

Vattenfall Wind Power Ltd

Thanet Extension Offshore Wind Farm

Appendix 15 to Deadline 6 Submission: Statement
of Common Ground – Natural England
Technical Topics (excluding Offshore Ornithology,
Saltmarsh, and Site Selection)

Relevant Examination Deadline: 6

Submitted by Vattenfall Wind Power Ltd

Date: May 2019

Revision D

| Date | Issue No. | Remarks / Reason for Issue | Author | Checked | Approved |
|------------|-----------|-------------------------------------------------------------|--------|---------|----------|
| 16/11/2018 | 01 | Issued for review | GoBe | GoBe | |
| 06/12/2018 | 02 | Updates following initial consultation with Natural England | GoBe | GoBe | |
| 15/01/19 | A | Original document submitted to the ExA | GoBe | GoBe | VWPL |
| 30/01/2019 | 03 | Revised draft submitted to Natural England | GoBe | GoBe | VWPL |
| 05/02/2019 | 04 | Revised draft received from Natural England | NE | NE | NE |
| 11/02/19 | 05 | Revised draft submitted to Natural England | GoBe | GoBe | VWPL |
| 25/02/19 | 06 | Revised draft received from Natural England | NE | NE | NE |
| 04/03/2019 | 07 | Revised draft through discussion with both parties | GoBe | GoBe | VWPL |
| 05/03/2019 | B | Revised draft submitted to the ExA | GoBe | GoBe | VWPL |
| 08/04/19 | 08 | Revised draft submitted to Natural England | GoBe | GoBe | VWPL |
| 02/05/19 | 09 | Revised draft submitted to Natural England | GoBe | GoBe | VWPL |
| 07/05/19 | 10 | Revised draft received from Natural England | NE | NE | NE |
| 09/05/19 | C | Revised draft submitted to the ExA | GoBe | GoBe | VWPL |
| 16/05/19 | 11 | Revised draft submitted to Natural England | GoBe | GoBe | VWPL |
| 28/05/19 | 12 | Revised draft received from Natural England | NE | NE | NE |
| 28/05/19 | D | Revised draft submitted to the ExA | GoBe | GoBe | VWPL |

Signatures

| | | |
|----------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|
| Signed |  | |
| Name | Christina Relf | |
| Position | Senior adviser | |
| For | Natural England | |


| | | |
|----------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|
| Signed |  | |
| Name | Daniel Bates | |
| Position | Thanet Extension OWF Consent Manager | |
| For | Vattenfall Wind Power Limited | |

Table of Contents

| | | |
|------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| 1 | Introduction | 6 |
| 1.1 | Overview | 6 |
| 1.2 | Approach to SoCG | 6 |
| 1.3 | The Development | 7 |
| 2 | Natural England's Remit | 9 |
| 3 | Consultation | 10 |
| 3.1 | Application elements under Natural England's remit | 10 |
| 3.2 | Consultation Summary | 11 |
| 3.3 | Post-application Consultation | 13 |
| 4 | Agreements Log | 14 |
| 4.1 | Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment | 14 |
| 4.2 | Marine Geology, Oceanography and Physical Processes | 29 |
| 4.3 | Marine Water and Sediment Quality | 34 |
| 4.4 | Benthic Subtidal and Intertidal Ecology | 38 |
| 4.5 | Fish and Shellfish Ecology | 43 |
| 4.6 | Marine Mammals | 48 |
| 4.7 | Designated Sites | 65 |
| 4.8 | Marine Conservation Zone Assessment | 68 |
| 4.9 | Onshore Biodiversity | 76 |
| 4.10 | DCO and dML | 83 |
| 5 | Matters under discussion | 89 |
| | Table 1: Consultation undertaken with Natural England pre-application | 12 |
| | Table 2: Consultation undertaken with the Natural England post-application | 13 |
| | Table 3: Status of discussions relating to the RIAA | 16 |
| | Table 4: Status of discussions relating to Marine Geology, Oceanography and Physical Processes | 30 |
| | Table 5: Status of discussions relating to Marine Water and Sediment Quality | 35 |
| | Table 6: Status of discussions relating to Benthic Subtidal and Intertidal Ecology | 39 |

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Table 7: Status of discussions relating to Fish and Shellfish Ecology. | 44 |
| Table 8: Status of discussions relating to Marine Mammals. | 49 |
| Table 9: Status of discussions relating to Designated sites. | 66 |
| Table 10: Status of discussions relating to the Marine Conservation Zones Assessment..... | 69 |
| Table 11: Status of discussions relating to Onshore Biodiversity..... | 77 |
| Table 12: Status of discussions relating to the DCO and dMLs | 84 |

1 Introduction

1.1 Overview

- 1 This Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) relates to the proposed development of the Thanet Extension Offshore Wind Farm (Thanet Extension). It has been prepared with respect to the application made by Vattenfall Wind Power Ltd (VWPL) (the Applicant) for a Development Consent Order (DCO) to the Planning Inspectorate (PINS) under the Planning Act 2008 (the Application).
- 2 This SoCG with Natural England is a means of clearly stating any areas of agreement and disagreement between the two parties in relation to the Application. The SoCG has been structured to reflect the topics of interest to Natural England on the Application.
- 3 It is the intention that this document captures the discussions held between both of the parties and also give the Examining Authority (ExA) an overview of the level of common ground between both parties.

1.2 Approach to SoCG

- 4 This SoCG has been developed during the pre-examination and examination phase of the Thanet Extension. In accordance with discussions between the Applicant and Natural England, the SoCG is focused on those issues raised by Natural England within its response to Scoping, Section 42 consultation, matters raised through the Evidence Plan process that has underpinned the pre-application consultation between the parties, the received relevant representations, and in reflection of the 'Rule 6' letter published by the ExA on the 9th November.
- 5 The structure of the SoCG is as follows:
 - Section 1: Introduction;
 - Section 2: Natural England's remit;
 - Section 3: Consultation;
 - Section 4: Agreements Log; and
 - Section 5: Matters under discussion.

1.3 The Development

- 6 Thanet Extension will comprise of wind turbine generators (WTGs) and all the infrastructure required to transmit the power generated to the national grid. A maximum of 34 WTGs will be installed with a power output of 340 MW. The project will install up to four offshore export cables and may require the installation of one Offshore Substation (OSS) and up to one Meteorological Mast.
- 7 The key offshore components of Thanet Extension are likely to include:
 - Up to 34 offshore WTGs;
 - OSS (if required);
 - Meteorological Mast (if required);
 - WTG Foundations;
 - Subsea inter-array cables linking individual WTGs;
 - Subsea export cables from the OWF to shore; and
 - Scour protection around foundations and on inter-array and export cables (if required).
- 8 The offshore elements of the project comprise an offshore export cable corridor (Work Area 3), and Work Areas 1 and 2. The latter are an area of 68.8 km² and comprise the Array Area (59.5 km²) and the Structures Exclusions Zone (9.3 km²). The latter being an area subject to restrictions on what can be placed within it, as described in Annex A of Appendix 7 of the Applicant's Deadline 5 Submission and Schedule 1, Part 3, Requirement 6 of the draft DCO. The Order Limits surround the existing Thanet Offshore Wind Farm (TOWF). It is located approximately 8 km north-east of the Isle of Thanet, situated in the County of Kent. Each WTG would have a maximum blade tip height of 250 m above Mean High Water Springs (MHWS), a maximum diameter of 220 m and a minimum 22 m clearance between the MHWS and the lowest point of the rotor.
- 9 Electricity generated will be carried via a maximum of four high voltage subsea cables to the landfall site, situated at Pegwell Bay. Offshore cables will be connected to the onshore cables and ultimately the national grid network at Richborough Energy Park. The onshore cable corridor is 2.6 km in length at its fullest extent.

- 10 More details on the proposed development are described in the Environmental Statement (ES) Volume 2, Chapter 1: Project Description (Offshore) (PINS Ref APP-042/ Application Ref 6.2.1) and Volume 3, Chapter 1: Project Description (Onshore) (PINS Ref APP-057/ Application Ref 6.3.1) of the Environmental Statement.

2 Natural England's Remit

- 11 Natural England is an executive non-departmental public body established under the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 ('NERC Act') and is the statutory advisor to the Government on nature conservation in England and promotes the conservation of England's wildlife and natural features. Natural England's remit extends to the territorial sea adjacent to England, up to 12 nautical miles from the coastline.
- 12 Natural England is a statutory consultee for the proposed development under section 42 of the Planning Act 2008 and a prescribed consultee under the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017. Natural England is a statutory consultee in respect of all applications for consent for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects which are likely to affect land in England.

3 Consultation

3.1 Application elements under Natural England's remit

- 13 Work Nos. 1 - 16, detailed in Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the draft DCO describe the elements of Thanet Extension which may affect the interests of Natural England.
- 14 Natural England is a non-departmental public body responsible for ensuring that England's natural environment, including its land, flora and fauna, freshwater and marine environments, geology and soils, are protected and improved. It also has a responsibility to help people enjoy, understand and access the natural environment.
- 15 The technical components of the DCO application of relevance to Natural England (and therefore considered within this SoCG) comprise:
- Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment (PINS Refs REP-018 and REP2-019 which supersedes APP-031/ Application Ref 5.2);
 - Volume 2, Chapter 2: Marine Geology, Oceanography and Physical Processes (PINS Ref APP-043/ Application Ref 6.2.2);
 - Volume 2, Chapter 3: Marine Water and Sediment Quality (PINS Ref APP-044/ Application Ref 6.2.3);
 - Volume 2, Chapter 5: Benthic Subtidal and Intertidal Ecology (PINS Ref APP-046/ Application Ref 6.2.5);
 - Volume 2, Chapter 6: Fish and Shellfish Ecology (PINS Ref APP-047/ Application Ref 6.2.6);
 - Volume 2, Chapter 7: Marine Mammals (PINS Ref APP-048/ Application Ref 6.2.7);
 - Volume 2, Chapter 8: Designated Sites (PINS Ref APP-049/ Application Ref 6.2.8);
 - Volume 4, Annex 5-3: Benthic Characterisation report (PINS Ref APP-082/ Application Ref 6.4.5.2);
 - Volume 4, Annex 5-3: Marine Conservation Zone Assessment (PINS Ref APP-083/ Application 6.4.5.3);
 - SAC and MCZ Clarification Note and Annexes (PINs Ref REP-047) (which includes previous submissions into the examination);

- Volume 3, Chapter 5: Onshore Biodiversity (PINS Ref APP-061/ Application Ref 6.3.5);
- Draft Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) (PINS Ref APP-133/ Application Ref 8.1);
- Environmental Impact Assessment Evidence Plan Report (PINS Ref APP-137/ Application Ref 8.5);
- Draft Outline Landscape Ecological Management Plan (OLEMP) (PINS Ref REP1-069 which supersedes APP-142/ Application Ref 8.7);
- Draft European Protected Species (EPS) licence (PINS Ref APP-144/ Application Ref 8.9);
- Draft Marine Mammal Mitigation Protocol for Piling Activities (PINS Ref APP-146/ Application Ref 8.11);
- Site Integrity Plan (PINS Ref REP4-022);
- Biogenic Reef Mitigation Plan (PINS Ref REP4-025 which supersedes PINS Ref APP-149/ Application Ref 8.15);
- Sand Wave Clearance, Dredging and Drill Arising: Disposal Site Characterisation (PINS Ref Rep5-038 which supersedes APP-148/ Application Ref 8.14); and
- Draft Development Consent Order (PINS Ref REP5-019 which supersedes APP-022/ Application Ref 3.1).

3.2 Consultation Summary

- 16 This section briefly summarises the consultation (in relation to those matters identified in section 3.1) that VWPL has undertaken with Natural England. Engagement during the pre-application phase, both statutory and non-statutory, is summarised in Table 1 below, this includes any meetings and correspondence held as part of the Evidence Plan process and Section 42 consultation.

Table 1: Consultation undertaken with Natural England pre-application

| Date & Type: | Detail: |
|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|
| October 2016 Evidence Plan | 1 st Steerco Evidence Plan meeting |
| June 2017 Evidence Plan | 2 nd Steerco Evidence Plan meeting |
| December 2016 | Evidence Plan meeting - Offshore Ornithology Meeting. |
| February 2017 Evidence Plan | Evidence Plan meeting - Offshore Ecology Meeting. |
| February 2017 Evidence Plan | Evidence Plan meeting - Offshore Ornithology Meeting. |
| February 2017 Evidence Plan | Evidence Plan meeting - Onshore Ecology Meeting. |
| April 2017 Evidence Plan | Evidence Plan meeting - Offshore Ornithology Meeting. |
| May 2017 Evidence Plan meeting | Evidence Plan meeting - Offshore Ecology Meeting. |
| June 2017 Evidence Plan | Evidence Plan meeting - Offshore Ornithology Meeting. |
| July 2017 Evidence Plan meeting | Evidence Plan meeting – General Offshore Meeting. |
| July 2017 Evidence Plan meeting | Evidence Plan meeting – General Onshore Meeting. |
| October 2017 Evidence Plan meeting | Evidence Plan meeting - HRA. |
| October 2017 Evidence Plan meeting | Evidence Plan meeting – General Offshore Meeting. |
| October 2017 Evidence Plan meeting | Evidence Plan meeting – General Onshore Meeting. |
| October 2017 | National Nature Reserve Steering Group Meeting |
| December 2017 | Evidence Plan meeting - Offshore Ornithology Meeting. |
| 2017 Consultation | HRA Screening Consultation |
| January 2018, S42 Consultation | Comments relating to the Preliminary Environmental Information Report |
| January 2018 Evidence Plan meeting | Evidence Plan meeting - Offshore Ecology Meeting. |
| February 2018 | Evidence Plan Meeting – Onshore Ecology and Ornithology |
| 2018 Consultation | RIAA Consultation |

| Date & Type: | Detail: |
|--------------|------------------------------------------------------|
| May 2018 | Evidence Plan Meeting – Onshore and Offshore Ecology |

3.3 Post-application Consultation

17 VWPL has engaged with Natural England since the Thanet Extension development was accepted for examination by the Planning Inspectorate on 23rd July 2018. A summary of the post-application consultation with Natural England is detailed in Table 2.

Table 2: Consultation undertaken with the Natural England post-application

| Date/ Type: | Detail: |
|---------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| July 2018 | Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan Meeting |
| July 2018 | Saltmarsh Management and Mitigation Meeting |
| October 2018 | Initial Discussions on developing a SoCG |
| November 2018 | Discussions on specific marine mammals matters raised in the Relevant Representation |
| November 2018 | Discussions on specific offshore ornithological matters raised in the Relevant Representation |
| January 2019 | Teleconference to discuss project design |
| January 2019 | Teleconference to discuss position post-deadline 1 |
| January 2019 | Teleconference to discuss position on offshore ornithological matters raised in the Written Representation |
| February 2019 | Teleconference to discuss the development of SoCG |
| March 2019 | Teleconference to discuss the development of SoCG |
| April 2019 | Teleconferences to discuss the development of SoCG |
| May 2019 | Meeting to discuss progression of benthic ecology issues |
| May 2019 | Teleconferences to discuss the development of SoCG |

4 Agreements Log

- 18 The following section of this SoCG identifies the level of agreement between the parties for each relevant component of the application material (as identified in section 3.1). In order to easily identify whether a matter is “agreed” or indeed “not agreed” a colour coding system of green and orange is used in the “final position” column to represent the respective status of discussions.

4.1 Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment

- 19 The Project provided a Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment with the submitted application to determine the potential for an Adverse Effect on Integrity (AEoI) on Natura 2000 sites.
- 20 This SoCG considers responses from Natural England on specific areas relating to physical processes, marine water and sediment quality, benthic ecology, fish and shellfish, marine mammals and onshore biodiversity (including intertidal and terrestrial ornithology), including assessment methods, outcomes, and conclusions relating to the relevant ES chapter (PINS Refs APP-043, APP-044, APP-046, APP-047 and APP-061/ Application Refs 6.2.2, 6.2.3, 6.2.5, 6.2.6, 6.2.7 and 6.3.5 respectively) and the RIAA (PINS Refs REP2-018 and REP2-019 which supersedes APP-031/ Application Ref 5.2). In addition, ornithological, including potential effects of SPAs, and saltmarsh issues are addressed within two further SoCG.
- 21 Therefore, this SoCG (including Table 3) considers SACs, Ramsar and transboundary SAC sites.
- 22 The sites considered within the RIAA and therefore this SoCG are:
- SACs:
 - Thanet Coast SAC;
 - Margate and Long Sands SAC; and
 - Southern North Sea cSAC.
 - Ramsar:
 - Thanet Coast and Sandwich Bay Ramsar; and
 - Alde-Ore Estuary Ramsar.

- Transboundary SAC:
 - Bancs de Flandres;
 - Baie de Canche et couloir des trois estuaires;
 - Vlake van de Raan;
 - Voordelta;
 - Estuaires et littoral picards (baies de Somme et d'Authie);
 - Recifs Gris-Nez Blanc-Nez;
 - Vlaamse Banken;
 - SBZ 1;
 - SBZ 2;
 - SBZ 3; and
 - Ridens et dunes hydrauliques du détroit du Pas-de-Calais.

Table 3: Status of discussions relating to the RIAA

| Discussion Point | Thanet Extension Position | Natural England Position | Final Position |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|
| Policy and Planning | The RIAA has identified all appropriate plans and policies, insofar as relevant to Natural England's remit and the HRA for Thanet Extension, and has given due regard to them within the assessment. | Agreed. | Agreed |
| Screening | Those sites identified as having potential Likely Significant Effects (LSE) Thanet Extension alone or in combination are appropriate. | Agreed. | Agreed |
| Screening | The RIAA, screening document, and Evidence Plan process has resulted in the identification of all relevant features of the designated sites that may be sensitive to changes as a result of the proposed Thanet Extension project activities. | Agreed. | Agreed. |
| Screening (transboundary) | The RIAA has identified all relevant transboundary designated sites that may be sensitive to changes as | Natural England has no further comments upon transboundary designated sites. Natural England do not consider it within our remit to advise on this. | Agreed |

| Discussion Point | Thanet Extension Position | Natural England Position | Final Position |
|----------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|
| | <p>a result of the proposed Thanet Extension project activities.</p> <p>The Applicant submitted a legal clarification paper on the competent authority for transboundary effects (PINS Ref REP1-078/ Annex E to Appendix 27 to Deadline 1 submission).</p> | | |
| Scope and Assessment Methodology | The potential impacts for Thanet Extension identified within the RIAA and associated screening documents are appropriate and adequate for benthic ecology, marine mammals, diadromous fish and onshore biodiversity. | Agreed – The applicant has provided further information in particular the Sandwave Clearance, Dredge and Disposal Site Characterisation (Appendix 27 to Deadline 5 Submission); and the SAC and MCZ Clarification Note and Annexes (Appendix 32 to Deadline 5 submission), which identified in further detail the potential impacts upon European sites, in particular the Thanet Coast SAC. | Agreed. |
| Scope and Assessment Methodology | The screening of potential likely significant effects, sites and species in relation to Thanet Extension is adequate and appropriate. | Agreed. | Agreed. |

| Discussion Point | Thanet Extension Position | Natural England Position | Final Position |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|
| Scope and Assessment Methodology | The study areas defined for the assessments are appropriate for the impacts and pathways considered. | Agreed. | Agreed |
| Baseline data used in the assessment | Sufficient primary and secondary data has been collated to appropriately characterise the baseline environment of the Thanet Extension study areas for the purposes of informing the RIAA. | Agreed - Following the removal of landfall option 2, and the resulting confirmation for the ExA, many of Natural England's concerns regarding the characterisation data associated with the RIAA have been reduced. Furthermore, and in relation to the saltmarsh, the SMRMP should ensure sufficient pre-construction data is collected to allow the monitoring and potential reinstatement of the saltmarsh to occur post-construction. | Agreed. |
| Baseline data used in the assessment | Data gaps have been highlighted and, appropriate and/ or adequate measures for filling any data gaps have been proposed. | Agreed. | Agreed. |

| Discussion Point | Thanet Extension Position | Natural England Position | Final Position |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|
| | The Applicant have submitted a clarification note on the implications of the removal of Option 2 in terms of the ES undertaken (PINS Ref REP2-036). The RIAA has also been updated to account for the removal of Option 2 (PINS Ref REP2-018 and REP2-019). | | |
| In-combination assessment methodology | The RIAA has considered all relevant plans and projects for the determination of in-combination LSE. | Agreed. The applicant has provided further information at deadline 5 - The Sandwave Clearance, Dredge and Disposal Site Characterisation (Appendix 27 to Deadline 5 Submission); and the SAC and MCZ Clarification Note and Annexes (Appendix 32 to Deadline 5 submission). | Agreed |
| In-combination assessment | The tiering methodology and definitions were agreed, with Natural England as part of the Evidence Plan process and are appropriate/ adequate. | Agreed. | Agreed |

| Discussion Point | Thanet Extension Position | Natural England Position | Final Position |
|---------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|
| Mitigation Measures | There are no further mitigation measures beyond those outlined in the RIAA are necessitated as a result of the assessment conclusions for the Thanet Extension project alone. | Agreed – The appropriate mitigation plans for European designated sites issues have been secured. Primarily this point is associated with the Saltmarsh Mitigation Plan and the cable exclusion zone around the Thanet Coast SAC. | Agreed. |
| Mitigation Measures | The Applicant will microsite around all chalk reef features within designated sites, noting that none have been identified within the Red Line Boundary. Chalk reef has been defined as by the presence of elevated chalk features by drop down video as presented in Table 5.5 of PINS Ref APP-046/ Application Ref 6.2.5. Volume 4, Annex 5-2 (PINS Ref APP-082/ Application Ref 6.4.5.2), Annex F-1 presents the dropdown video surveys undertaken by the project. | Agreed- Natural England have been reassured that the applicant will microsite around all chalk reef features and have none have been identified within the RLB. However, this will be confirmed with further pre-construction surveys. | Agreed. |
| Mitigation Measures | The Applicant will observe a seasonal restriction in the intertidal area between October and March inclusive and this has | Agreed. | Agreed |

| Discussion Point | Thanet Extension Position | Natural England Position | Final Position |
|----------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|
| | been adequately secured in the DCO (see Table 12). | | |
| Monitoring | <p>The Applicant has proposed and secured adequate monitoring measures.</p> <p>Note: The Saltmarsh Mitigation Reinstatement and Monitoring Plan (PINS Ref REP4-020) is considered in the Site Selection, Project Description and Saltmarsh SoCG with Natural England.</p> | Agreed - The applicant submitted an updated SMRMP at Deadline 4 following comments made previously by Natural England. Following these updates we are content adequate monitoring has been secured. | Agreed |
| Outcomes of the RIAA | It was agreed through the Evidence Plan process that the RIAA would not repeat the screening process within the report. However, the screening was reviewed and updated appropriately within the Thanet Extension RIAA to take into account the Sweetman II Judgement. The revisions | Agreed. | Agreed |

| Discussion Point | Thanet Extension Position | Natural England Position | Final Position |
|----------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|
| | adequately account for Sweetman II. | | |
| Outcomes of the RIAA | No adverse effect on the integrity of Thanet Coast SAC is predicted either alone or in-combination as a result of as a result of the proposed Thanet Extension project activities. | Agreed. The applicant has provided further information at deadline 5 - The Sandwave Clearance, Dredge and Disposal Site Characterisation (Appendix 27 to Deadline 5 Submission); and the SAC and MCZ Clarification Note and Annexes (Appendix 32 to Deadline 5 submission). | Agreed |


| Discussion Point | Thanet Extension Position | Natural England Position | Final Position |
|----------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|
| | <p>The RIAA has been revised and submitted as part of the Applicant's Deadline 2 Submission (PINS Ref REP2-018 and REP2-019). These revisions account for design changes, such as the revised CEA to ensure that all cable works (and associated direct impacts) are outwith the Thanet Coast SAC, see Figure 1.</p> <p>As confirmed in Sandwave Clearance, Dredge and Disposal Site Characterisation (PINs Ref REP5-038) there will be no disposal of material within Thanet Coast SAC.</p> | | |
| Outcomes of the RIAA | No adverse effect on the integrity of Margate and Long Sands SAC is predicted either alone or in-combination as a result of as a | Agreed. | Agreed |

| Discussion Point | Thanet Extension Position | Natural England Position | Final Position |
|----------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|
| | result of the proposed Thanet Extension project activities. | | |
| Outcomes of the RIAA | <p>No adverse effect on the integrity of Southern North Sea cSAC is predicted either alone or in-combination as a result of as a result of the proposed Thanet Extension project activities.</p> <p>The position of Natural England, that a mechanism is required to manage, monitor and review the various SIPs anticipated to come forward, is acknowledged. The Applicant can only undertake the assessment, alone and in-combination, and provide mitigation as necessary to avoid an AEoI. It is the Applicant's position that the RIAA (PINS Refs REP2-018 and REP2-019), MMMP (PINS Ref APP-146/ Application Ref 8.11) and SIP (PINS Ref REP4-022) provide certainty that an AEoI will be avoided with respect to the SNS cSAC/SCI. Further information is</p> | <p>Natural England have provided further detailed comments regarding the RIAA at Deadline 3 in our response to the ExA.</p> <p>Regarding the overall conclusions of no AEoI of the SNS SCI, Natural England have stated:</p> <p>A mechanism needs to be developed by the regulators to ensure continuing adherence to the SNCB thresholds over time. Multiple SIPs will be developed, piling can take place over several years, and new projects can come online during this time. Should potential exceedance of the thresholds occur, a process for dealing with this issue needs to be in place – the affected developers / industries will need to work together with the regulator and SNCBs to prevent adverse effect on the SCI.</p> <p>Until the mechanism by which the SIPs will be managed, monitored and reviewed is developed, Natural England are unable to advise that this approach is sufficient to address the in-combination impacts and therefore the risk of Adverse Effect on Integrity on the Southern North Sea SCI cannot be fully ruled out.</p> | Disagree |

| Discussion Point | Thanet Extension Position | Natural England Position | Final Position |
|----------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|
| | provided in Appendix 3 to the Applicant's Deadline 4 Submission (PINS Ref REP4-005) which provides detailed clarifications to each of the items raised by Natural England. | The applicant has committed to putting in a seasonal restriction in place, if the mechanism to manage the SIPs is not agreed. This seasonal restriction in effect would address the in-combination impacts as described above. However, Natural England have requested to secure this seasonal restriction on the face of the DCO / DML to ensure it is enforceable. The Applicant has yet to agree to this condition, and thus our overall concerns regarding the management of the SIP and in-combination impacts and therefore the risk of Adverse Effect on Integrity on the Southern North Sea SAC remain. | |
| Outcomes of the RIAA | No adverse effect on the integrity of transboundary sites are predicted either alone or in-combination as a result of as a result of the proposed Thanet Extension project activities. | Natural England has no further comments upon transboundary designated sites. Natural England do not consider it within our remit to advise on this. | Agreed |

| Discussion Point | Thanet Extension Position | Natural England Position | Final Position |
|----------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|
| | <p>The RIAA has been revised and submitted as part of the Applicant's Deadline 2 Submission (PINS Ref REP2-018 and REP2-019).</p> <p>The Applicant submitted a legal clarification paper on the competent authority for transboundary effects (Annex E to Appendix 27 to Deadline 1 submission) (PINS Ref REP1-078). This paper concluded that Natural England are the competent authority.</p> | | |
| Outcomes of the RIAA | No adverse effect on the integrity of Thanet Coast and Sandwich Bay Ramsar is predicted either alone or in-combination as a result of as a result of the proposed Thanet Extension activities. | Agreed. | Agreed. |

| Discussion Point | Thanet Extension Position | Natural England Position | Final Position |
|----------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|
| Outcomes of the RIAA | No adverse effect on the integrity of Alde-Ore Estuary Ramsar is predicted either alone or in-combination as a result of as a result of the proposed Thanet Extension project activities. | Agreed. | Agreed |



THANET EXTENSION OFFSHORE WIND FARM

Works Plan (Offshore): RLB Comparison: Designated Sites

Legend

- Updated Order Limits
- Original Order limits
- Cable Exclusion Area
- SACs
- MCZ
- Work No. 3
- Work No. 2
- Work No. 1

Datum: ETRS 1989
Projection: UTM31N



© Vattenfall Wind Power Ltd 2018. © Crown copyright and database rights 2017 Ordnance Survey 0100031673.
© Crown Copyright, 2016. All rights reserved License No. EK001-412013. NOT TO BE USED FOR NAVIGATION

Scale @ A1 - 1:50,000
0 0.65 1.3 NM 0 1 2 km

| | | | |
|--------|-----------------------------------------|-------|-----------|
| Drg No | 2.5_TEOW_Offshore_works_plan_comparison | | |
| Rev | A | Date | 1/18/2019 |
| By | SM | Check | SL |

Marine Geology, Oceanography and Physical Processes

- 23 The Project has the potential to impact upon marine processes and these interactions are duly considered within Volume 2, Chapter 2: Marine Geology, Oceanography and Physical Processes of the ES (PINS Ref APP-043/ Application Ref 6.2.2). Table 4 identifies the status of discussions relating to this topic area between the parties.

Table 4: Status of discussions relating to Marine Geology, Oceanography and Physical Processes.

| Discussion Point | Thanet Extension Position | Natural England Position | Final Position |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|
| Policy and Planning | The assessment has identified all appropriate plans and policies, insofar as relevant to Natural England's remit, relevant to physical processes and has given due regard to them within the Thanet Extension assessment. | Agreed. | Agreed |
| Consultation | The ES chapter has been adequately updated following S42 and Evidence Plan consultation and concerns raised have been adequately addressed or clarified. | Agreed – further information with regards to the MCZs is provided in section 4.8. | Agreed |
| Scope and Assessment Methodology | The evidence based approach to the assessment of effects is deemed appropriate or adequate for assessing Thanet Extension, for the purposes of predicting changes to the receiving environment. | Agreed. | Agreed |
| | The potential impacts identified are appropriate or adequate in relation to Thanet Extension, for physical process receptors and pathways. | Agreed - further information with regards to the MCZs is provided in section 4.8. | Agreed |
| | The definitions of sensitivity and magnitude are appropriate for the purposes of the assessment. | Agreed. | Agreed |
| | The study area defined for the assessment is appropriate or adequate in relation to Thanet | Agreed. | Agreed |

| Discussion Point | Thanet Extension Position | Natural England Position | Final Position |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|
| | Extension, for the impacts and pathways considered. | | |
| Baseline data used in the assessment | Sufficient primary and secondary data has been collated to appropriately characterise the baseline environment for the purposes of informing the EIA for Thanet Extension | Agreed. | Agreed |
| | Data gaps have been highlighted and appropriate or adequate measures for filling any data gaps have been proposed for the Thanet Extension project. | Agreed. | Agreed |
| | The sensitivity and importance of the receiving environment is appropriately or adequately described within the Thanet Extension Environmental Statement. | Agreed - Natural England did have concerns regarding the level of sensitivity and importance afforded to the saltmarsh supporting habitat for the SPA and Ramsar and SSSI. These concerns have been lessened now that option 2 has been dropped. | Agreed. |
| Mitigation Measures | The embedded mitigation measures are considered appropriate or adequate in relation to Thanet Extension, and no further mitigation is necessitated as a result of the assessment conclusions. | Agreed – however we are in discussions regard the possibility of a sandwave clearance plan with the applicant. | Agreed. |

| Discussion Point | Thanet Extension Position | Natural England Position | Final Position |
|---------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|
| Outcomes of the EIA | <p>The conclusions of the assessment appropriately and adequately reflects the potential impacts on physical processes within the study area during the construction, operation and decommissioning phases of the Thanet Extension project.</p> <p>Detailed numeric information regarding sediment plumes and deposition are provided in the Sandwave Clearance, Dredge and Disposal Site Characterisation (PINS Ref REP5-038) for both discrete and uniform deposition of material.</p> | Agreed - further information with regards to the MCZs is provided in section 4.8. | Agreed |
| | <p>The cumulative effects have been adequately and appropriately described in relation to Thanet Extension within the ES and the conclusions are appropriate.</p> <p>The Applicant has provided further clarity on the current status of the disposal activities within the study area which addresses Natural England's concerns of in-combination effects. Please see relevant row of Table 3 also for HRA considerations.</p> | Agreed. | Agreed |

| Discussion Point | Thanet Extension Position | Natural England Position | Final Position |
|------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|
| | The effects of turbid wakes have adequately and appropriate been assessed in relation to Thanet Extension, based on site specific data, analogous projects and available literature. | Agreed. | Agreed |

4.2 Marine Water and Sediment Quality

- 24 The Project has the potential to impact upon marine water and sediment quality and these interactions are duly considered within Volume 2, Chapter 3: Marine Water Quality and Sediment Quality of the Thanet Extension ES (PINS Ref APP-044/ Application Ref 6.2.3). Table 5 identifies the status of discussions relating to this topic area between the parties.

Table 5: Status of discussions relating to Marine Water and Sediment Quality.

| Discussion Point | Thanet Extension Position | Natural England Position | Final Position |
|--------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|
| Policy and Planning | The assessment has identified all appropriate plans and policies, insofar as relevant to Natural England's remit, and relevant to water and sediment quality and has given due regard to them within the assessment. | Agreed. | Agreed |
| Consultation | The ES chapter has been adequately updated following S42 and Evidence Plan consultation and concerns raised have been adequately addressed or clarified. | Agreed. | Agreed |
| Scope and Assessment Methodology | The potential impacts identified are appropriate and adequate in relation to Thanet Extension, for water and sediment quality receptors. | Agreed. | Agreed |
| | The study area defined for the assessment is appropriate for the impacts considered in relation to Thanet Extension. | Agreed. | Agreed |
| Baseline data used in the assessment | Sufficient primary and secondary data has been collated to appropriately characterise the baseline environment for the purposes of informing the Thanet Extension EIA. | Agreed. | Agreed |
| | The sensitivity and importance of the receiving environment is appropriately or adequately | Agreed - Natural England did have concerns regarding the level of sensitivity and importance | Agreed |

| Discussion Point | Thanet Extension Position | Natural England Position | Final Position |
|--------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|
| | described within the Thanet Extension Environmental Statement. | afforded to the saltmarsh supporting habitat for the SPA and Ramsar and SSSI. These concerns have been lessened now that option 2 has been dropped. | |
| Baseline data used in the assessment | All data gaps have been highlighted and all appropriate or adequate measures for filling any data gaps have been proposed. | Agreed. | Agreed |
| Mitigation Measures | The embedded mitigation measures are considered appropriate or adequate in relation to Thanet Extension, and no further mitigation is necessitated as a result of the assessment conclusions. | Agreed. | Agreed. |
| Mitigation Measures | The contaminated land management plan is appropriately or adequately secured in the DCO and provides for ensuring the sufficient reinstatement of the seawall to prevent leachate issues, the information to be submitted for approval to the relevant authority at the relevant time. | Agreed. | Agreed. |
| Outcomes of the EIA | The conclusions of the assessment appropriately or adequately reflects the potential impacts on the marine water quality within the study area during the construction, operation and | Agreed. | Agreed. |

| Discussion Point | Thanet Extension Position | Natural England Position | Final Position |
|---------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|
| | <p>decommissioning phases of the Thanet Extension project.</p> <p>The Applicant submitted a Project Description transcription clarification note as part of their Deadline 1 Submission (PINS Ref REP1-023) to provide clarification following the receipt of the Relevant Representations.</p> | | |
| Outcomes of the EIA | The cumulative effects have been adequately or appropriately described within the ES and the conclusions are appropriate for the Thanet Extension project. | Agreed. | Agreed |

4.3 Benthic Subtidal and Intertidal Ecology

- 25 The Project has the potential to impact upon benthic subtidal and intertidal ecology and these interactions are duly considered within Volume 2, Chapter 5: Benthic Subtidal and Intertidal Ecology of the ES (PINS Ref APP-046/ Application Ref 6.2.5). Table 6 identifies the status of discussions relating to this topic area between the parties. The discussions relating to saltmarsh are considered within a further SoCG.

Table 6: Status of discussions relating to Benthic Subtidal and Intertidal Ecology.

| Discussion Point | Thanet Extension Position | Natural England Position | Final Position |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|
| Policy and Planning | The assessment has identified all appropriate plans and policies, insofar as relevant to Natural England's remit, relevant to benthic ecology and has given due regard to them within the assessment. | Agreed. | Agreed |
| Consultation | The ES chapter has been adequately updated following S42 and Evidence Plan consultation and concerns raised have been adequately addressed or clarified. For consultation matters regarding MCZ assessments please see Table 10. | Agreed. | Agreed |
| Scope and Assessment Methodology | The potential impacts identified are appropriate or adequate, in relation to Thanet Extension, for benthic ecology receptors. For matters regarding MCZ assessments please see Table 10. | Agreed. | Agreed |
| | The study area defined for the assessment is appropriate for the impacts considered for the Thanet Extension project. | Agreed – however as per Examiner Question 1.1.4 we would like clarification on the discrepancies in the study area between 12, 13 and 14 km. | Agreed |

| Discussion Point | Thanet Extension Position | Natural England Position | Final Position |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|
| | Additional clarification has been provided in the Applicant's response to Natural England's response to the Examiner's Question 1.1.4. | | |
| Baseline data used in the assessment | Sufficient primary and secondary data has been collated to appropriately characterise the baseline environment for the purposes of informing the Thanet Extension EIA. | Agreed – the baseline is sufficient for EIA purposes given much of the proposed construction is outside of designated sites. However, this position should not be assumed for HRA or MCZ purposes. | Agreed |
| | Data gaps have been highlighted and appropriate measures for filling any data gaps have been proposed for Thanet Extension. The Applicant has sought to infill gaps through the use of all available data sources, including data from the Nemo Interconnector surveys. It is the Applicant's position that pre-construction surveys (if consented) will provide further characterisation of the area in which works are proposed prior to works being undertaken, including for the areas of intersection with the MCZ. | Agreed. However, for the area of the RLB associated with the pMCZ please refer to Table 10. | Agreed. |
| | The sensitivity and importance of the receiving environment is appropriately or adequately | Agreed – the applicant has confirmed that subtidal chalk has not been identified within the | Agreed. |

| Discussion Point | Thanet Extension Position | Natural England Position | Final Position |
|---------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|
| | described within the Thanet Extension Environmental Statement. | RLB. Pre-construction surveys will further reaffirm this. | |
| Mitigation Measures | The embedded mitigation measures are considered appropriate or adequate, in relation to Thanet Extension, and no further mitigation is necessitated as a result of the assessment conclusions. | Agreed. | Agreed |
| Outcomes of EIA | The conclusions of the assessment appropriately or adequately reflects the potential impacts on the benthic ecology within the study area during the construction, operation and decommissioning phases of the Thanet Extension project. Noting that this excludes effects on intertidal saltmarsh habitats. For matters regarding MCZ assessments please see Table 10. | Agreed – As the applicant’s position states please refer to section 4.8 / table 10 for matters regarding the MCZ assessment. | Agreed |
| | The cumulative effects have been adequately or appropriately described within the ES (and associated examination submissions) and the | Agreed. | Agreed |

| Discussion Point | Thanet Extension Position | Natural England Position | Final Position |
|--------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|
| | <p>conclusions are appropriate for the Thanet Extension project.</p> <p>For matters regarding MCZ assessments please see Table 10.</p> | | |
| Core Reef Approach | <p>The report has been agreed in principle with Natural England for Thanet Extension for the reasons detailed in their Relevant Representation, and has been appropriately or adequately addressed following Natural England's relevant representations.</p> <p>The Applicant submitted a revised Biogenic Reef Plan (PINS Ref REP4-025) which addresses Natural England's concerns.</p> | Agreed. | Agreed. |

4.4 Fish and Shellfish Ecology

- 26 The Project has the potential to impact upon fish and shellfish ecology and these interactions are duly considered within Volume 2, Chapter 6: Fish and Shellfish Ecology of the ES (PINS Ref APP-047/ Application Ref 6.2.6). Table 7 identifies matters identified by the ExA as requiring agreement between the Applicant and Natural England, and as noted within Natural England's Relevant Representation.

Table 7: Status of discussions relating to Fish and Shellfish Ecology.

| Discussion Point | Thanet Extension Position | Natural England Position | Final Position |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|
| Policy and Planning | The assessment has identified all appropriate plans and policies, insofar as relevant to Natural England's remit, relevant to fish and shellfish ecology and has given due regard to them within the Thanet Extension assessment. | Agreed. | Agreed |
| Consultation | The ES chapter has been adequately updated following consultation and concerns raised have been adequately addressed or clarified. | Agreed. | Agreed |
| Scope and Assessment methodology | The potential impacts identified are a appropriate and adequate reflection of the potential impacts, in relation to Thanet Extension, on the fish and shellfish ecology. | Agreed. | Agreed |
| | The noise modelling and metrics are appropriate or adequate, in relation to Thanet Extension, for assessing the impacts on fish species. | In reviewing the environmental statement from the applicant Natural England has no further concerns with regards to the noise modelling. Therefore, we agree with position in relation to fish species protected by designated sites, however we encourage further consultation with other statutory bodies such as CEFAS and the MMO. | Agreed |

| Discussion Point | Thanet Extension Position | Natural England Position | Final Position |
|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|
| | The methodologies applied to the assessment are robust and appropriate for the Thanet Extension project. | In reviewing the environmental statement from the applicant Natural England has no further concerns with regards to the methodologies applied to the assessment. Therefore, we agree with this position in relation to fish species protected by designated sites, however we encourage further consultation with other statutory bodies such as CEFAS and the MMO. | Agreed |
| | The study area defined for the assessment is appropriate, in relation to Thanet Extension, for the impacts considered. | Agreed. | Agreed |
| Baseline data used in the assessment | Sufficient primary and secondary data has been collated to appropriately characterise the baseline environment for the purposes of informing the Thanet Extension EIA. | In reviewing the environmental statement from the applicant Natural England has no further concerns in relation to the baseline data. Therefore we agree with this position in relation to fish species protected by designated sites, however we encourage further consultation with other statutory bodies such as CEFAS and the MMO. | Agreed |
| | Data gaps have been highlighted and appropriate measures for filling any data gaps have been proposed for the Thanet Extension project. | In reviewing the environmental statement from the applicant Natural England has no further concerns in relation to data gaps. Therefore we agree with this position in relation to fish species protected by designated sites, however we | Agreed |

| Discussion Point | Thanet Extension Position | Natural England Position | Final Position |
|---------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|
| | | encourage further consultation with other statutory bodies such as CEFAS and the MMO. | |
| | All relevant species of fish within the study area have been identified and assessed for the Thanet Extension project. | In reviewing the environmental statement from the applicant Natural England has no further concerns with the fish species outlined within this assessment. Therefore, we agree with this position in relation to fish species protected by designated sites, however we encourage further consultation with other statutory bodies such as CEFAS and the MMO. | Agreed |
| | The sensitivity and importance of the receiving environment is appropriately or adequately described within the Thanet Extension ES. | Agreed. | Agreed |
| Mitigation Measures | The embedded mitigation measures are considered appropriate or adequate, in relation to Thanet Extension, and no further mitigation is necessitated as a result of the assessment conclusions. | In reviewing the environmental statement from the applicant Natural England has no further concerns with regards to the embedded mitigation outlined within the assessment. Therefore, we agree with this position in relation to fish species protected by designated sites, however we encourage further consultation with other statutory bodies such as CEFAS and the MMO. | Agreed |

| Discussion Point | Thanet Extension Position | Natural England Position | Final Position |
|---------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|
| Outcomes of the EIA | The assessment criteria and assignment of significance is appropriate in relation to Thanet Extension. | Agreed | Agreed |
| | The sensitivity and importance of the receiving environment is appropriately or adequately described within the Thanet Extension ES. | Agreed | Agreed |
| | The conclusions of the assessment appropriately or adequately reflects the potential impacts on the fish and shellfish ecology within the study area during the construction, operation and decommissioning phases of the Thanet Extension project. | In reviewing the environmental statement from the applicant Natural England has no further concerns. Therefore we agree with this position in relation to fish species protected by designated sites, however we encourage further consultation with other statutory bodies such as CEFAS and the MMO. | Agreed |
| | The cumulative effects have been adequately and appropriately described within the ES and the conclusions are appropriate for the Thanet Extension project. | In reviewing the environmental statement from the applicant Natural England has no further concerns. Therefore we agree with this position in relation to fish species protected by designated sites, however we encourage further consultation with other statutory bodies such as CEFAS and the MMO. | Agreed |

4.5 Marine Mammals

- 27 The Project has the potential to impact upon marine mammals and these interactions are duly considered within Volume 2, Chapter 7: Marine Mammals of the ES (PINS Ref APP-048/ Application Ref 6.2.7). Table 8 identifies the status of discussions relating to this topic area between the parties.

Table 8: Status of discussions relating to Marine Mammals.

| Discussion Point | Thanet Extension Position | Natural England Position | Final Position |
|----------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|----------------|
| Policy and Planning | The assessment has identified all appropriate plans and policies relevant to marine mammals, insofar as relevant to Natural England's remit, and has given due regard to them within the assessment. | Agreed. | Agreed |
| Consultation | The ES chapter has been adequately updated following both the S42 consultation and the Evidence Plan concerns raised have been adequately addressed or clarified. | Agreed, with any outstanding concerns detailed below. | Agreed |
| Scope and Assessment methodology | The potential impacts identified are an appropriate and adequate reflection of the potential impacts on the marine mammals in relation to Thanet Extension. | Agreed. | Agreed |
| | The underwater noise modelling and metrics are appropriate for assessing the potential impacts on marine mammals, in relation to Thanet Extension, as agreed through the Evidence Plan process. | Agreed. | Agreed |
| | The methodologies applied to the assessment are robust and appropriate in relation to Thanet Extension. | Agreed. | Agreed |

| Discussion Point | Thanet Extension Position | Natural England Position | Final Position |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|
| | The study area defined for the assessment is appropriate for the impacts considered in relation to the Thanet Extension project. | Agreed. | Agreed |
| | The main species of interest, in relation for Thanet Extension, have been considered within the assessment. | Agreed. | Agreed |
| Baseline data used in the assessment | Sufficient primary and secondary data has been collated to appropriately characterise the baseline environment for the purposes of informing the Thanet Extension EIA. A clarification note has been drafted to indicate the implications of adopting the JCP III derived harbour porpoise density estimates in the assessment and to demonstrate that this does not result in a material change to the assessment outcome. | Following the review of Annex G, Natural England is satisfied with the new information presented in Annex G submitted at Deadline 1. Overall, we agree with the conclusion of the modelling that there was no material change to the assessment and the impact significance remains minor. | Agreed |
| | The clarification note was submitted as Annex G to Appendix 1 of the Applicant's Deadline 1 Submission (PINS Ref REP1-023). | | |
| | Data gaps have been highlighted and appropriate measures for filling any data gaps have been proposed for the Thanet Extension project. | Agreed. | Agreed |

| Discussion Point | Thanet Extension Position | Natural England Position | Final Position |
|---------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| | The sensitivity and importance of the receiving environment is appropriately or adequately described within the Thanet Extension Environmental Statement. | Agreed. | Agreed |
| Mitigation Measures | The embedded mitigation measures are considered appropriate or adequate, and no further mitigation is necessitated as a result of the assessment conclusions when the Thanet Extension project is considered alone. | Agreed. | Agreed |
| | No further mitigation is necessitated as a result of the EIA assessment conclusions for the Thanet Extension project when considered alone or cumulatively. | <p>Update at Deadline 3:</p> <p>The applicant submitted a draft SIP at Deadline 2 for Natural England to review. Whilst we welcome the production of a SIP, and have provided minor comments to the ExA at Deadline 3, the overall mechanism by which the SIPs will be managed, monitored and reviewed is yet to be developed. Therefore as stated previously, Natural England are unable to advise that this approach is sufficient to address the in-combination impacts and therefore the risk of Adverse Effect on Integrity on the Southern North Sea SCI cannot be fully ruled out.</p> | Agreed in terms of the EIA. |

| Discussion Point | Thanet Extension Position | Natural England Position | Final Position |
|------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|
| | | <p>Natural England RR comment NE 102 concerning detailing possible mitigation options (reduction of noise technology): This issue could be dealt with via the production of a SIP – see below.</p> <p>The BEIS Review of Consents (RoC) has concluded that as long as Site Integrity Plans (SIPs) are placed on all DCOs (in relation to HRA and in combination impacts on the Southern North Sea SCI for harbour porpoise), there will be no adverse impact on site integrity.</p> <p>While Natural England agrees that SIPs are a method to prevent an adverse effect on site integrity, there is also a need to put a timeframe on the SIP and a mechanism for assessing multiple SIPs at the same time. At what stage will the developer be required to reassess whether the parameters that have been assessed within the BEIS HRA have been exceeded? We suggest at the next Contract for Differences (CfD) stage and then again as each project reaches their Final Investment Decision (FiD) stage in case further mitigation is required. Assessment will also need</p> | |

| Discussion Point | Thanet Extension Position | Natural England Position | Final Position |
|------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|
| | | <p>to be made of possible EPS requirements – as the applicant stated in response to Natural England RR comment NE-103 that <i>An updated assessment of the potential for cumulative disturbance will be carried out to inform an EPS licence application if deemed necessary at the appropriate stage</i>. This should take place within the SIP.</p> <p>More information is required from the MMO / BEIS on how spatio-temporal impacts will be managed to prevent exceedance of the SNCB noise guidance thresholds. A process will need to be developed to ensure continuing adherence to the SCI thresholds as multiple SIPs are developed over time, especially when piling can take place over several years, and new projects can come online during this time. Should potential exceedance of the thresholds occur, a process for dealing with this issue needs to be in place – the affected developers / industries will need to work together with the regulator and SNCBs to prevent adverse effect on the SCI. However, this process</p> | |

| Discussion Point | Thanet Extension Position | Natural England Position | Final Position |
|---------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| | | <p>needs to be developed and agreed before SIPs are placed onto DCOs.</p> <p>Natural England agree if there is the production of a SIP by the applicant and there is clear guidance from the regulator on how this process will be managed strategically. However, Natural England is satisfied that from an EIA perspective, the proposed mitigation is sufficient and impacts to the Southern North Sea SAC are identified within the RIAA. Please refer to table 3 for discussions in relation to the RIAA.</p> | |
| Outcomes of the EIA | The conclusions of the assessment appropriately or adequately reflects the potential impacts on marine mammals within the study area during the construction, operation and decommissioning phases of the Thanet Extension project. | <p>Natural England RR Comment NE-96: Figures 7.19 & 7.20 and Figures 7.22 & 7.23 - Disturbance thresholds for porpoise hit the coastline in this figure for both monopiles and pin piles. While Natural England accept Thanet's response to Natural England's relevant representations that <i>'published dose response curves have indicated that at levels around 145 SELss (which is the sound level indicated by the contours on the coast in Figure 7.19), levels of response are approximately 50% - therefore at this distance,</i></p> | Agreed in terms of the EIA. |

| Discussion Point | Thanet Extension Position | Natural England Position | Final Position |
|------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|
| | | <p><i>half the animals present would be expected to show a behavioural response such as moving away from the source. In this case, this would probably result in animals moving along the coastline to adjacent quieter areas to the north and south of this area.'</i> Natural England would like to note that while this is accepted, (although figures 7.22 and 7.23 show 155 and 150dB SELss contours hitting the coastline respectively) there is no scientific evidence that porpoise movement will be north or south along the coastline as a result of the disturbance, and not cause any live strandings.</p> <p>Natural England RR comment NE-103 concerning maximum PTS distance to be mitigated: Despite a Thanet response detailing the distances in the ES being mean distances rather than maximum distances, Paragraph 7.11.83 before table 7.26 in the ES states: <i>The potential for exposure to noise levels that could cause PTS over the whole piling sequence can be reduced by extending the mitigation zone out to the maximum range</i></p> | |

| Discussion Point | Thanet Extension Position | Natural England Position | Final Position |
|------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|
| | | <p><i>(across all species) predicted by the NOAA thresholds of 960 m.</i></p> <p>This suggests that this is the max range not the mean. In any case, the applicant has committed to reporting the max and the average distances within the MMMP should they gain consent. Natural England agree with the applicant's commitment to provide both values in the MMMP.</p> <p>However, Natural England is satisfied that from an EIA perspective, the proposed mitigation is sufficient and impacts to the Southern North Sea SAC are identified within the RIAA. Please refer to table 3 for discussions in relation to the RIAA.</p> | |
| | No evidence for live strandings resulting from noise exposure from offshore wind farm construction– porpoises will move away from the noise, following a gradient of sound levels, with the aim to get to a quieter area – they are unlikely to continue to move into shallower and shallower water and strand. | Agreed. | Agreed |

| Discussion Point | Thanet Extension Position | Natural England Position | Final Position |
|------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|
| | <p>Harbour porpoises are predicted to move away from the noise generated by pile driving and predicted noise levels close to the coast are at a level whereby some individuals may still be expected to respond. It is expected that animals will then seek to find quieter areas by moving into adjacent waters with lower noise levels, resulting in net movement parallel to the coast. We do not believe that live stranding of porpoises exposed to piling noise in the area between the windfarm and the coast is at all likely. To date, in the UK there have been several offshore wind farms constructed in close proximity to the coast, in areas where harbour porpoise are present. There are a total of 26 wind farms within 15 km of the coast, 21 of these are less than 10 km from the coast. There have been no reported live strandings in these areas associated with periods of offshore wind farm construction. Live strandings of porpoises are relatively rare, data from the Cetacean Strandings Investigation Programme (CSIP) indicated they occurred at an average rate of 4 per year between 2005 and 2015. Detailed data</p> | | |

| Discussion Point | Thanet Extension Position | Natural England Position | Final Position |
|------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|
| | from recorded live strandings from the British Divers Marine Life Rescue from 2009/2010 indicated that out of eight live strandings across these two years, four were of newborn calves presumably separated from their mothers and the remainder were either malnourished or dehydrated and were later euthanised. There was no indication that exposure to noise had resulted in strandings. | | |
| | There is no available framework or methodology for robust quantitative assessment of all potential 'noisy' activities, given the differences in temporal and spatial scale of each activity. However, given baseline levels of those activities, the predicted future extent of those activities, together with the results of the North Sea wide population level predictions with respect to the cumulative effects of offshore wind farms, no significant impact is predicted to the North Sea harbour porpoise population from the cumulative effect of all noisy activities such as offshore wind farm construction, seismic survey, shipping and UXO detonation. | Agreed. | Agreed. |

| Discussion Point | Thanet Extension Position | Natural England Position | Final Position |
|------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|
| | As per the Applicant's response to RR NE-98 (7.11.113 & 114), the assessment concluded a minor adverse impact for the effect of disturbance on hauled out seals, which is not significant in EIA terms. This conclusion was based on a combination of the small proportion of time affected, the low proportion of the total animals that may show a response, the duration of any response and the overall patterns of usage of the area. Given the small number of seals affected, the fact that there are several alternative haul out sites in the vicinity, and the fact that the seals are not associated with any protected area, disturbance at haul-outs is anticipated to be minor. It is therefore not considered necessary to implement a seasonal restriction on activity during that period. | Agreed. | Agreed. |
| | The cumulative effects have been adequately and appropriately described within the ES and the conclusions are appropriate for the Thanet Extension project. | Natural England RR comment NE-101 concerning cumulative assessment of UXOs: As a point of principle, all noisy activities should be assessed together as part of the cumulative assessment. Natural England would argue that currently this is not a complete CEA. However, given the levels of seismic activity in the porpoise management unit | Agreed. |

| Discussion Point | Thanet Extension Position | Natural England Position | Final Position |
|------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| | | <p>and their potential for disturbance, combined with UXO detonations, there is unlikely to be a population level impact on harbour porpoises, given the Booth et al findings using the iPCoD model. However, the same cannot be said for the RIAA and HRA assessment.</p> <p>(Booth, C., J. Harwood, R. Plunkett, S. Mendes, and R. Walker. 2017. Using The Interim PCoD Framework To Assess The Potential Effects Of Planned Offshore Wind Developments In Eastern English Waters On Harbour Porpoises In The North Sea – Final Report. SMRUC-NEN-2017-007, Provided to Natural England and the Joint Nature Conservation Committee, March 2017, SMRU Consulting.)</p> | |
| Mitigation | The mitigation proposed in the MMMP (PINS Ref APP-146/ Application Ref 8.11) is appropriate and sufficient given the conclusions of the Thanet Extension marine mammals assessment. | <p>Update at Deadline 3:</p> <p>The applicant submitted a draft SIP at Deadline 2 for Natural England to review. Whilst we welcome the production of a SIP, and have provided minor comments to the ExA at Deadline 3, the overall mechanism by which the SIPs will be managed, monitored and reviewed is yet to be developed. Therefore as stated previously, Natural England are unable to advise that this approach is sufficient to address the in-combination impacts and therefore the risk of</p> | Agreed in terms of the EIA. |

| Discussion Point | Thanet Extension Position | Natural England Position | Final Position |
|------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|
| | | <p>Adverse Effect on Integrity on the Southern North Sea SCI cannot be fully ruled out. The BEIS Review of Consents has concluded that as long as Site Integrity Plans (SIPs) are placed on all DCOs (in relation to HRA and in combination impacts on the Southern North Sea SCI for harbour porpoise), there will be no adverse impact on site integrity. While Natural England agrees that SIPs are a method to prevent an adverse effect on site integrity, there is also a need to put a timeframe on the SIP and a mechanism for assessing multiple SIPs at the same time. At what stage will the developer be required to reassess whether the parameters that have been assessed within the BEIS HRA have been exceeded? We suggest at the next CfD stage and then again as each project reaches their FiD stage in case further mitigation is required. Assessment will also need to be made of possible EPS requirements – as the applicant stated in response to Natural England RR comment NE-103 that An updated assessment of the potential for cumulative disturbance will be carried out to inform an EPS licence application if</p> | |

| Discussion Point | Thanet Extension Position | Natural England Position | Final Position |
|------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|
| | | <p>deemed necessary at the appropriate stage. This should take place within the SIP.</p> <p>More information is required from the MMO / BEIS on how spatio-temporal impacts will be managed to prevent exceedance of the SNCB noise guidance thresholds. A process will need to be developed to ensure continuing adherence to the SCI thresholds as multiple SIPs are developed over time, especially when piling can take place over several years, and new projects can come online during this time. Should potential exceedance of the thresholds occur, a process for dealing with this issue needs to be in place – the affected developers / industries will need to work together with the regulator and SNCBs to prevent adverse effect on the SCI. However, this process needs to be developed and agreed before SIPs are placed onto DCOs.</p> <p>Natural England agree if there is the production of a SIP by the applicant and there is clear guidance from the regulator on how this process will be managed strategically.</p> | |

| Discussion Point | Thanet Extension Position | Natural England Position | Final Position |
|------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|
| | | <p>While this list is not exhaustive, Natural England would expect the following to be included in the SIP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A finalised design plan; • An updated HRA; • Updated mitigation measures (if required) – outlining potential mitigation that can and cannot be used and the reasoning. • Where modelling via the RoC has been updated (e.g. the Dogger projects), further mitigation may be required to ensure porpoises are out of an enlarged Permanent Threshold Shift zone than was predicted in the original EIA. • Detail the requirement for EPS licences and Marine Licences for UXO detonation. • Provide a timetable for development of the plan. E.g. Post CfD, and again pre FID to ensure timely agreements and timeframes for finances to be agreed. <p>However, Natural England is satisfied that from an EIA perspective, the proposed mitigation is sufficient and impacts to the Southern North Sea</p> | |

| Discussion Point | Thanet Extension Position | Natural England Position | Final Position |
|------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|
| | | SAC are identified within the RIAA. Please refer to table 3 for discussions in relation to the RIAA. | |
| | The MMMP (PINS Ref APP-146/ Application Ref 8.11) will be finalised post-consent (if granted) following detailed design. | Agreed. | Agreed |

4.6 Designated Sites

- 28 The Project has the potential to impact upon designated sites and these interactions are duly considered within Volume 2, Chapter 8: Offshore Designated Sites of the ES (PINS Ref APP-049/ Application Ref 6.2.8). Table 9 identifies the status of discussions relating to this topic area between the parties.

Table 9: Status of discussions relating to Designated sites.

| Discussion Point | Thanet Extension Position | Natural England Position | Final Position |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|
| Policy and Planning | The assessment has identified all appropriate plans and policies relevant to the offshore designated sites, insofar as relevant to Natural England's remit, and has given due regard to them within the assessment. | Agreed. | Agreed |
| Baseline data used in the assessment | <p>Appropriate data and information was used to characterise the baseline, in relation to Thanet Extension, for the purposes of the assessment.</p> <p>The Applicant submitted a clarification note as part of the Deadline 2 Submission, as an agreed action with Natural England, on the in-combination assessment of dredging and disposal activities on the MCZs in the proximity of the development (PINS Ref REP2-006).</p> <p>Sandwave Clearance, Dredge and Disposal Site Characterisation (PINS Ref REP4-019) provides detailed information regarding both the refined project design for these elements and the worst case scenarios (both in terms of area</p> | <p>Agreed at a high level and on the basis ONLY that evidence gaps will be filled at a later date.</p> <p>For Goodwin Sands, NE has addressed site specific comment in the MCZ section of the SOCG.</p> | Agreed |

| Discussion Point | Thanet Extension Position | Natural England Position | Final Position |
|----------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|
| | and deposition height) which now addresses Natural England's concerns. | | |
| Scope and Assessment methodology | All relevant designated sites have been appropriately or adequately identified and included within the Thanet Extension assessment. | Agreed. | Agreed |
| | The conservation objectives have been appropriately identified within the Thanet Extension assessment. | Agreed – Goodwin Sands pMCZ currently has no conservation objectives published. However, we encouraged the applicant to use the Thanet Coast MCZ as a proxy. | Agreed |
| Outcomes of the EIA | The conclusions of the assessment appropriately or adequately reflects the potential impacts on the designated sites for the lifetime of the Thanet Extension project. For matters regarding MCZ assessments please see Table 10. | Agreed – please see further information in the MCZ section (Table 10). | Agreed |
| | The in-combination effects have been adequately and appropriately described within the ES and the conclusions are appropriate. | Agreed. | Agreed |

4.7 Marine Conservation Zone Assessment

- 29 The Project has the potential to impact upon marine conservation zones and these interactions are duly considered within Volume 4, Annex 5-3: Marine Conservation Zone Assessment of the ES (PINS Ref APP-083/ Application Ref 6.4.5.3). Table 10 identifies the status of discussions relating to this topic area between the parties.
- 30 The Project submitted a clarification note on the MCZ assessment, including further detail for Goodwin Sands pMCZ, as part of the Applicant's Deadline 2 Submission (PINS Ref REP2-006). The Applicant submitted MCZ Assessment Clarification Note as Appendix 20 to the Deadline 4 Submission (PINS Ref REP4-024) this note sought to address the concerns raised within Table 2 of Natural England's comments on clarification notes submitted at Deadlines 1 and 2 (PINS Ref: REP3-020). This is in addition to comments being addressed in the Appendix 3 to the Applicant's Deadline 4 response (Response to Other IPs).
- 31 The Project submitted a consolidation of material and additional clarification for Natural England as Appendix 32 to the Deadline 5 Submissions (PINS Ref REP5-047). This appendix and associated annexes were provided by the Applicant following a request from Natural England and sought to address their concerns.

Table 10: Status of discussions relating to the Marine Conservation Zones Assessment.

| Discussion Point | Thanet Extension Position | Natural England Position | Final Position |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|
| Policy and Planning | The assessment has identified all appropriate plans and policies relevant to the assessed MCZs for Thanet Extension, at the time of writing, and has given due regard to them within the assessment. | Agree – however we would like to remind the applicant that Goodwin Sands is now a proposed MCZ and is now considered a material consideration. | Agreed |
| Baseline data used in the assessment | Appropriate or adequate data and information was used to characterise the baseline for the purposes of the Thanet Extension assessment. The baseline of the environment is characterised and presented in the Benthic Characterisation report (PINS Ref APP-082/ Application Ref 6.4.5.2). These surveys were agreed to be fit for the purpose of characterising the benthic baseline environment, for the purposes of undertaking an EIA, as part of the Evidence Plan Process (PINS Ref APP- 137/ Application Ref 8.5). Natural England have requested to review the dropdown video data captured for the Thanet Extension project, which is presented in Annex F.1 of the Benthic Characterisation report (PINS Ref APP-082/ Application Ref 6.4.5.2). | Disagree – Natural England deem the original baseline data was inadequate to characterise the Goodwin Sands pMCZ. However, the applicant has committed to collect further pre-construction data that will fill some of the data gaps and allow for any impacts of the proposed activities to be properly measured and assessed. | Disagree. |

| Discussion Point | Thanet Extension Position | Natural England Position | Final Position |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|
| Scope and Assessment methodology | All relevant MCZs have been appropriately or adequately identified for the proposed Thanet Extension activities and included within the assessment. | Agreed. | Agreed |
| | The conservation objects for Thanet Coast MCZ have been appropriately or adequately identified within the assessment. | Agreed. | Agreed |
| | <p>The assessment of Goodwin Sands pMCZ is appropriate and robust, for the proposed Thanet Extension activities, and is based on appropriate information and assumptions.</p> <p>The Applicant provided additional technical clarifications which address Natural England's concerns in –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC and MCZ Clarification Note and Annexes as Appendix 32 to Deadline 5 (PINS Ref PER5-047) (which consolidated all previous MCZ submissions and provided additional clarifications); • The MCZ Assessment Clarification Note as Appendix 20 to the Deadline 4 Submission (PINS Ref REP4-024); | <p>Under discussion – Whilst this point is highlighted as being under discussion NE agree the assessment is near completion. The newest document (Annex B to Appendix 15 to Deadline 6 Submission) has addressed many concerns. However, we require further clarification on the evidence to support conclusions of the Applicant that rock protection will be buried if used within the site. Otherwise the assessment should be updated to acknowledge that this would be footprint loss of feature.</p> <p>Furthermore, due to the piecemeal approach of the assessment of Goodwin Sands, NE would like to see the updated assessments and clarification notes pulled together in one document in order to be confident that all impacts have been</p> | Under discussion |

| Discussion Point | Thanet Extension Position | Natural England Position | Final Position |
|------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The SAC and MCZ technical clarification note as Appendix 32 to the Deadline 5 Submission; and Sandwave Clearance, Dredge and Disposal Site Characterisation (Appendix 27 to Deadline 5 Submission). <p>Annexes A and B to this Appendix provides the requested information (from the meeting held 2nd May) which adequately addresses Natural England's concerns.</p> <p>It is the Applicant's understanding (following a telephone call on 24th May) that these matters will be resolved following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Applicant creating a consolidated document of all submissions relating to the MCZ to date with an accompanying signposting note; Natural England's final review of the consolidated materials; and The Applicant providing further clarification on rock protection (as requested by Natural England). | <p>assessed. This should clearly refer to the draft general management approach for each feature as per the Defra MCZ consultation, as well as the Thanet Coast MCZ Conservation Advice package (which has been used as a proxy for the assessment). In particular this should show how the assessment has been informed by the pressures in the advice on operations section and the feature attributes in the supplementary advice section of the conservation advice package. Any mitigation measures and licence conditions required to ensure the conservation objectives are not hindered should be referenced too. NE suggests that a summary table could be a useful way to present this.</p> <p>NE will await the final assessment document before formally agreeing that the works will not hinder the conservation objectives of the site.</p> | |

| Discussion Point | Thanet Extension Position | Natural England Position | Final Position |
|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|
| | • | | |
| Monitoring | Monitoring (biogenic reef, cable protection and sandwave clearance (if undertaken within the site)) within Goodwin Sands pMCZ (if designated) is appropriately and adequately secured within the DCO. | Under Discussion – Natural England have raised points regarding the monitoring commitments at Deadline 6. Once these have been addressed we envisage agreement will be met. | Under discussion |
| Outcomes of the MCZ assessment | The conclusions of the assessment appropriately or adequately reflects the potential impacts on the Thanet Coast MCZ for the lifetime of the Thanet Extension project. | Agreed. | Agreed |
| | <p>The conclusions of the assessment appropriately or adequately reflects the potential impacts on the Goodwin Sands pMCZ for the lifetime of the Thanet Extension project.</p> <p>The Applicant provided additional technical clarifications which address Natural England's concerns in –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC and MCZ Clarification Note and Annexes as Appendix 32 to Deadline 5 (PINS Ref PER5-047) (which consolidated | Under discussion – Whilst this point is highlighted as being under discussion NE agree the assessment is near completion. The newest document (Annex B to Appendix 15 to Deadline 6 Submission) has addressed many concerns. However, we require further clarification on the evidence to support conclusions of the Applicant that rock protection will be buried if used within the site. Otherwise the assessment should be updated to acknowledge that this would be footprint loss of feature. | Under discussion |

| Discussion Point | Thanet Extension Position | Natural England Position | Final Position |
|------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|
| | <p>all previous MCZ submissions and provided additional clarifications);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The MCZ Assessment Clarification Note as Appendix 20 to the Deadline 4 Submission (PINS Ref REP4-024); • The SAC and MCZ technical clarification note as Appendix 32 to the Deadline 5 Submission; and • Sandwave Clearance, Dredge and Disposal Site Characterisation (Appendix 27 to Deadline 5 Submission). <p>Annex A to this appendix provides the requested information (from the meeting held 2nd May) which adequately addresses Natural England's concerns. The Applicant has sought to secure the disposal of material disturbed, from sandwave clearance in Goodwin Sands pMCZ within the site where practicable or within 500 m of the site, in the revised Schedule of Mitigation.</p> | <p>Furthermore, due to the piecemeal approach of the assessment of Goodwin Sands, NE would like to see the updated assessments and clarification notes pulled together in one document in order to be confident that all impacts have been assessed. This should clearly refer to the draft general management approach for each feature as per the Defra MCZ consultation, as well as the Thanet Coast MCZ Conservation Advice package (which has been used as a proxy for the assessment). In particular this should show how the assessment has been informed by the pressures in the advice on operations section and the feature attributes in the supplementary advice section of the conservation advice package. Any mitigation measures and licence conditions required to ensure the conservation objectives are not hindered should be referenced too. NE suggests that a summary table could be a useful way to present this.</p> | |

| Discussion Point | Thanet Extension Position | Natural England Position | Final Position |
|------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|
| | <p>It is the Applicant's understanding (following a telephone call on 24th May) that these matters will be resolved following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Applicant creating a consolidated document of all submissions relating to the MCZ to date with an accompanying signposting note; • Natural England's final review of the consolidated materials; and • The Applicant to providing further clarification on rock protection (as requested by Natural England). | NE will await the final assessment document before formally agreeing that the works will not hinder the conservation objectives of the site. | |
| | <p>The cumulative effects have been adequately or appropriately described within the assessment and the conclusions are appropriate for the Thanet Extension project.</p> <p>MCZ Assessment Clarification Note as Appendix 20 to the Deadline 4 Submission (PINS Ref REP4-024) addresses the concerns raised by Natural England.</p> | Agreed. | Agreed |

| Discussion Point | Thanet Extension Position | Natural England Position | Final Position |
|------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|
| | <p>The Applicant provided additional technical clarifications which address Natural England's concerns in –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC and MCZ Clarification Note and Annexes as Appendix 32 to Deadline 5 (PINS Ref PER5-047) (which consolidated all previous MCZ submissions and provided additional clarifications); • The MCZ Assessment Clarification Note as Appendix 20 to the Deadline 4 Submission (PINS Ref REP4-024); • The SAC and MCZ technical clarification note as Appendix 32 to the Deadline 5 Submission; and • Sandwave Clearance, Dredge and Disposal Site Characterisation (Appendix 27 to Deadline 5 Submission). | | |

4.8 Onshore Biodiversity

- 32 The Project has the potential to impact upon onshore biodiversity and these interactions are duly considered within Volume 3, Chapter 5 of the Thanet Extension ES (PINS Ref APP-061/ Application Ref 6.3.5). Table 11 identifies the status of discussions relating to this topic area between the parties.

Table 11: Status of discussions relating to Onshore Biodiversity.

| Discussion Point | Thanet Extension Position | Natural England Position | Final Position |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|
| Policy and Planning | The assessment has identified all appropriate plans and policies relevant to biodiversity assessment, insofar as relevant to Natural England's remit, and has given due regard to them within the assessment. | Agreed. | Agreed |
| Consultation | The ES chapter has been adequately updated following S42 and Evidence Plan consultation and concerns raised have been adequately addressed or clarified. | Agreed. | Agreed |
| Scope and Assessment Methodology | The potential impacts identified, in relation to Thanet Extension, are appropriate or adequate for biodiversity receptors. | Agreed. | Agreed |
| | The study area defined for the assessment is appropriate for the Thanet Extension project impacts considered. | Agreed. | Agreed |
| Baseline data used in the assessment | <p>Sufficient primary and secondary data has been collated to appropriately characterise the baseline environment for the purposes of informing the Thanet Extension EIA.</p> <p>The Applicant submitted a revised OLEMP as part of their Deadline 1 Submission (PINS Ref</p> | <p>The OLEMP has now been finalised.</p> <p>As highlighted below, there have been instances where the applicant has not been able to collect as much data as they and Natural England would have wanted. Natural England have had discussions with the applicant to provide as</p> | Agreed |

| Discussion Point | Thanet Extension Position | Natural England Position | Final Position |
|------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|
| | REP1-069) to account for Natural England's consultation. | <p>much information as possible regarding species of importance within the onshore environment.</p> <p>We have been reassured by the applicants commitments in the OLEMP and the pre-construction surveys they plan to carry out which should provide a further representation of the species and habitats that reside here.</p> | |
| | <p>The Applicant had previously agreed the terrestrial invertebrate survey provided sufficient or adequate data to characterise and evaluate the value of these receptors for the Thanet Extension project.</p> <p>The Applicant submitted a revised OLEMP as part of their Deadline 1 Submission (PINS Ref REP1-069) to account for Natural England's consultation.</p> | <p>Agreed -The surveys were limited to only one visit late in August, where ideally a few visits should have been undertaken. Natural England have provided further information to applicant following the meeting on the 5th October 2018, which included further information on the potential species that could reside in this area and their conservation status. Furthermore, as highlighted in the OLEMP (a conditioned document in the DCO) a Terrestrial Invertebrate Mitigation Strategy (TIMS) is to be developed. This is alongside further pre-construction surveys to further identify invertebrate species of importance at the landfall location.</p> | Agreed |

| Discussion Point | Thanet Extension Position | Natural England Position | Final Position |
|------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|
| | | Following the finalisation of the OLEMP, plus commitments from the applicant to collect further pre-construction data to inform any mitigation, Natural England are confident that invertebrates have been considered fully. Furthermore, the notification that landfall option 2 has been dropped will result in less damaging scenarios that originally considered in the environmental statement. | |
| | Data gaps have been highlighted and appropriate or adequate measures for filling any data gaps have been proposed for the Thanet Extension project. | As highlighted above the applicant has acknowledged data gaps associated with invertebrate surveys and other surveys including great crested newt. Following commitments from the applicant to gather sufficient pre-construction data to form a robust baseline once construction practices are known, Natural England are confident onshore biodiversity will characterised sufficiently. | Agreed |
| | The sensitivity and importance of the receiving environment is appropriately or adequately described within the Thanet Extension Environmental Statement. | Agreed. | Agreed |

| Discussion Point | Thanet Extension Position | Natural England Position | Final Position |
|---------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|
| Mitigation Measures | The embedded mitigation measures are considered appropriate or adequate, and no further mitigation is necessitated as a result of the Thanet Extension assessment conclusions. | Agreed. | Agreed |
| | The mitigation proposed (Construction Environmental Management Plan, Code of Construction Practice, Saltmarsh Mitigation, Reinstatement and Monitoring Plan (Application Ref 8.1) and a seasonal restriction) are adequately secured in the DCO. | Agreed –Natural England’s major concerns are associated with the damage and disturbance associated with the works upon the saltmarsh. The SMRMP should effectively monitor and mitigate any recovery and damage respectively. | Agreed. |
| | The Applicant has provided the site selection and saltmarsh specific SoCG prior to Deadline 3 to Natural England. | | |
| Outcomes of EIA | The conclusions of the assessment appropriately or adequately reflects the potential impacts on the onshore biodiversity within the study area for the lifetime of the Thanet Extension project. | Agreed. | Agreed. |
| | The cumulative effects have been adequately and appropriately described within the ES and the conclusions are appropriate for the Thanet Extension project. | Agreed. | Agreed. |

| Discussion Point | Thanet Extension Position | Natural England Position | Final Position |
|------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|
| Outline Landscape and Ecology Management | <p>The OLEMP (Application Ref 8.7) provides adequate or sufficient detail of in-principle management measures for the Thanet Extension project.</p> <p>The Applicant submitted a revised OLEMP as part of their Deadline 1 Submission (PINS Ref REP1-069) to account for Natural England's consultation.</p> | <p>Agreed - Natural England have been in receivership of an updated OLEMP at Deadline 1. Natural England agree with the revised OLEMP.</p> | Agreed |
| | <p>The OLEMP provides appropriate or adequate information, for the Thanet Extension project, on outline details of proposed biodiversity enhancements and proposed monitoring.</p> <p>The Applicant submitted a revised OLEMP as part of their Deadline 1 Submission (PINS Ref REP1-069) to account for Natural England's consultation.</p> | <p>Agreed - Natural England welcome the proposed biodiversity enhancements and monitoring.</p> | Agreed |
| Legally Protected Species | <p>The Thanet Extension project is highly unlikely to impact on legally protected species.</p> | <p>Agreed – however it is the applicant's duty to carry out any additional pre-construction surveys to identify any legally protected species that may be present. Should any pre-construction surveys identify the presence of any Nationally Protected (NPS) or European</p> | Agreed |

| Discussion Point | Thanet Extension Position | Natural England Position | Final Position |
|------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|
| | | Protected Species (EPS) the applicant may consider that a licence application may be required at a later date. | |

4.9 DCO and dML

- 33 Table 12 identifies the status of discussions relating to this topic area between the parties insofar as relevant to Natural England's remit

Table 12: Status of discussions relating to the DCO and dMLs

| Discussion Point | Thanet Extension Position | Natural England Position | Final Position |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|
| Inclusion of additional project parameters within the DCO/dML | <p>The Applicant has drafted a clarification note, which will become a certified document, with all of the maximum parameters assessed within the ES which can be used as an audit and therefore, the requested items are not required should not be included in the DCO/dML as it would preclude the need to consider the effects as presented in the ES for enforcement.</p> <p>The clarification note was submitted as Annex A to Appendix 1 of the Applicant's Deadline 1 submission (PINS Ref REP1-023).</p> | Agreed. | Agreed. |
| Arbitration | Following the revised wording with reference to arbitration is agreed as appropriate, insofar as relevant to Natural England's remit. | Disagree - Further information is provided in Natural England's response to the ExA's commentary on the dDCO. | Disagree. |
| General comments on | Following the responses to the Natural England's RR, the revised draft DCO and dML | Agreed. | Agreed. |

| Discussion Point | Thanet Extension Position | Natural England Position | Final Position |
|-------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|
| numbers and cross-referencing | accurately cross reference documents and project description information. | | |
| O&M activities | The Applicant will provide annual reporting of O&M activities in the context of the consent (if granted). | Agreed. | Agreed. |
| Monitoring plans | The effects are known and understood, given the unique position of Thanet Extension as a project, so there is no necessity to provide an In-principle Monitoring Plan (IPMP) or further monitoring plans; other the In-principle Offshore Ornithology Monitoring Plan (which is captured within the Ornithology SoCG with Natural England). The Applicant has provided detailed monitoring plans for known risks or areas of uncertainty with the application. | Agreed – The specific monitoring plans and the schedule of monitoring have been provided and as stated in the applicant’s column the Offshore Ornithology In-principal monitoring plan is captured within the distinct Ornithology SoCG. | Agreed |
| Mitigation | The OLEMP (PINS Ref REP1-069 which supersedes APP-142/ Application Ref 8.7) has been adequately secured within the DCO. | Agreed - Natural England agree the OLEMP is secured within the draft DCO. | Agreed. |

| Discussion Point | Thanet Extension Position | Natural England Position | Final Position |
|------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|
| Mitigation | The CoCP (PINS Ref APP-133/ Application Ref 8.1) has been adequately secured within the DCO. | Agreed. | Agreed |
| Mitigation | The CEMP has been adequately secured within the DCO. | Agreed. | Agreed |
| Mitigation | The Saltmarsh Mitigation, Reinstatement and Monitoring Plan (PINS Ref REP4-020 which supersedes APP-147/ Application 8.13) has been adequately secured within the DCO. | Agreed. | Agreed |
| Mitigation | The Contaminated Land Plan been adequately secured within the DCO. | Agreed. | Agreed |
| Mitigation | The MMMP (PINS Ref APP-146/ Application Ref 8.11) has been adequately secured within the DCO. | Agreed. | Agreed |
| Mitigation | The seasonal restriction within the intertidal area, between October and March inclusive, has been adequately secured within the DCO. | Agreed. | Agreed |

| Discussion Point | Thanet Extension Position | Natural England Position | Final Position |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|
| Submission Timescales | The provision of monitoring plans 4-months prior to commencement is considered appropriate given the proposed construction programme of the project. | Natural England consider that monitoring plans should be provided 6 months prior to commencement to allow a thorough review of the documents and to allow all stakeholders to review and potentially suggest changes to the monitoring. This is in line with the MMO's position. | Disagree. |
| | The provision of documents 4 months in advance of proposed works is considered a proportionate given that the project inherently requires less flexibility and will be built out to the extents assessed. | Natural England consider that documents should be provided 6 months prior to commencement to allow a thorough review of the documents and to allow all stakeholders to review and potentially suggest changes to the monitoring. This is in line with the MMO's position. | Disagree |
| Commencement | The clearance of UXO will not be included under commencement as if it is required then a separate marine licence will be sought. | Agreed. | Agreed. |
| | Following the revised wording in the draft DCO (PINS Ref REP5-019) the definition of commencement is agreed. | Disagree. Further information is provided in Natural England's response to the ExA's commentary on the dDCO. | Disagree |

| Discussion Point | Thanet Extension Position | Natural England Position | Final Position |
|------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|
| Offshore noise | As presented in the Schedule of Monitoring (PINS Ref REP5-011), the Applicant has included appropriate Conditions to monitor offshore noise resulting from the installation of the first four foundations. | Agreed. | Agreed. |

5 Matters of disagreement

- 34 This summary section identifies those matters raised by Natural England during examination that have yet to be resolved as of the last consultation meeting held with Natural England.
- 35 The current topics which are disagreed:
- Timescale requirements for post-consent documents;
 - Arbitration;
 - Definition of commencement;
 - The management of the SIP; and
 - The assessment, findings and baseline data of the MCZ assessment.