Please be aware that my client purchased the old MOD/DIO pipelines in 2015, however they didn't purchase them all. I have record that DIO/MOD have a pipeline that will be affected by your project and I would advise that a free Linesearch Before You Dig search ( <a href="http://www.linesearchbeforeudig.co.uk/">www.linesearchbeforeudig.co.uk/</a> ) is completed to attain official responses from them as to whether their assets will be affected or not.	N	Ørsted acknowledged that CLH Pipeline System (CLH-PS) Ltd had no assets impacted by the proposed work. No further action was required.
The Planning Inspectorate	We acknowledge receipt of your email and attachments in regard to s46 notification of your project. You will receive a formal acknowledge tomorrow.	N/A	Ørsted acknowledged this response.
McNicholas Construction Services Ltd.	Many thanks for the opportunity to offer comment in relation to your consultation on the above. I have spoken with our Company Secretary and we confirm that we have no comment to offer at this time and remain most interested in this important Project that will contribute to the UK's energy needs.		Ørsted acknowledged that McNicholas Construction Services Ltd had no assets impacted by the proposed work. No further action was required.
Leep Electricity Networks Ltd	I can confirm that LEEP utilities have nothing in this area		Ørsted acknowledged that LEEP Electricity Networks Ltd had no assets impacted by the proposed work. No further action was required.
Anglian Water Services Limited	Would you be able to send me on GIS layer of the proposed cable route as shown on the plans provided? The reason that I ask that this would help us to provide a response to this consultation.		Ørsted provided a shapefile of the Hornsea Three onshore export cable corridor to Anglian Water and organised an introductory meeting.
Marchwood Power	As previously stated, as attached, please be informed that Marchwood Power Ltd, located in Southampton, Hampshire, does not have any apparatus in the area of your interest. Please can you remove Marchwood Power from your contact lists, both email and post.		Ørsted acknowledged that Marchwood Power had no assets impacted by the proposed work. No further action was required.
SABIC UK Petrochemicals Limited	We have received your enquiry regarding apparatus in the area of the Hornsea Project Three Scheme and can confirm that the notification document below does not affect SABIC UK / INEOS Ethylene Pipeline apparatus.		Ørsted acknowledged that SABIC UK Petrochemicals Ltd had no assets impacted by the proposed work. No further action was required.
Phillips 66 Limited	Phillips 66 are not affected by these proposals. Please note that Phillips 66 Limited do not have any land interests in the vicinity of the proposed cable corridor. We believe that your enquiry should be directed to ConocoPhillips(UK) Limited. Portman House, 2 Portman Street, London W1H 6DU. I should be grateful if you would remove us from the consultation process.		Ørsted acknowledged that Phillips66 Ltd have no assets impacted by the proposed work and Phillips66 Ltd were subsequently removed from the distribution list. No further action was required.
ESP Utilities Group Ltd	I can confirm that ESP Gas Group Ltd has no gas or electricity apparatus in the vicinity of this site address and will not be affected by your proposed works. Therefore, ESP DOES NOT OBJECT to the proposed stopping up order. ESP are continually laying new gas and electricity networks and this notification is valid for 90 days from the date of this letter. If your proposed works start after this period of time, please re-submit your enquiry. Please be advised that any enquiries for ESP Connections Ltd, formerly known as British Gas Connections Ltd, should be sent directly to us at the address shown above or alternatively you can email us at: <a href="mailto:PlantResponses@espipelines.com">PlantResponses( @ )espipelines.com</a>		Ørsted acknowledged that ESP Utilities Group Ltd have no assets impacted by the proposed work. No further action was required.
McNicholas on behalf of TATA	This location is NOT AFFECTED by TATA apparatus.		Ørsted acknowledged that TATA had no assets impacted by the proposed work. No further action was required.
Jacynth Rogers on behalf of Oulton Parish Council	Please note I am no longer Clerk of Oulton Parish Council. All correspondence should in future be addressed to Lloyd Mills [REDACTED]	I	Ørsted acknowledged this response and verified contact details on distribution list.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A? <sup>72</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
EirGrid plc (Transmission System Operator, Ireland)	I refer to correspondence received by mail from Dong Energy dated 25th July and 2nd August (received today, 4th August). I wonder if EirGrid plc has been included as a potential participant by error? EirGrid plc operates and develops the national high voltage electricity grid in Ireland and is a State owned company. Its subsidiary company SONI Limited operates and develops the high voltage electricity grid in Northern Ireland. Another subsidiary EirGrid company, EirGrid Interconnector DAC owns and operates the East-West Interconnector between the UK and Ireland. Other than these involvements, EirGrid does not operate within the UK market and accordingly I am unclear as to the reasons why EirGrid is being asked to participate in this UK public consultation. Perhaps you could please clarify.		Ørsted acknowledged that EirGrid PLC had no assets impacted by the proposed work. No further action was required.
The National Trust	I refer to your letter of 25 July 2017 (attached); thank you for getting in touch regarding your proposals for a new off-shore wind farm. So that I can identify what (if any) land owned by the National trust is affected by the proposals I would be grateful if you could provide me detailed plans as to the routes of the cables on-shore.	N/A	A response was sent out to the National Trust confirming that there were no known land interests in the area and providing a link to the detailed plans on 19/09/2017.
Gigaclear plc	Thank you for adding Gigaclear to your consultation process for your Hornsea Project 3. In this instance we are not directly affected by your project and therefore don't need to take a further role in the consultation process.	N/A	Ørsted acknowledged that Gigaclear PLC had no assets impacted by the proposed work. No further action was required
LNG Portable Pipeline Services Limited	Could I ask that you please remove this company from your mailing list as the business was dissolved in March 2017.		Ørsted acknowledged that LNG Portable Pipeline Services Limited had no assets impacted by the proposed work. No further action was required.
Natural England	Difficulties opening the following file on USB or website: - HOW03_PEIR_Volume 6 Annex 8.1_Baseline Noise Survey Report	I	Ørsted acknowledged the response and noted that an error had occurred in the data transfer process for that particular file. The file was re-uploaded to the Hornsea Three website and the consultee was notified.
Itteringham Parish Council	Please direct all further emails to [REDACTED]	I	Ørsted acknowledged the response and verified contact details on distribution list.
Sky Telecommunications Services Ltd.	Thank you for your enquiry. Please be advised that Sky Telecommunications Services Ltd will not be affected by these works. Best endeavours have been made to ensure accuracy, however if you require further information, please contact us. If you would like to submit your plant enquiries electronically, please send them to nrswa( @ )sky.uk. Please be advised that our fax number has changed to [REDACTED].		Ørsted acknowledged that there will be no direct impacts on Sky Telecommunications Services Limited assets. No further action was required.
Interoute	Interoute will not be affected by this project, please remove us from the mailing list.		Ørsted acknowledged that Interoute had no assets impacted by the proposed work. No further action was required.
Mutual Energy Ltd	Thank you for forwarding the consultation information on the above project. Your enquiry does not encroach on the Premier Transmission Pipeline System (PTPS); however should you require any further information or safety advice in respect of the PTPS, i.e. for any future works, please do not hesitate to contact us by email or phone [REDACTED].		Ørsted acknowledged that Mutual Energy Ltd had no assets impacted by the proposed work. No further action was required.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>72</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
EPA, Ministry of the Environment and Food of Denmark	I write as the Danish Point of Contact for notifications regarding to the Espoo convention. In Denmark, we are a bit confused about how we understand your Espoo-process and thus the letter from Dong Energy dated July 27th. In Denmark, it is always the Espoo authority that sends hearings to parties, but as I read your letter, a builder in England also sends out consultations? However, I understand your letter as being the same hearing, as the one we received from the English authority by Kathrine King. As a result of this understanding, Denmark initiated a hearing based on the notification from Katherine King. This consultation has now been completed in Denmark, and with this mail I will forward the responses I have sent today to Katherine King to you - the attached files contain the Danish consultation response. This also means that no public consultation has been initiated based on your letter of 27 July. If I have completely misunderstood your process, I would like to hear from you more closely.		PINS contact all stakeholders under the Regulation 37 of the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (the 2017 EIA Regulations), however, as a company we also contact key stakeholders as best practice to ensure we are aware of any issues as early as possible allowing us to respond.  A summary of engagement with transboundary consultees is provided in Annex 5 (document reference number A5.1.5) of the Consultation Report.
Health & Safety Executive	Thank you for your letter of 25th July 2017 consulting HSE under Section 42 of the Planning Act 2008 for the proposed Hornsea Project Three Offshore Wind Farm. Please find HSE's advice attached.	N	Response noted.
Health & Safety Executive	Explosives. HSE has no comment to make in this regard, as there are no licensed explosive sites in the vicinity.	N	Response noted.
Health & Safety Executive	Electrical Safety. No comment from a planning perspective. Please note any further electronic communication can be sent directly to the HSE's designated e-mail account for NSIP applications to the details of which can be found at the top of this letter (NSIP.applications( @ )hse.gov.uk). Alternatively, hard copy correspondence should be sent to: Mr Dave Adams (MHPD), NSIP Consultations, 2.2 Redgrave Court, Merton Road, Bootle, Merseyside, L20 7HS.	N	Response noted.
Norwich City Council	Having referred to the PEIR, I can confirm that Norwich City Council do not wish to make comment on the proposals or the report at this stage. With regard to your letter on 4th August 2017, as this relates to utilities apparatus and assets within a 1km buffer zone, I have forwarded this letter to John Reid at NPS Norwich who manage City Council Assets. John will be able to consider and respond on this matter.	N	Noted.
Plumstead Parish Council	These representations are made on behalf of Plumstead Parish Council in North Norfolk and made by Carolyn Price, Clerk to the Council. Plumstead Parish Council supports Offshore Turbines as a source of renewable energy. However, the Parish Council wish to raise the following concerns which affect their parish only:	N	Noted.
Plumstead Parish Council	The Parish Council would be grateful for further consultation / answers on the questions raised above. All correspondence concerning this matter should be addressed to myself.	N	Noted.
Ministry of Infrastructure and the Environment, Dutch Government	My name is Pieter Jonker, I work for the Ministry of Infrastructure and the Environment and I am involved in the planning of the North Sea for the Netherlands. We are involved in the PEIR for windfarms close to our EEZ in general and for wind farm Hornsea III in particular. At the moment I am reviewing the PEIR and more specifically Volume 2 – Offshore Chapters, Chapter 7: Shipping and Navigation.	N	Noted

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>72</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Ministry of Infrastructure and the Environment, Dutch Government	I write as the Danish Point of Contact for notifications regarding to the Espoo convention. In Denmark, we are a bit confused about how we understand your Espoo-process and thus the letter from Dong Energy dated July 27th. In Denmark, it is always the Espoo authority that sends hearings to parties, but as I read your letter, a builder in England also sends out consultations? However, I understand your letter as being the same hearing, as the one we received from the English authority by Kathrine King. As a result of this understanding, Denmark initiated a hearing based on the notification from Katherine King. This consultation has now been completed in Denmark, and with this mail I will forward the responses I have sent today to Katherine King to you - the attached files contain the Danish consultation response. This also means that no public consultation has been initiated based on your letter of 27 July. If I have completely misunderstood your process, I would like to hear from you more closely.	N	Under the EIA Regulations 2017 Regulation 37, the duty sits with the Planning Inspectorate to contact stakeholders. However, as best practice and in an effort to get early sight of any concerns a stakeholder might have so that we can respond appropriately, we also key stakeholders directly ourselves.
Milieu	After an internal consultation round, Belgium has no comments during this project stage. Thanks for keeping us informed.	N	Noted.
Centrica	on behalf of Centrica Exploration and Production, by those copied representing the above, address as per below and as per email addresses copied	N	Response noted.
Peel Ports	In lieu of the receipt of detailed design and construction information, GYPC would seek to reserve its position in respect of its support for the proposal until such time as have received the necessary reassurances that the following points will be adequately addressed:	N	Noted.
Peel Ports	We also reserve our position to notify you of any further concerns in addition to those notified above which may arise as a result of our receiving further or more detailed information in relation to the Project. Should you require any further information or clarification on any matter please do not hesitate to make contact.	N	Noted
Great Yarmouth Borough Council	We are responding at an Officer level, incorporating views from the Council's Strategic Planning and Economic Development departments. The onshore area (i.e. the landfall and grid connections) are outside the Borough of Great Yarmouth, therefore no comments have been made in relation to this. Comments forthwith relate to the offshore elements of the project.	N	Noted
Anglian Water Services Ltd	Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above project prior to submission of the DCO application. Anglian Water is the water and sewerage undertaker for the proposed site. The following comments are submitted on behalf of Anglian Water. General comments We note that the above project is considered to be a nationally significant infrastructure project and that a Development Consent Order (DCO) will be required.	N/A	Ørsted acknowledged Anglian Water Services Ltd's (hereafter referred to as Anglian Water) interest in Hornsea Three and had regard to comments received.
Holt County Division	Submission from Sarah Butikofer County Councillor for Holt Division on behalf of constituents and Parish Councils who have registered their concerns with me as their elected representative.	N	Noted, responses provided to individual comments.
Natural England	1.1 It would be useful if the title pages of additional documents, reports and annexes clearly stated the revision number and the date of the last revision, to see if the comments had been previously provided on that iteration of the document.	I	The designation status for sites referred to in Environmental Statement volume 2, chapter 1: Marine Processes has been checked and updated, as necessary.



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>72</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
The Ipswich Hospital	I write to confirm that Ipswich Hospital would not be affected by any proposed works concerning the aforementioned project. It would appear that the majority of the associated works with this project would be primarily in the Norfolk region and therefore being some considerable distance and being located in Ipswich in Suffolk it is hard to foresee if these works would affect us in any way, shape or form. Our initial enquiries would indicate that we are not affected and therefore I write to confirm on behalf of the Trust that these works should not affect us in any way.  I hope this clarifies the matter but should you require any additional details or information please do not hesitate to contact me.		Ørsted acknowledged that Ipswich Hospital had no assets impacted by the proposed work. No further action was required.
Kelling Parish Council (Barbara Young)	Proposal - this area has suffered enough	I	See previous comments relating to steps Hornsea Three has taken to minimise disruption to the local communities at landfall and along the onshore cable corridor route.
<b>Section 42: Local Authorities (prescribed under section 43 of the Act)</b>			
Great Yarmouth Borough Council	Forwarded to relevant team in council.	N/A	Ørsted acknowledged this response.
King's Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council	The Borough Council of King's Lynn & West Norfolk has no comments regarding the above consultation.	N	Ørsted acknowledged this response.
Norwich City Council	Having referred to the PEIR, I can confirm that Norwich City Council do not wish to make comment on the proposals or the report at this stage. With regard to your letter on 4th August 2017, as this relates to utilities apparatus and assets within a 1km buffer zone, I have forwarded this letter to John Reid at NPS Norwich who manage City Council Assets. John will be able to consider and respond on this matter.	N	Noted.
Great Yarmouth Borough Council	We are responding at an Officer level, incorporating views from the Council's Strategic Planning and Economic Development departments. The onshore area (i.e. the landfall and grid connections) are outside the Borough of Great Yarmouth, therefore no comments have been made in relation to this. Comments forthwith relate to the offshore elements of the project.	N	Noted
<b>Section 42: Persons with an interest in the land (prescribed under section 44 of the Act)</b>			
Anglian Water Services Limited	Would you be able to send me on GIS layer of the proposed cable route as shown on the plans provided? The reason that I ask that this would help us to provide a response to this consultation.		Ørsted provided a shapefile of the Hornsea Three onshore export cable corridor to Anglian Water and organised an introductory meeting.
Richard Gordon	1. I refer to your letter of 25th July 17 informing me of the proposed exhibition at Monday 4th September 17. We will be unable to attend that meeting as we will be away on that date.	N/A	Response noted. No further action required.
Richard Gordon	2. You inform me that documents are available on a USB card. As I would be unable to use this card. However you say it is available on a hard copy format which will cost me £1160. This will be putting me at immediate expense and further substantial legal and consulting costs	N/A	The letter confirms that the Non-Technical Summary documents and USBs containing the full application were available to view/collect free of charge at local libraries, where computer facilities were available and in hard copy at the Norfolk and Norwich Millennium Library.
Dr George Carman	I have placed in the mail today the hardcopy Feedback Form but wish to supplement it with this typed version ( my handwriting is not the best) together with maps and photographs.	N/A	Hornsea Three noted the response.
Dr George Carman	Following is Stakeholder response to the Phase 2 Consultation Feedback Form – not all items are addressed	N/A	Hornsea Three noted the response
Dr George Carman	Elements to be considered Please refer specifically to Questions/Response numbers 10 and 13	N/A	Noted. Answers provided in response to previous comments.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>72</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Dr George Carman	Further comments Whilst many of the 3rd party reports include impact assessment statements; a comprehensive and time-evolved Risk Register has not been found. The lack of proponents RISK REGISTER does not provide for a HOLISTIC AND TRANSPARENT DOCUMENTATION FOR THE PROPOSED PROJECT	N/A	The Environmental Statement prepared for Hornsea Three follows the relevant guidelines of the PINS advice notes. A full list of guidance which has been considered is listed in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 5: Environmental Impact Assessment Methodology. It is noted, however, that the methodology of specific topic chapters is informed by an assessment of risk, for example the assessment of impacts from air quality provided in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 9: Air Quality.
Dr George Carman	Access to Information Online access is spurious in North Norfolk. Whilst DONG has provided the PEIRS report on a USB, it is missing some data/information elements and sifting through the almost 1 GB of information is most confusing and onerous for inexperienced and time-poor stakeholders holding down jobs, supporting families and maintaining their properties.	N/A	Response noted. Ørsted has sought to make the documents as accessible as possible by providing USB sticks to all relevant consultees as well as uploading all documentation onto the project website. Furthermore, hard copies of the PEIR (including documents, plans and maps) was available at several locations during the Phase 2 consultation period, which ran from 27 July to 20 September. Locations included: North Norfolk District Council office, Broadlands District Council office, South Norfolk District Council office, Norwich City Council office, Norfolk County Council office and six local library's along the proposed cable corridor.  Details of where the hard copies of the DCO Application will be available is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 1: Introduction.
Dr George Carman	Incorporation of Feedback into Final design Assurance that this feedback and all feedback is fed into the Final Design MAY be improved by making ALL FEEDBACK PUBLIC	N/A	All consultation feedback has been considered when making final design decisions and these are reflected in the Project Description of the Environmental Statement.
Dr George Carman	SEE ATTACHED SUPPORTING FIGURES and PHOTOS	N/A	Response noted.
Dr George Carman	Approximate time spent studying material and preparing this response: 25 professional man-hours	N/A	Response noted.
Stephen and Sandra Carman	Further comments Lack of proponents RISK REGISTER does not provide for a HOLISTIC AND TRANSPARENT DOCUMENTATION FOR THE PROPOSED PROJECT.	N/A	The Environmental Statement prepared for Hornsea Three follows the relevant guidelines of the PINS advice notes. A full list of guidance which has been considered is listed in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 5: Environmental Impact Assessment Methodology. It is noted, however, that the methodology of specific topic chapters is informed by an assessment of risk, for example the assessment of impacts from air quality provided in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 9: Air Quality.
Stephen and Sandra Carman	Access to Information Online access is spurious in North Norfolk. Whilst DONG has provided the PEIRS report on a USB, it is missing some data/information elements and sifting through the almost 1 GB of information is most confusing and onerous for inexperienced and time-poor stakeholders holding down jobs, supporting families and maintaining their properties.	N/A	Response noted. Ørsted has sought to make the documents as accessible as possible by providing USB sticks to all relevant consultees as well as uploading all documentation onto the project website. Furthermore, hard copies of the PEIR (including documents, plans and maps) was available at several locations during the Phase 2 consultation period, which ran from 27 July to 20 September. Locations included: North Norfolk District Council office, Broadlands District Council office, South Norfolk District Council office, Norwich City Council office, Norfolk County Council office and six local library's along the proposed cable corridor.  Details of where the hard copies of the DCO Application will be available is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 1: Introduction.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>72</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Jane Kenny, Savills (general comments)	Consultation – There have been a number of meetings with DONG Energy and their agents Dalcour McLaren to discuss Hornsea Project Three. However many of the questions have remained unanswered. Some of the information which has been provided is clearly contradicted by the PEIR. Our clients report that it is difficult to provide any feedback as consultees as the information has not been available to be able to make constructive feedback on Furthermore, the PEIR is very generalised, which in itself gives rise to many of their areas of concern.	N/A	Hornsea Three confirmed that the Preliminary Environmental Impact Report is only preliminary and comprised of information and supporting proposals available at that time. The Environmental Statement contains an updated summary and report of the proposed scheme.
Anglian Water Services Ltd	Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above project prior to submission of the DCO application. Anglian Water is the water and sewerage undertaker for the proposed site. The following comments are submitted on behalf of Anglian Water. General comments We note that the above project is considered to be a nationally significant infrastructure project and that a Development Consent Order (DCO) will be required.	N/A	Ørsted acknowledged Anglian Water Services Ltd's (hereafter referred to as Anglian Water) interest in Hornsea Three and had regard to comments received.
D.N Gray	Yes, via post. You are contacting me already (spelling errors in your version of my address).	N	Noted.
D.N Gray	Offshore Array - No knowledge of area	N	Noted.
D.N Gray	Offshore cable corridor - Nothing to comment. Through my ignorance of the subject	N	Noted.
D.N Gray	Proposal - With reservations - Investigate why gap is growing and rectify. The need is to meet ever increasing energy demand. Electric tooth brushes - light pollution - 24/7 vehicle use. Vs Fitness centres - less night clubs - walking/cycling	N	Noted.
D.N Gray	Further Comments - Not really, realise the need, the objective of this project is to meet the need and I realise that you have done your best to meet current and future objections. I am a very small farmer and this will affect me much greater than my neighbour who farms a land over 100 times larger.	I	Noted. Impacts on agricultural land classification and farm holdings are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 6: Land Use and Recreation.
Sandra Gentle	Local Matters Landfall - Not that I am aware of	N	Noted
Sandra Gentle	PEIR - No - I will leave that to the specialists	N	Noted.
Sandra Gentle	Baseline Information - Not read it all. Far too much detail to notice.	N	Noted.
Timewell Properties (Jane Kenny)	The site is very complex and includes various challenges from environmental, infrastructure and commercial points. Her client does not feel suitably informed in order to provide constructive feedback or comments. Requested a meeting with Stuart Livesy and/or other engineers. Provided corrections to points on socio-economics within the PEIR.	Y	1. Meeting on site now not required due to route avoiding land in question. 2. Points regarding socio-economics have been reviewed by Orsted's Environment and Consents teams. Further details are documented in Environmental Statement, volume 3, chapter 10, Socio Economics.
<b>Section 47: Duty to consult local community</b>			
East Lindsey District Council	Can you advise why ELDC are being consulted when it is nowhere near East Lindsey	N/A	Ørsted advised that East Lindsey District Council (ELDC) had received the consultation materials, as the council was listed on the general distribution list. Ørsted confirmed that ELDC is not a prescribed local authority with regard to Hornsea Three (under Section 43 of the Planning Act 2008), however were welcome to comment where relevant.
East Lindsey District Council	Before we decide whether to comment can you advise how far it is from the East Lindsey Coast for example to Skegness and how high the turbines are because it maybe that it won't even be visible from East Lindsey	N	Ørsted confirmed that the closest point of the offshore array is approximately 147 km from the East Lindsey coast.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>72</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Norfolk Geodiversity Partnership	We would be grateful to receive paper work from you relating to the statutory consultation on the environmental impact of the Hornsea 3 onshore cable project in Norfolk. The Norfolk Geodiversity Partnership is the body which designates Local Sites of geodiversity interest (County Geodiversity Sites), re. sections 109 and 117 of the National Planning Policy Framework.	N/A	Ørsted issued a further copy of the consultation overview and USB containing the full PEIR and supporting consultation materials to the Norfolk Geodiversity Partnership.
Victoria Phillips (Portakabin)	Can we please update address to;  Victoria Phillips [REDACTED]  Could you also please confirm once amended as I have my post on a diversion only until the end of the month.	I	Ørsted acknowledged this response and verified contact details on distribution list.
East Lindsey District Council	I have found the height of the turbines to tip height in the documents but could you let me know ASAP how far this wind farm array is from the East Lindsey Coast.	N/A	Ørsted acknowledged comments and a shapefile was shared with the Oil & Gas Authority to inform their consultation response.
Ann Abbott	Explained that she was unable to attend the community consultation event on the 7th September at Weybourne Village Hall and noted the need for faster deployment of electricity sources to accommodate future increased production of electric cars,	N	Support for the project and the deployment of renewable energy is noted.
East Lindsey District Council	Thanked for consultation. It is noted that the offshore array is located some 120 km north east from the Norfolk coast and would be 160 km east of the Yorkshire coast. It is also noted that none of the landfall works and grid connection works are located in Lincolnshire and all are located in Norfolk. Given the above there is no material impact on East Lindsey and there the Council has no comment to make on the proposals.	N	Response noted. No further action required as works located away from LPA.
George Francis	I am writing to request a copy of the documentation relating to PIER. Please send to me in accordance with the process specified in the Section 128 notice a full set of documentation on a memory stick to: GI Francis, [REDACTED]. Please also treat this as a request by Mr David Rice of [REDACTED] for the same thing. If you find it convenient, you may send both memory sticks to my address.	N/A	Ørsted sent a USB containing the full PEIR and supporting consultation materials by post to the consultee.
George Francis	Thank you for supplying two memory sticks, containing the information referred to in the section 128 notice, which I safely received today. Unfortunately I was unable to contact you by telephone today, to discover the precise kind of memory stick they are. Please would you let me know this so that my colleague and I may use them.	N/A	Ørsted contacted the consultee to advise on how to use the USB.
East Lindsey District Council	Please note that we aim to respond by 17/08/2017. However unfortunately due to the high volume of enquiries it may not always be possible. If you have any queries please do not hesitate to contact Mr. C. Panton who is dealing with this enquiry please quote our reference number as shown at the top of this letter.	N	Noted.
David Edwards	Hi, I live quite near the proposed HVDC Converter/HVAC Substation in Swardeston and would be interested in what it looks like, Do you have any plan/ drawing I could view.	N/A	Ørsted advised the consultee to attend one of the community consultation events if possible or to view the exhibitions banners available on the Hornsea Three website.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>72</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
John Lewis	I am a member of the Computing & Alternative Technologies (CAT) group, run by the University of the Third Age (U3A) in North Norfolk. We meet locally two mornings a month, we normally number 15 'older persons'. Renewable Energy has been a subject for discussion on a number of occasions but as a Group we would like to expand our knowledge. We are aware of your proposed public sessions but something a little more technical would be of interest, on-shore of course! From local media reports we have a 'vague' idea of Hornsea Project Three, would there be any technical briefings that we could perhaps benefit from? From the workings of the turbine, getting the power ashore to integrating it into the National Grid are subjects that interest us. As a group we have reasonable IT skills, our members from a variety of backgrounds. We are all reasonable fit and mostly well, but none of us has any special needs. I look forward to hearing from you.	N/A	Volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description provides an outline description of Hornsea Three. It sets out the Hornsea Three design and components for both onshore and offshore infrastructure, as well as the main activities associated with the construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning phases.  Although the project envelope has been designed to include sufficient flexibility to accommodate further project refinement during detailed design, post-consent, it provides technical information which may be of interest to the CAT group.
Paul Craske	I am sorry not to have completed your designer feedback form ,but they never allow you to express what you feel, outside of the box! I would just say that at the Consultation Event it may have been beneficial to you , if all members of staff were singing from the same hymn sheet.	N	Noted.
Michael Davey	Is it possible to get the proposed route as a .kml, .kms or .shp file?	N/A	It was noted that the route and plans presented at that time were indicative and subject to change. Shapefiles were shared with consultees on request. Importantly, in order to ensure good data management it is important for Ørsted to understand what the shapefile will be used for, to ensure that only the latest versions are in use. Ørsted enquired as to the use of the shapefile and did not received a response, and consequently no shapefile was issued.
Cllr Graham Everett (District Councillor for Reepham) - Broadland District Council	I must start by giving my sincere thanks and appreciation to all the representatives from DONG energy who I have had the pleasure of meeting at the various public events that I have attended. All representatives have been highly professional, having great knowledge and always willing to take time to provide answers to all questions and matters whether high level or minor. Special thanks must also be given to Emily Woolfenden for the way the events were organised and managed ensuring that the relevant bodies were kept fully involved, engaged and updated on all matters and by always being ready to assist on any issue.	N	Noted
Cllr Graham Everett (District Councillor for Reepham) - Broadland District Council	I am confident that DONG energy will address any environmental issues with sensitivity during and post the construction period.	N	Noted
Cllr Graham Everett (District Councillor for Reepham) - Broadland District Council	Finally: Having been heavily involved with the PINS inquiry into the Norwich Northern Distributor Road (NDR) I appreciate the thoroughness of the planning process and wish DONG energy every success in achieving a successful outcome and receiving permission to construct the Hornsea Three Development.	N	Noted
Friends of North Norfolk	2. Hornsea Project Three will, on its own, be one of the largest offshore wind farms in the world and the scale of it, when considering Hornsea Projects One and Two (for which Dong Energy already have approval and are currently developing) is massive and it seems likely that Hornsea Project Four will very likely follow on.	N	Noted



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>72</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Dr. William Brian Ankers (on behalf of Yvette Gibson)	Further to my previous representations to you under the Phase 1.b Community Consultation as a report entitled: 'HORNSEA PROJECT THREE OFFSHORE WIND FARM, REPORT REGARDING POTENTIAL CANDIDATE SITE FOR HVAC BOOSTER STATION AT POND HILLS, NORFOLK – OPTION A', dated March 2017 I have the following comments regarding the PEIR and supporting documents. In making these comments I am instructed as before by Yvette Gibson of [REDACTED] ([REDACTED]):	N	Noted, responses provided to individual comments.
Mervyn & Maureen Bibb	We attended the recent community consultation event at Swardeston Village Hall about the proposed route of the onshore cable corridor and we are contacting you to make the following representation.	N	Noted
Mervyn & Maureen Bibb	We are supportive of wind power and have been impressed with your consultative exercise thus far, but the issues raised above leave us concerned. Can you please confirm receipt of this e-mail?	N	Noted
Rt Hon Norman Lamb MP	I appreciate that delivery plans are still being scoped and finalised. It is crucial that DONG listens to, hears and acts upon the views and concerns of the people of North Norfolk who will be directly and indirectly affected by this massive undertaking. To that end I would welcome an open meeting with you, local councillors and residents to discuss your proposals after the consultation findings have been collated.	N	Hornsea Three has sought to minimise impacts to local residential receptors, either through site selection/route refinement or through the identification of suitable mitigation measures. Where there are impacts to residential receptors, these are assessed in the relevant topic specific chapters of the Environmental Statement (volume 3), for example noise during the operation of the HVDC converter/HVAC substation is assessed and appropriate mitigation measures identified in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 8: Noise and Vibration.  As part of our public consultation, we have held three rounds of community consultation events through 2016 and 2017. These events were an opportunity for members of the local community to view the latest plans, to speak directly with members of the project team where individuals required further clarity, and to comment on our proposal at that stage. Attendees were encouraged to capture their thoughts and any concerns by completing one of our feedback forms or by writing to us directly. All the feedback received at and after the events has been carefully considered by the Project and will be incorporated where possible into the final design. A summary of the feedback received is provided in the Consultation Report which forms part of the DCO application.
Robert & Christine Strong	We are Robert & Christine Stronge and live at Ceol Mor, Gt Melton Road, Little Melton, Norwich. We have submitted an online feedback form but it is not possible to attached a document to that so we are also emailing you. Please take this email as our feedback on the Hornsea Project Three.	N/A	This email was acknowledged by Ørsted and their feedback was considered by the Project.
Matthew Martin	If this is the Non-Technical summary I dread to think what the Technical Report consists of!	I	A non-technical summary forms part of the DCO application and seeks to provide a summary of the Environmental Statement.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>72</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Derek Barber	In some places these appear to border or completely surround residential properties. If these sites are to be in use for several years these residents have to be properly compensated.	I	Where possible and practicable the cable corridor route selected seeks to avoid passing adjacent to properties. This is to reduce impacts associated with construction disturbance and to seek to minimise conflicts such as Heavy Goods Vehicle (HGV) traffic movements. However, it is not possible to avoid passing in close proximity to all properties on the route. Where properties are located in close proximity, the Project will ensure that sensitive construction management measures, such as noise, dust and traffic control are considered. These are documented in an outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), which accompanies the DCO application.  In respect to compensation, we will compensate landowners who are directly affected by the cable through their land. Compensation is paid for the freehold depreciation of the land affected by the easement and for all reasonable and substantiated losses arising from construction of the project.
Michael Wilton	Signed up to our mailing list.	N	Ørsted added the consultee to the mailing list.
Steffan Aquarone	signed up to our mailing list.	N	Ørsted added the consultee to the mailing list.
Caroline Rix	Europe is covered in windfarms & the UK need to get a grip with the use of windfarms either land or sea else there will be many broken down electric cars come 2040 on the side of the road due to lack of power provision. EIA for HOW03 so far - comprehensive. PEIR - Good provision of jobs & learning opportunities for those interested.	N	Ørsted acknowledged this response.
J Krantic	Great project, go for it	N	Noted.
Marguerite Russel	The important words are 'to date'. As work starts other more sensitive issues may arise. These will need to be addressed.	I	Noted, updated information is included within the Environmental Statement.
Marguerite Russel	Mitigation methods - Keep the discussions going. Extremely important.	N	Noted.
David Young (NNDC Councillor)	Information - Access is one thing - understanding is another!	N	Impacts relating to access are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 7: Traffic and Transport.
David Young (NNDC Councillor)	EIA - Too complex, report too large, to be able to assimilate	I	Noted, the Non-technical summary which forms part of the DCO application provides a summary of the findings of the Environmental Statement.
Dawn Moore	Proposal - Support the project but with some reservations as outlined	N	Noted, see previous responses.
Sandra Gentle	Local Matters Landfall - Not that I am aware of	N	Noted
Sandra Gentle	PEIR - No - I will leave that to the specialists	N	Noted.
Sandra Gentle	Baseline Information - Not read it all. Far too much detail to notice.	N	Noted.
John Walker, (SHOOT)	Information - Exactly how you propose to compensate local owners (i.e. tenants) for the disturbance	N	We will compensate landowners who are directly affected by the cable through their land. Compensation is paid for the freehold depreciation of the land affected by the easement and for all reasonable and substantiated losses arising from construction of the project.
Hugh Guyatt	Consultation - People at the consultation meeting in Weybourne were telling us conflicting and opposing views and facts	N	Noted, responses are provided to the relevant points in this log.
Pat Floyd	Mitigation Methods - Any element I would like considered have been explained in previous questions	N	Noted.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>72</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Pat Floyd	Further Comments - No one seems to know as no final details are in place. I am sure your surveys have been extensive, but not been completed by people who live in the area in a lot of case	N	All the feedback received at and after the consultation events, or during Statutory Consultation has been carefully considered by the Project and will be incorporated where possible into the final design. A summary of this process is provided in the Consultation Report which accompanies the application. Where relevant, this has also informed the baseline presented in the Environmental Statement.
Pat Floyd	Information - No access to computerised information, a fault in common with a lot of older people in Norfolk	N	Response noted. Orsted has sought to make the documents as accessible as possible by providing USB sticks to all relevant consultees as well as uploading all documentation onto the project website. Furthermore, hard copies of the PEIR (including documents, plans and maps) was available at several locations during the Phase 2 consultation period, which ran from 27 July to 20 September. Locations included: North Norfolk District Council office, Broadlands District Council office, South Norfolk District Council office, Norwich City Council office, Norfolk County Council office and six local library's along the proposed cable corridor.  Hard copies of the DCO Application will be available in Norfolk and details of locations are confirmed in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 1: Introduction
Peter Youart	Consultation - Excellent PR job - Burying and masking vital information	N	Hornsea Three has sought to provide a transparent record of the Environmental Impact Assessment process within the Environmental Statement, including the provision of a non-technical summary to assist readers to understand the key issues and conclusions of the assessment.
Roger Hughes	Further Comments - You do not know what you do not know	N	Noted. The Hornsea Three EIA has employed a maximum design scenario approach, which reflects the Rochdale Envelope approach. By identifying, and assessing based on the maximum design scenario, it can therefore be concluded that the all issues have been addressed and any impacts will be no greater for any other design scenario.  The full details of the EIA methodology are set out in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 5: EIA Methodology.
John Norman	Onshore Cable Corridor - See attached page re: High Kelling and Bodham Wood - Information relating to paths between points A to H on the above map.	I	Information relating to cable corridor routing is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives. Cable corridor routing was informed by a number of factors including technical and environmental constraints.
Ray Bennett	Offshore Array Area - None - my preferred option	N	Noted.
Ray Bennett	PEIR - Have not read them	N	Noted.
Ray Bennett	Baseline Assessments - None - seems satisfactory at this stage	N	Noted.
Ray Bennett	Information - How do you provide feedback to my feedback?	N	Hornsea Three has responded to indicate how the project has had regard to comments made during the public consultations and Statutory consultations within the Consultation Report, of which this forms part, which forms part of the DCO application.
Matthew Martin	PEIR - I have got to be supplied with a non-technical summary	N	The non-technical summary accompanies the Environmental Statement and seeks to provide a high level summary of the approach taken within, and the conclusions of the Environmental Statement.
Matthew Martin	PEIR surveys - I have yet to receive a copy of the non-technical summary	N	The non-technical summary accompanies the Environmental Statement and seeks to provide a high level summary of the approach taken within, and the conclusions of the Environmental Statement.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>72</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Matthew Martin	EIA - I have yet to be supplied with a copy of the non-technical summary	N	The non-technical summary accompanies the Environmental Statement and seeks to provide a high level summary of the approach taken within, and the conclusions of the Environmental Statement.
George Francis - Swardeston Village Hall	PEIR - These seem to me to be careful and fairly stated	N	Noted.
Valerie Stubbs	Further Comments - Rather a lot to plough through!	N	Noted.
Christine Walton	Further Comments - Please do not do it.	N	Noted.
Christine Walton	Dong's Use of Public Opinion - Not sure - I would like to think that the views of us will be taken into account, but I can't help but doubt it as clearly this neither helps people nor saves the environment	N	All the feedback received at and after the events has been carefully considered by the Project and will be incorporated where possible into the final design. A summary of all the comments received and how we have had regard to these is provided within the Consultation Report which forms part of the DCO application.
Christine Walton	Export Cable - Please see above. My concerns would be similar to this. HOW03 would have a cumulative and greater effect as being the 3rd large similar project as an area with numerous offshore wind turbines, interconnection cables and other offshore substation/platforms. I question the need for another wind farm. This intentionally is about someone making a lot of money rather than being good for the environment	I	Cumulative impacts are assessed within the relevant topic chapter of the Environmental Statement (volume 3).
Christine Walton	Local Matters Landfall - So you already know this then	N	Noted.
T Mason	Consultation - Very informative - DONG representatives were very helpful	N	Noted.
Gervase Walton	Temporary Construction - The onshore cable corridor will go right past my garden. If the work is as proposed at the consultation exhibition and Swardeston village hall I do not see this as being an issue	N	Noted.
Ruth Bullard	PEIR Surveys - I have not seen the report	N	Noted.
Elaine Parkinson	PEIR Surveys - A lot of information to read and understand contained in numerous files at the community event. Unable to read through it all. It was mentioned briefly in community newsletter June 2017	N	Noted.
Elaine Parkinson	EIA - Unable to read through all the files	N	Noted, a non-technical summary forms part of the DCO application and seeks to provide a summary of the Environmental Statement.
Elaine Parkinson	Information - Would have liked more detail but in precise form	N	Noted, a non-technical summary forms part of the DCO application and seeks to provide a summary of the Environmental Statement.
Mark Cook	Consultation - The DONG representatives were reluctant to answer some questions and were cagey in the responses. I get the feeling they were prepared to answer certain questions	N	Noted.
Sue Lowther	Offshore Array - No, I am generally in favour of wind power	N	Noted.
Neil Buxton	Baseline Assessments - The information has been manipulated to produce the best outcome for DONG	N	The Hornsea Three EIA has employed a maximum design scenario approach, which reflects the Rochdale Envelope approach. By identifying, and assessing based on the maximum design scenario, it can therefore be concluded that the all issues have been addressed and any impacts will be no greater for any other design scenario.  The full details of the EIA methodology are set out in Volume 1, chapter 5: EIA Methodology.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>72</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
John Mangan	Baseline Assessments - Unable to comment without significant background study	N	Noted, additional information is provided in the Environmental Statement topic assessment chapters (volume 2 and 3)
John Mangan	Mitigation Methods - Not enough time to assimilate by 20/9/2017	N	Noted, a summary of mitigation proposed is provided in each topic specific chapter of the Environmental Statement (volume 2 and 3), whilst a summary of the commitments made by the project as a whole is provided in Environmental Statement volume 4, annex 5.1: Enhancements, Mitigation and Monitoring Commitments.
Louisa Peaver	Consultation - The interactive map to show us the location of this project is not fit for purpose for the simple reason that the background map is not ordinance surveys. It is impossible to actually see exactly where your corridor and onshore booster station will be	N	The location of the HVAC booster station and HVDC converter/HVAC substation is shown in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description.
Merlyn Bibb	Consultation - Generally very good but it was only the last consultation meeting that the true extent of the require excavations became apparent (three widely spaced cables, not one, and a much wider working corridor than initially conveyed)	I	Hornsea Three has sought to minimise direct impacts on sensitive receptors by reducing the onshore cable corridor from 200 m to approximately 80 m. A number of factors have fed into this refinement process, including technical and environmental, as summarised in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives.  The project parameters, including the number of cable circuits is set out in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 3: Project Description. There would be up to a maximum of six cable circuits, in six trenches.
Sarah Griggs-Smith	Offshore Array - No, I support wind generation of electricity	N	Noted.
Judy Holland	Signed up to mailing list.	N	Noted.
Julia Peters	Consultation - Would have appreciated a printed copy available for consultation closer to North Norfolk than the Millennial Library in Norwich to refer to, as although available on the website can be difficult to find the exact information required to comment on.	N	Noted. Details of where the hard copies of the DCO Application will be available is provided in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 1: Introduction.
Karen Saunders	Further Comments - I only found out about this from a neighbour. I've received no correspondence and my property will be one of the closest to the proposed hvac station. Not good enough.	N	Hornsea Three has undertaken a comprehensive consultation process, which has included a number of community consultation events through 2016 and 2017. These events were an opportunity for members of the local community to view the latest plans, to speak directly with members of the project team where individuals required further clarity, and to comment on our proposal at that stage. Further information is provided in the Consultation Report which accompanies the DCO application.
Simon Evans - Irelands Arnolds Keys (Land Agent)	Signed up to mailing list.	N	Noted.
Brian Donovan	PEIR - The key parts are easy to understand for the lay person	N	Noted
Stuart Franklin	Signing up to mailing list and supportive of the project.	N	Noted
R.H Peaver	PEIR - I am appreciative of the efforts made by Dong to keep the local population informed.	N	Noted
R.H Peaver	Proposal - I am resigned to the project going ahead, whatever I may or may not feel about it.	N	Noted, responses have been provided to individual comments.
John Humberstone	Proposal - No - additional material would be welcomed	I	Additional information is provided within the DCO application.
Simon Willcox	No one from your survey team has approached us or questioned us or indeed any of our neighbours on our views, local advice or information	N	As noted above, Hornsea Three has held a number of public consultation events, and statutory consultations which have encourages local community members to provide feedback to the project on views, local advice or information. Communication through this pathway ensures all feedback is recorded and can be incorporated into the final design.



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>72</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Simon Willcox	This consultation period is too short	N/A	As part of our public consultation, we have held three rounds of community consultation events through 2016 and 2017. These events were an opportunity for members of the local community to view the latest plans, to speak directly with members of the project team where individuals required further clarity, and to comment on our proposal at that stage. In respect to the formal consultation period, the duration was in accordance with legislative requirements and lasted significantly longer than the minimum of 28 days for this consultation.  Further information is provided in the Consultation Report which accompanies the DCO application.
Graham & Susan Mette	PEIR - To be reviewed - I will comment later	N	Noted
Graham & Susan Mette	Did not really get clear answers to my concern at the consultation - all very 'correct' corporate 'speak'	N	Noted, responses are provided to the relevant points in this log.
Graham & Susan Mette	With all due respect, this is a procedure, a stage to be achieved, a box to be ticked. All decisions have already been made, of that I am sure.	N/A	The DCO application will be examined by the Planning Inspectorate (PINS), who must be satisfied that we have undertaken sufficient pre-application consultation with statutory consultees and local communities under consultation requirements contained in section 42 and section 47 of the Planning Act 2008. Hornsea Three has undertaken this consultation and carefully considered the issues raised; in many instances the feedback received has informed the refinement of the design.  Copies of the responses received and a summary of how Ørsted had regard to comments received is included in the Consultation Report which accompanies the DCO application.
Tina Hayward	PEIR - have not seen this	N	Noted
Tina Hayward	Support - If it is essential - it has to be. I would much rather have wind farms than nuclear power. However, Norfolk seems to be crossed by an ever increasing network of gas pipelines and windfarm cables. I just hope the safety aspects of all these have been properly assessed to protect people's health and their safety.	N	Noted, Hornsea Three has given due consideration to health and safety during the design of the project, in line with standard guidance and established standards.
<b>Section 48: Duty to publicise</b>			
Norfolk Geodiversity Partnership	We would be grateful to receive paper work from you relating to the statutory consultation on the environmental impact of the Hornsea 3 onshore cable project in Norfolk. The Norfolk Geodiversity Partnership is the body which designates Local Sites of geodiversity interest (County Geodiversity Sites), re. sections 109 and 117 of the National Planning Policy Framework.	N/A	Ørsted issued a further copy of the consultation overview and USB containing the full PEIR and supporting consultation materials to the Norfolk Geodiversity Partnership.
Amir Khan	I found your website through Internet and realized that despite having a great design; it was not ranking on any of the search engines (Google Yahoo and Bing) for most of the keywords relating to your business. I am affiliated with an SEO company based in India that has helped over 200 businesses rank on the 1st Page of GOOGLE for even the most competitive Industries. Let me know if you are interested and we will send you a proposal which will not only improve your sales but website visitors too.	N	Ørsted acknowledged receipt and shared this information with the relevant team internally should this service be required.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>72</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
World Tech Online	<p>I've been trying to get in touch with you and just recently left a message to discuss how we can positively assist your company/upcoming event in providing contact list of "Energy and Utility Industry" who would be interested in your product and services with required contact details like first &amp; last names, Phone, fax, e-mail, physical address etc.</p> <p>We have compiled our list from the following:</p> <p>Industry</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Electrical Utility</li> <li>• Gas Utility</li> <li>• Energy Utility</li> <li>• Water Utilities</li> <li>• Oil And Gas</li> <li>• Energy Service Companies</li> <li>• Pipeline Operators</li> <li>• Natural gas companies</li> <li>• Petrochemical industry</li> </ul> <p>Titles</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Executive, General or Corporate Management</li> <li>• Engineering Management</li> <li>• Planning, Design and Systems</li> <li>• Information Systems</li> <li>• Operations and Maintenance</li> <li>• Operations Management</li> <li>• Purchasing</li> <li>• Research and Development</li> </ul> <p>Kindly let us know your target requirement in the below format, so that we can send you the details accordingly.            Target Industry: _____            Target Titles: _____            Target Geography: _____</p>		Hornsea Three noted that this was not a valid landowner response and therefore no follow up was necessary.
Michael Davey	Is it possible to get the proposed route as a .kml, .kms or .shp file?	N/A	It was noted that the route and plans presented at that time were indicative and subject to change. Shapefiles were shared with consultees on request. Importantly, in order to ensure good data management it is important for Ørsted to understand what the shapefile will be used for, to ensure that only the latest versions are in use. Ørsted enquired as to the use of the shapefile and did not received a response, and consequently no shapefile was issued.
Douglas Walters (Norfolk Geographical Association)	EIA - It seems to have been done in a thorough way with good local consultation for people's views	N	Noted.
Douglas Walters (Norfolk Geographical Association)	Mitigation Methods - Just perhaps donations to local voluntary organisations in areas disrupted by the construction for inconvenience	N	We have established voluntary Community Benefit Funds (CBFs) for a number of our projects, which are currently under construction. These funds can make a valuable contribution to the local area, by supporting projects such as community building improvements and recreation facilities, conservation and wildlife projects etc. Hornsea Project Three will review the interactions of the project, as the proposal is refined and consider an appropriate way to feed benefits back into the local community. However, any decision to establish a community benefit fund for Hornsea Three would be made post financial investment decision (FID).

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>72</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Douglas Walters (Norfolk Geographical Association)	Further Comments - Just I hope it provides a boost to the local economy: in terms of jobs, improved skills and long term cheaper local energy. In general I think it is a good idea. Just have more days in Norwich for the consultation - 3/4 days for local people that couldn't make it today	I	Impacts on socio-economics, in particular job creation, are assessed in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 10: Socio-Economics.
Douglas Walters (Norfolk Geographical Association)	Information - Just in general more information on how it progresses	N	Noted, Hornsea Three will continue to communicate project information via the dedicated project website <a href="http://hornseaproject3.co.uk/">http://hornseaproject3.co.uk/</a>
Douglas Walters (Norfolk Geographical Association)	Export cable corridor - I did not initially realise the project would involve this. It seems to be being done in an environmentally sensitive way and if it adds more electricity for Norfolk/East Anglia, it is a good idea.	N	Noted.
George Carman, Geodirect Resources P/L	Further Comments Proposal - Lack of proponents RISK REGISTER does not provide for a HOLISTIC AND TRANSPARENT DOCUMENTATION FOR THE PROPOSED PROJECT. Electronic version provides supporting maps and photographs	N	The Environmental Statement prepared for Hornsea Three follows the relevant guidelines of the PINS advice notes. A full list of guidance which has been considered is listed in Environmental Statement volume 1, chapter 5: Environmental Impact Assessment Methodology. It is noted, however, that the methodology of specific topic chapters is informed by an assessment of risk, for example the assessment of impacts from air quality provided in Environmental Statement volume 3, chapter 9: Air Quality.

Table 3.39: Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Further Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.B) relating to consultation/local engagement

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>73</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 42: Prescribed consultees (The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009: Schedule 1))</b>			
<i>No comments were received from the prescribed consultees relating to consultation/local engagement under Phase 2.B.</i>			
<b>Section 42: Local Authorities (prescribed under section 43 of the Act)</b>			
UK Power Networks	Planning applications (in the East of England) are processed by our Property and Consents Department, I have cc'd them into this email but for all future requests (in the East) their email address is consents.epn( @ )ukpowernetworks.co.uk . Should you wish to contact them by telephone the number you require is 03301 591 841.	I	Further to UKPN's response, Ørsted made further contact with their Property and Consents Department using the contact details provided. Protective Provisions and a side agreement have been discussed to provide adequate protection for UKPN's apparatus. Hornsea Three is in further discussions with UKPN in respect of a side agreement to regulate the interaction between Hornsea Three and UKPN's apparatus, including the diversion of UKPN's apparatus at the Onshore HVAC substation or HVDC converter station site.
Breckland District Council	Thank you for your email. Please can you update your records to make Jon Berry, Head of DM, your key point of contact - [REDACTED] ( @ )breckland.gov.uk	N	Noted.
Oulton Parish Council	My Council would like to invite you to one of their meetings to discuss your proposals and how they may impact on the parish of Oulton. The dates of our next few meetings in 2018 are 23 January, 6 March and 17 April and you would be most welcome to attend in order to provide answers to the questions raised in our two responses to your present consultation. Please advise whether and when a representative will be joining us and we will confirm exact meeting details.	N	Ørsted attended Oulton Parish Council's meeting on 6 March 2018 as requested to discuss their concerns. The concerns raised by the community, as well as Oulton Parish Council in respect to the main construction compound are responded to individually below.

<sup>73</sup> Y = Yes change made; N = No change made; I = Incorporated into or considered when producing the assessment or landowner voluntary agreement offer; N/A = Not applicable.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>73</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Steven Vandendorre, Milieu	We have organized an internal Belgian (all relevant federal and regional authorities have been involved) consultation on this project, via our Coastguard cooperation. No comments have been transmitted. So Belgium has no comments at this stage.	N	Hornsea Three acknowledges that Milieu has no comments to make at this stage. No action required.
Estelle Hook, Norfolk Coast Partnership	We'd be very happy to meet to discuss possibilities. We would welcome involvement in future consultations and any expert topic group meetings.	N	Noted.
CPRE Norfolk	Please note the change of address for our branch office	N	Noted.
Southern Gas Networks	For avoidance of doubt SNG maintains that the Wind Farm will not interact with its gas network. As such, Hornsea does not need to consult with SGN in respect of its plans, development and/or construction for, and of the wind farm.		Hornsea Three acknowledged SNG's response and the company was removed from the distribution list.
Sky UK Limited	Please find enclosed updated contact details for our Plant Enquiry Team below. Our preferred method of receiving and responding to enquiries is by email and all enquiries should be sent to nrswa( @ )sky.uk. This will not only ensure a quicker response, but also help limit our carbon footprint by reducing paper waste. If you still wish to send us enquiries by post, our address details are below. SKY UK LIMITED, NRSWA, 70 Buckingham Avenue, Slough, Berkshire, SL1 4PN All enquiries should include a location map, nature of your intended works and address details with eastings/northings being preferred.	N/A	Hornsea Three acknowledged Sky UK Ltd's response and updated its records accordingly
Premier Transmission	Your enquiry doesn't not encroach on the Premier Transmission Pipeline System (PTPS). However, should you require any further information or safety advice in respect of the PTPS, i.e. for any future works, please do not hesitate to contact us by email or phone (028 9043 7580).	N/A	Hornsea Three acknowledges that Premier Transmission assets are not affected by the potential offshore alternative routes. No further action required.
Phillips 66 Limited	Please note Phillips 66 Limited have no land interests in the area affected by this proposal. Please therefore remove us from the consultation process.	N/A	Phillips 66 was noted and it was subsequently removed from the distribution list.
Public Health England	Thank you for your email notifying us of this further statutory consultation. PHE previously responded to the most recent consultation on the 13 <sup>th</sup> September so understand from your email below that our comments are still under consideration, hence there is no requirement for a further formal response from us at this stage. Please let us know if you have any further queries.	N	Noted.
Shotesham Parish Council	This email account is no longer regularly monitored. Please send to clerk.shotesham( @ )outlook.com.	N	Noted.
Espoo Contact France	By this mail, we acknowledge receipt of your notification of second consultation relating to Hornsea Three offshore wind farm project and we thank you for this transmission.	N	Noted.
Forestry Commission	Thanks you for consulting the Forestry Commission we <u>do not have any comment to make</u> on these additional elements of the project in the Further statutory Consultation November 2017.	N	Noted.
Environment Agency	Thank you for your correspondence of 21 November 2017 received on 23 November 2017 addressed to our Chief Executive, James Bevan.	N	Noted.
NATS	NATS acknowledges receipt of the consultation regarding changes to the scheme. With regards to the cable corridors, NATS will review the detailed proposals when final locations are known. However, from the Overview plan received, NATS anticipates no impact from any structure/route within the currently defined area.	N	Hornsea Three acknowledges that NATS anticipates no impact regarding changes to the Hornsea Three offshore cable corridor from the potential offshore alternative routes. No further action was required.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>73</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Cadent	Please see attached the latest interactions with Cadent that will need to be considered		Hornsea Three noted the information provided by Cadent, no further action was required.
The Cruising Association	The Cruising Association comments only on matters of recreational and small craft safety and navigation. Where our members have views on other aspects of proposals they are advised to make these known through other bodies with more relevant experience. We confirm our views previously sent to you and have no further comment as a result of the changes or additional areas now proposed.	N	Hornsea Three acknowledges that the Cruising Association has no further comment to make. No further action required.
Norwich Airport	Please see attached our second letter following review of the documents you have attached for your Statutory Consultation with the Airport.	N	Noted
King's Lynn & West Norfolk Borough Council	The Borough Council of King's Lynn & West Norfolk has no comments regarding the above consultation.	N	Noted.
The Coal Authority	I have checked the updated 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. Accordingly, the Coal Authority has no issues that it would wish to see considered as part of the Environmental Statement for this proposal.	N	Hornsea Three acknowledges that The Coal Authority has no further comment to make. No further action required.
Swedish Maritime Administration	The Swedish Maritime Administration (SMA) is not the formal consultation authority in Sweden with regard to offshore windfarms outside Sweden. Therefore we urge you to not send any more consultations in this matter to SMA.	N	A response was sent to the Swedish Maritime Authority [09/01/2018] confirming that they would be removed from future consultations and that the Swedish Environmental Protection Agency, Implementation & Enforcement Department (Mr Egon Enocksson) has also been consulted.
Energy Assets	With regards to your request for details of existing services, we can confirm that based on the details provided to us, we have no buried plant or equipment in the identified area.	N/A	Hornsea Three acknowledged Energy Assets' response, no further action was required
Gamma	Having examined our records, I can confirm that Gamma has no owned apparatus within the search area of your proposed Works. All future enquiries can be done via the FREE to use LinesearchbeforeUdig service. To access the LinesearchbeforeUdig service please go to <a href="http://www.linesearchbeforeudig.co.uk">www.linesearchbeforeudig.co.uk</a> We have changed our Plant Protection process and have become a member of the LinesearchbeforeUdig service, this means that you will be able to place an enquiry via the FREE LinesearchbeforeUdig service which will then qualify if Gamma have assets at your proposed work site. If your proposed site DOES affect our assets we will then respond directly to you with our plans and information. If your proposed site DOES NOT affect our assets you will be notified immediately on screen and you will receive a confirmation email from LinesearchbeforeUdig.	N/A	Hornsea Three acknowledged Gamma's response, no further action was required
Gas Networks Ireland (UK)	I just wish to confirm with you as per my earlier email below that Gas Networks Ireland (UK) are not impacted by your works. Can you please remove us from further consultation on this project?	N/A	Gas Networks Ireland's response was noted by Hornsea Three and it was subsequently removed from the distribution list
Penspen Ltd	Would like to know why they are being consulted. Provide a range of services to the energy industry.		



Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>73</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
ESP Utilities Group Ltd	<p>I can confirm that ESP Gas Group Ltd has no gas or electricity apparatus in the vicinity of this site address and will not be affected by your proposed works. ESP are continually laying new gas and electricity networks and this notification is valid for 90 days from the date of this letter. If your proposed works start after this period of time, please re-submit your enquiry.</p> <p><b>Important Notice</b> Please be advised that any enquiries for ESP Connections Ltd, formerly known as British Gas Connections Ltd, should be sent directly to us at the address shown above or alternatively you can email us at: PlantResponses( @ )espipelines.com</p>	N/A	ESP Utilities Group Ltd's response was noted, no further action was required
Colt Technology Services	<p>Please Note: Our search criteria has changed. We previously searched for Colt Network which was within 200 metres, this has now changed to 50 metres. The negative response will be for all enquiries that the network is 50 metres or more away from the place of enquiry.</p> <p>We can confirm that Colt Technology Services do not have apparatus near the above location as presented on your submitted plan, if any development or scheme amendments fall outside the 50 metre perimeter new plans must be submitted for review.</p> <p>Search is based on Overseeing Organisation Agent data supplied; we do not accept responsibility for O.O. Agent inaccurate data.</p>	N/A	Colt Technology Services' response was noted, no further action was required
Natural England	<p>To help us maintain and improve our service to you, can you please send your consultations to Natural England by email to: consultations( @ )naturalengland.org.uk However, if you need to send any consultation by post please send to the Crewe address below</p> <p>Consultation Service Natural England Hornbeam House Electra Way Crewe Cheshire CW1 6GJ</p> <p>We only need to receive paper copies or discs in exceptional circumstances.</p>	N	Noted
Essex and Suffolk Water	<p>Firstly I think you may have duplicate entries for us on your database as I receive two copies of all communication. This may be because Essex &amp; Suffolk water are part of the Northumbrian Water group.</p> <p>I have asked our group operations manager and the area operations manager to review all documents relating to the Hornsea project. Both gentlemen have confirmed that the project will not affect any of our landholdings or assets. The Hornsea project will be sited quite far to the north of any of our concerns.</p> <p>We do not therefore need to be included in the consultation, unless there is a change of area to the south of the current plans.</p>	N/A	Essex and Suffolk Water's response was noted, no further action was required.
Anglian Water	<p><b>Potential offshore alternatives routes supporting information</b> We have no comments to make in respect of the alternative offshore cable routes which have been identified following the previous consultation.</p>	N/A	Hornsea Three acknowledged Anglian Water's response, no further action was required

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>73</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Norfolk Vanguard (Vattenfall Wind Power Ltd)	<p><b>2. Further project discussion and sharing of information</b></p> <p>We appreciate that, at the moment, the assessment and conclusions for the changes proposed within this section 42 consultation are still being prepared. We would welcome sight of the conclusions of the assessment, particularly in relation to the onshore works, when this is available and you are able to share this information.</p> <p>We are keen to continue meetings and discussions between Norfolk Vanguard and Hornsea 3 teams in the New Year, in order to discuss the above.</p>	N	Hornsea Three acknowledges the response from Norfolk Vanguard and welcomes the opportunity to continue the engagement with Vanguard.
Sky Telecommunications Services Ltd	<p>Further to your enquiry at the location above, the following SKY route(s) are indirectly affected: Virgin Media(NTL)-WBPT-Wisbech-Peterborough. The SKY route(s) is indirectly affected as we only lease telecoms infrastructure from Virgin Media, who own and are responsible for the maintenance or diversion thereof. For further information or detailed plans for this area, please contact their Enquiry Team.</p> <p>You may be able to contact Virgin Media, by email: plant.enquiries.team( @ )virginmedia.co.uk or Phone: 0870 888 3116 Option 2. Please be aware that their contact details may have changed and we do not manage their updates. Please visit their company website for more information.</p> <p>Please note that if our apparatus is deemed to be affected by your proposal and requires relocation or diversion in any way, you will need to contact SKY to provide estimates as per NRSWA Diversionary Works process.</p>	N/A	Sky Telecommunications Services Limited's response was noted and it was confirmed through further dialogue that their assets are located within Virgin Media infrastructure. Protection for this Virgin Media infrastructure is included within the protective provisions of the DCO application.
Ministry of Environment and Food (Denmark)	<p>With reference to letter from 16 November 2017 on Statutory Consultation regarding the Hornsea Three Project we take note that our previous response from 9 August 2017 is still taken into consideration by the project.</p> <p>The Ministry of Foreign Affairs Denmark, Unit "EU and Fisheries Policy", will reiterate comments as attached from 9 September to notification letter from 27 June 2017 from 'The Planning Inspectorate' concerning the Hornsea Three windmill project and the comments given by the Danish fisheries organizations "Danish Pelagic Producers Organisation" and "The Danish Fishermen's Association".</p>	N	Hornsea Three acknowledges the response from the Ministry of Environment and Food (Denmark) and can confirm that the response on 9 August 2017 has been taken into consideration (see annex 15: Phase 2 Response, of the Consultation Report)
Dutch Ministry of Infrastructure and Water Management (RWS)	From our Ministry, you have already received an email from my colleague Leo de Vrees. At this moment, we do not have any further issues.	N	Comment acknowledged
Suffolk Fire & Rescue Services	She represents Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service and wants to know how/why they have been identified as a consultee.	N/A	Several attempts were made to contact the Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service. It was noted that the Norfolk Fire and Rescue Service were also contacted as the relevant body.
<b>Section 42: Persons with an interest in the land (prescribed under section 44 of the Act)</b>			
Strutt & Parker (on behalf of (1) Charles & Arlie Inglis (2) Beckhithe Farms)	<p><b>General Comments</b></p> <p>Our clients are very disappointed that neither Orsted or Dalcour Maclaren have made no attempt to contact them to discuss the proposed access routes shown in the additional consultation documents. Our clients have occupied the land which Hornsea Project Three is proposing to cross for a long time, and have a wealth of local knowledge which could greatly benefit the route and access planning process. When Orsted presented the project update to land agents in Norwich on 30th November 2017, they informed us that the proposed access routes had been carefully assessed. Having reviewed the two access routes which affect our clients we would like more details on what is considered to be a safe and practical entry point to the cable corridor, as we disagree that the ones currently proposed fit those criteria.</p>	Y	The proposed access routes, and other areas and routes, have been assessed in line with the project requirements for review and consideration by landowners and the public via the relevant methods of consultation. The feedback on this point is important and gratefully received and changes have been reviewed in line with this feedback.

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>73</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Cadent	Please see attached the latest interactions with Cadent that will need to be considered	N/A	Hornsea Three noted the information provided by Cadent, no further action was required.
<b>Section 47: Duty to consult local community</b>			
Diana Jenkinson	The information you have provided so far is very poor and I wish to be kept updated of any developments. Please add my email to a mailing list if possible.	N	Ørsted added the consultee to the mailing list to receive subsequent updates on Hornsea Three.
Mark Flatman on behalf of Mr & Mrs DW Flatman	Received October 2017 Newsletter and hitherto had not been included in any of the proceeding consultation exercises, and were consequently not aware of the proposals. Questions whether Hornsea Three has fulfilled its statutory obligation in terms of consultation given the proximity of Mr & Mrs Flatman's property in relation to the proposed development.	N/A	Ørsted have checked the mailing records and can confirm that the address in question was sent copies of the June 2017 community newsletter and Statutory Consultation document issued in July 2017.
Mark Flatman on behalf of Mr & Mrs DW Flatman	At the formal application stage, I require Orsted to include the above representations in full with any formal NSIP application submission it makes. Please also advise me directly of all future stages in the NSIP consultation and application process for Hornsea Project 3 as and when they are undertaken.	I	Ørsted added the consultee to the mailing list to receive subsequent updates on Hornsea Three.
Councillor Greg Peck, Broadland District Council	Should the project receive Secretary of State approval I would request that regular updates and discussions take place with all affected parties in the Salle, Heydon, Reepham area as the scheme progresses.	I	A Communications Plan will be developed in consultation with the Local Planning Authorities and implemented using a phased approach to reflect the various stages of the construction programme. A Community Liaison Officer (CLO) will be appointed prior to commencement of the onshore works and will act as the point of contact between the local community and the construction team to deal with any complaints or issues that may arise. Further information is provided in Appendix A to the Code of Construction Practice (document reference number A8.5).
Councillor Jo Copplestone, Broadland District Council	If your project receives approval from the Planning Inspectorate, I request the communities affected by the project are kept informed and further consultation events are planned as to how the scheme progresses.	I	A Communications Plan will be developed in consultation with the Local Planning Authorities and implemented using a phased approach to reflect the various stages of the construction programme. A Community Liaison Officer (CLO) will be appointed prior to commencement of the onshore works and will act as the point of contact between the local community and the construction team to deal with any complaints or issues that may arise. Further information is provided in Appendix A to the Code of Construction Practice (document reference number A8.5).
CPRE Norfolk	Please note the change of address for our branch office	N	Noted.
Councillor Graham Everett, Broadland District Council	I responded to the previous consultation so will not repeat my comments other than to say that I support the project and renewable offshore wind farm schemes. The additional comments I wish to make are as follows:	N	Noted, response provided to individual points below.
Councillor Graham Everett, Broadland District Council	Should the project receive Secretary of State approval I would request that regular updates and discussions take place with all affected parties in the Salle/Reepham area as the scheme progresses.	I	A Communications Plan will be developed in consultation with the Local Planning Authorities and implemented using a phased approach to reflect the various stages of the construction programme. A Community Liaison Officer (CLO) will be appointed prior to commencement of the onshore works and will act as the point of contact between the local community and the construction team to deal with any complaints or issues that may arise. Further information is provided in Appendix A to the Code of Construction Practice (document reference number A8.5).

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>73</sup> ?	Regard had to response (s49)
Mrs Sally Oates	No doubt you will get condemning letters. This is not one of them. Here goes. My father was an early qualified electrician in the nineteen twenties and he started a business with his friend Ted. Large new houses were built on the outskirts of Leicester, a busy manufacturing city. They fitted concealed lighting and electric cookers and heaters in the houses. There were electric trams in Leicester, I remember them, the drivers ringing bells to clear the tracks when I went to school in them. The city fathers removed them from buses, noisy and smelling of exhaust. Our house had electric lights and heater, an electric fire and cooker. This was the nineteen thirties. Norfolk villages had no electric lights and sewers until after the war in the nineteen fifties. "One day" my Father said "There will be electric cars. At the moment, they would need charging too often, but we shall have them. It will be solved." It has been. My son, his grandson, has just bought an electric car. He lives in Scotland. Are they ahead of us?! I saw those strange things standing in the Sea turning, when I went to Cley at the weekend. There was a strong wind. My electric lights are on and my electric cooker, new, works beautifully. P.S Good Luck	N	Noted.
Dale Heaton	Wind farms are not 'efficient' in terms of power generation particularly with the need to improve battery technology. However its currently the best we have.	N	Noted.
Dale Heaton	So, to conclude, in years to come there will be improvements in technology which mean we can generate 'green' energy' more efficiently and much cheaper. However this is the best we currently have so let's get on with it and let's try to move on from the aggressive doom laden nimbys who live throughout Norfolk. You will never please all the people.	N	Noted.
Ian Webb	You have sent me consultation updates for some time now. In the latest update you state that plans can be viewed online from the 23rd November to 22nd December at <a href="http://www.hornseaproject3.co.uk">www.hornseaproject3.co.uk</a> . I have tried this but I get a website 403 error, Access is denied. Can you supply access details please?	N	Access to the Hornsea Three website is available at <a href="http://www.hornseaproject3.co.uk">www.hornseaproject3.co.uk</a> .
Ruth Goodall	Many thanks for a really useful meeting and for your patience in dealing with all the questions. I have one comment which relates to community benefit. Although it is not a material part of the application I think it would be of great benefit if plans and proposals were in place in parallel, which had been developed with the local community. Very best wishes, Ruth	N	Hornsea Project Three will review the interactions of the project, as the proposal is refined and consider an appropriate way to feed benefits back into the local community. However, any decision to establish a community benefit fund or other links to the local community in respect to Hornsea Three would be made post financial investment decision (FID).
Mervyn Bibb	As I said, we are greatly in favour of wind energy, so we hope that all goes well with the project (hopefully avoiding route 2 – the first alternative proposed that lies immediately adjacent to the gardens of three of our four barns!).	Y	This comment was acknowledged by Ørsted.  The final onshore cable route avoids route 2 in the vicinity of Little Melton, which originally was the alternative route presented in the Statutory Consultation Plans (Phase 2.A).
North Norfolk Community Woodland Trust	I also write on behalf of myself and my colleague Thomas Carr who is (like me) only engaged with the more southerly and earlier project. I understand that he and I have both also received an invitation from you to take part in the consultation for the Hornsea Project Three. As this Project is a relatively long distance away from the original project of which we received details some time ago, we prefer to engage only with the this earlier and more southernly consultation. We hope this will be acceptable	N/A	It is considered that there may be some confusion between Hornsea Three and Norfolk Vanguard, the latter of which makes landfall at a more southernly location within North Norfolk District. Notwithstanding this, it is noted that no comments have been made specific to Hornsea Three.
Mervyn and Maureen Bibb	We hope that this feedback is useful and that we do not have to raise any objections with the Planning Inspectorate when you submit your proposal next year.	N	Noted.
<b>Section 48: Duty to publicise</b>			

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>73?</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
TMP Worldwide	<p><b>Offering services for public notifications and advertising.</b> I hope you don't mind me contacting you. TMP Worldwide are the preferred agency supplier for the Scottish Govt Framework, Planning Inspectorate and the Department for Infrastructure, the Environment Agency, Marine Management and other parts of DEFRA as well as around 70 county and local councils. We are a specialist public notice and public information advertising agency. We realise as part of the planning application process is the responsibility you have to publish information in the offline press, whether local or national, we have access to the best media rates throughout the UK. We can help you with this process by producing your notice as cost effectively as possible as well as booking and delivering artwork to the respective media. We believe that we have the expertise and knowledge provided by our in-house Public Notice and Production teams to ensure a value added and seamless experience rather than going to the publishers direct. They will outsource production outside the UK and give very little in the way of best practice advice. Attached is a case study for the Scottish Govt detailing the savings they have made as one of our valued clients. I noticed your advert was in a national paper "The Guardian" we have effectively advertised nationally for other clients in a much more cost effective way. If you would like the opportunity to discuss this further please let me know. I have included a few comments below from some of our clients endorsing our services.</p>	N/A	Ørsted confirmed that at this stage this support is not required. However, should Hornsea Three require services from TMP Worldwide in the future we have the relevant contact details.

Table 3.40: Summary of consultation responses received as part of the Focused Statutory Consultation (Phase 2.C) relating to consultation/local engagement

Consultee	Summary of response	Change Y / N / I / N/A <sup>74?</sup>	Regard had to response (s49)
<b>Section 42: Prescribed consultees (The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009: Schedule 1))</b>			
Norfolk Fire & Rescue Service	With reference to the Hornsea Project I will be the contact for any consultation with Norfolk Fire & Rescue Service. With the documentation already provided the service has no comment to make.	N	Response noted.
<b>Section 42: Local Authorities (prescribed under section 43 of the Act)</b>			
No comments were received from the local authorities relating to consultation/local engagement under Phase 2.C.			
<b>Section 42: Persons with an interest in the land (prescribed under section 44 of the Act)</b>			
No comments were received from persons with an interest in land relating to consultation/local engagement under Phase 2.C.			
<b>Section 47: Duty to consult local community</b>			
No comments were received from the local community relating to consultation/local engagement under Phase 2.C.			
<b>Section 48: Duty to publicise</b>			
No comments were received in response to the Public Notice relating to consultation/local engagement under Phase 2.C			

<sup>74</sup> Y = Yes change made; N = No change made; I = Incorporated into or considered when producing the assessment or landowner voluntary agreement offer; N/A = Not applicable.