

Outer Dowsing Offshore Wind

The Applicant's Close of Examination Progress Tracker

Deadline 6

Date: April 2025

Document Reference: 24.8

Rev: 1.0

Company:		Outer Dowsing Offshore Wind		Asset:		Whole Asset	
Project:		Whole Wind Farm		Sub Project/Package:		Whole Asset	
Document Title or Description:		24.8 The Applicant’s Close of Examination Progress Tracker					
Internal Document Number:		PP1-ODOW-DEV-CS-SUM-0011		3 rd Party Doc No (If applicable):		N/A	
Rev No.	Date	Status / Reason for Issue	Author	Checked by	Reviewed by		Approved by
1.0	April 2025	Deadline 6	GoBe SLR	Outer Dowsing	Shepherd & Wedderburn		Outer Dowsing

Table of Contents

1	Introduction and Document Purpose	4
1.1	Introduction.....	4
1.2	Document Purpose.....	4
1.3	Document Structure and Outline	4
1.4	Planned Engagement Processes to Progress Issues	5
1.5	Examination Principal Issues Progress Trackers.....	6
1.1.1.	Benthic Ecology, Intertidal, Subtidal and Coastal Effects	6
1.1.2.	Civil and Military Aviation and Communication	10
1.1.3.	Cumulative Effects	11
1.1.4.	Fish and Shellfish Ecology	13
1.1.5.	Habitats and Onshore Ecology, including Onshore Ornithology	14
1.1.6.	Habitats Regulations Assessment.....	16
1.1.7.	Historic Environment and Marine Archaeology	30
1.1.8.	Land Use, Geology and Ground Conditions.....	34
1.1.9.	Landscape and Visual Effects.....	36
1.1.10.	Marine and Intertidal Ornithology	38
1.1.11.	Marine Mammals.....	42
1.1.12.	Noise and Vibration	45
1.1.13.	Oil, Gas and Other Offshore Infrastructure	46
1.1.14.	Traffic, Transport and Public Rights of Way	50
1.1.15.	Hydrology, Hydrogeology and Flood Risk (Water Quality and Resources)	50

Table of Tables

Table 1.1:	Benthic Ecology, Intertidal, Subtidal and Coastal Effects	6
Table 1.2:	Civil and Military Aviation and Communication	10
Table 1.3:	Commercial Fisheries and Fishing.....	11
Table 1.4:	Cumulative Effects	11
Table 1.5:	Fish and Shellfish Ecology	13
Table 1.6:	Habitats and Onshore Ecology, including Onshore Ornithology	14
Table 1.7:	Habitats Regulations Assessment	16
Table 1.8:	Historic Environment and Marine Archaeology.....	30
Table 1.9:	Land Use, Geology and Ground Conditions	34
Table 1.10:	Landscape and Visual Effects	36
Table 1.11:	Marine and Intertidal Ornithology.....	38
Table 1.12:	Marine Mammals.....	42
Table 1.13:	Noise and Vibration	45

Table 1.14: Oil, Gas and Other Offshore Infrastructure	46
Table 1.15: Traffic, Transport and Public Rights of Way.....	50
Table 1.16: Hydrology, Hydrogeology and Flood Risk	50

1 Introduction and Document Purpose

1.1 Introduction

1. The Rule 6 Letter (PD-009) was published by the Examining Authority on the 4th of September 2024 requesting the submission of progress trackers at key points throughout examination.

This Close of Examination Progress Tracker has been prepared, to provide subsequent information following the previously issued Pre-examination Principal Issues Progress Tracker (PD1-073) and Mid-examination Principal Issues Progress Tracker (REP3-052). This document is intended to support the application by GT R4 Limited trading as Outer Dowsing Offshore Wind (the 'Applicant') for development consent to construct, operate and decommission the proposed Outer Dowsing Offshore Wind Farm (the Project).

1.2 Document Purpose

2. This document has been produced in response to the Examining Authority's Rule 6 (PD-009) and Rule 8 (PD-011; PD-014; PD-022) letters requesting examination Progress Trackers, reporting on what the Applicant considers are the principal, and other notable, issues in the Examination.
3. The Examining Authority provided headings following their initial assessment of the application documents, which detail the Examining Authority (ExA)'s view of Principal Issues. The Applicant has further detailed throughout the tables in this document what the Applicant believes the Principal Issues under each of these heading are, and the perceived likelihood of resolution.
4. As outlined in the Rule 6 Letter (PD-009) the Applicant has been requested to submit a 'Mid-Examination' Progress Tracker, expected to be submitted at Deadline 3 in accordance with the draft Examination Timetable, and Closing Statements to be submitted at the final deadline.

1.3 Document Structure and Outline

5. Section 1.5 Principal Issues Progress Trackers contains tables that set out what the Applicant believes the principal issues are grouped by topic, as set out in Annex C of the Examining Authority's Rule 6 letter (PD-009), it logs the Interested Parties that have raised them and summarises both the Interested Parties' and the Applicant's positions, alongside the likelihood of resolving the issue. Section 1.4 Planned Engagement Processes to Progress Issues, below outline the steps the Applicant plans to use to progress positions and seek alignment with Interested Parties where possible and the anticipated timelines for that.
6. Within each table, the Applicant has included the Pre-examination status alongside the current mid-examination status and progress update, to give a clear indication of where matters are progressing and works being undertaken to resolve issues where they were previously raised, and new issues where they have arisen during the examination to date.
7. For ease of reference, and in accordance with the ExA's suggestion in the Rule 6 letter (PD-009) the tables use a colour-coding "RAGG" colour system to guide the reader to the likelihood of resolving the issues as follows:

Colour	Likelihood of Resolution
Red	The Interested Party / Parties and the Applicant have been unable to align their positions.
Amber	The Interested Party / Parties and the Applicant are in discussions to discern whether positions can be aligned (not in use for Close of Examination Status).
Green	The Interested Party / Parties' and the Applicant's positions are aligned.
Light Green	The Applicant has responded to the Interested Party/Parties comments either outside of the examination process or within submissions made to date, and believes this matter is now resolved, pending only written confirmation of this from the Interested Parties.
Grey	The Interested Party / Parties and the Applicant's positions are not aligned, however the matter is considered immaterial.

1.4 Engagement

8. The Applicant worked with parties to resolve the majority of the principal issues outlined in this document during the examination.

1.5 Examination Principal Issues Progress Trackers

1.1.1. Benthic Ecology, Intertidal, Subtidal and Coastal Effects

Table 1.1: Benthic Ecology, Intertidal, Subtidal and Coastal Effects

Interested Party	Principal Issues	Pre-examination Status	Mid Examination Status	Close of Examination Status
Natural England (RR-045)	Cable protection within the nearshore area	<p>The Applicant has responded to comments relating to Natural England's advice around avoiding near shore cable protection and avoiding sediment transportation. within the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations (PD1-071).</p> <p>The Applicant has provided further clarity on techniques used within the nearshore.</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to engage with Natural England following the engagement process outlined in section 1.4 of this document to seek further resolution, using timeframes and mechanisms that both the Applicant and Natural England agree are appropriate for effective engagement.</p>	<p>The Applicant has responded to comments on cable protection within the nearshore area within the Applicant's Comments on Deadline 1 Submissions (Table 2: Appendix B1) (REP2-053), submitted at Deadline 2, and has provided further clarification in response to NE's Q1 HRA 1.7 answer in document 20.7 The Applicant's comments on ExQ1 Responses, submitted at Deadline 3.</p> <p>In summary, the height of the cable protection in this area is effectively controlled through dML condition 13 (1) (d) (ii) which includes for consultation with Maritime and Coastguard Agency (MCA) and Trinity House where cable protection is likely to exceed 5% of navigable depth. (Note: 0.35m is 5% of 7.1m (the inner depth of closure).</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to engage with Natural England following the engagement process outlined in section 1.4 of this document to seek further resolution, using timeframes and mechanisms that both the Applicant and Natural England agree are appropriate for effective engagement.</p>	<p>The Applicant has responded to comments on Natural England's advice on cable protection within the nearshore area within Table 1.2.1 of The Applicant's Comments on Natural England's Risk & Issues Log (document reference 21.8, updated at Deadline 6).</p> <p>In summary, the Applicant has committed to the use of concrete mattresses in the nearshore in addition to the commitment of the nearshore cable protection height to not exceed 0.35 m. This is secured in the (further) updated Outline Scour Protection and Cable Protection Management Plan (document reference 8.21, V5) submitted at Deadline 6).</p> <p>The Applicant considers this issue as resolved.</p>
Natural England (RR-045)	Mitigation proposed for potential benthic impacts	<p>The Applicant has provided additional clarification regarding comments about whether mitigation had been considered for potential benthic impacts, including on priority habitats, in the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations (PD1-071).</p> <p>Natural England may wish to seek further clarification once they have had the opportunity to review the information provided to date, at which point the Applicant will provide clarity where needed.</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to engage with Natural England following the engagement process outlined in section 1.4 of this document to seek further resolution, using timeframes and mechanisms that the Applicant and Natural England agree are appropriate for effective engagement.</p>	<p>The Applicant has responded to comments on Mitigation proposed for potential benthic impacts within the Applicant's Comments on Deadline 1 Submissions (REP2-053) (Table 3: Appendix C1), submitted at Deadline 2. The Applicant has provided further clarification to NE's Appendix K, in the Applicant's comments on ExQ1 Responses (REP3-054).</p> <p>The Applicant has presented a robust and well-considered approach to benthic mitigation within the Outline Biogenic Reef Mitigation Plan (PD1-066) and has demonstrated that the mitigation is secured and feasible.</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to engage with Natural England following the engagement process outlined in section 1.4 of this document to seek further resolution, using timeframes and mechanisms that both the</p>	<p>The Applicant has responded to comments on proposed mitigation in Table 21 of The Applicant's Comments on Deadline 5 Submissions (document reference 24.2, submitted at Deadline 6).</p> <p>The Applicant considers the proposed mitigation measures for benthic impacts to be robust and well considered. The Applicant has presented a robust and well-considered approach to Annex I biogenic reef and biogenic reef protected under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006 mitigation within the Outline Biogenic Reef Mitigation Plan (PD1-066) and has demonstrated that the mitigation is secured and feasible.</p> <p>Additionally, the Applicant has conducted an assessment of the supporting habitat for <i>S. spinulosa</i> reef within the Offshore ECC, which intersects with the IDNRRB SAC. The</p>

Interested Party	Principal Issues	Pre-examination Status	Mid Examination Status	Close of Examination Status
			Applicant and Natural England agree are appropriate for effective engagement.	<p>findings are detailed in the <i>S. spinulosa</i> Reef Supporting Habitat Technical Note (REP5-145REF). Natural England approved the Applicants interpretation of the methodologies and the quantification of the supporting habitat area for <i>S. spinulosa</i> reef via email through DAS on 25th March 2025. The Applicant notes that the requirement to identify supporting habitat for <i>S. spinulosa</i> reef and to mitigate any impacts was not raised during the extensive pre-application process undertaken by the Applicant. The request to include this assessment was provided by Natural England at Deadline 3 submissions Appendix C2 (REP3-067) and Appendix C3 (REP3-068).</p> <p>This advice was supplemented by Natural England's comments at Deadline 4 (Appendix C4 to the Natural England Deadline 4 Submission (REP4-134)), summarised in the following paragraph: "<i>Natural England advises the Applicant undertakes and submits into examination an assessment of supporting habitats and processes for potential Annex I S. spinulosa reef, to demonstrate that the recovery of this feature will not be hindered by the installation of the export cable and/or the lasting placement of cable protection. This will provide the Secretary of State comfort an adverse effect on integrity to IDRBNR SAC Annex I reef features and habitats/processes in which it relies upon will be avoided.</i>"</p> <p>The Applicant has mapped out supporting habitat in accordance with the guidance supplied and has agreed to mitigate impacts using removable cable protection within the areas identified. It should be noted that the conservation objectives of the SAC do not require that habitats with the potential to support designated habitats receive the same level of protection as the designated habitats themselves. Whilst the conservation objective focuses on maintaining and restoring the supporting processes necessary for qualifying habitats, it is not reasonable to interpret this as a requirement to protect all habitats within the SAC that could develop into Annex I reef at some undefined time as if they were reef features themselves, nor has Natural England provided a justification for such an approach.</p>

Interested Party	Principal Issues	Pre-examination Status	Mid Examination Status	Close of Examination Status
				<p>The Applicant considers that the further analysis and further commitment to removable cable protection in defined areas of supporting habitat bolsters the existing conclusions of the assessment that there is no AEol. The Applicant has updated the RIAA with this detail at Deadline 6 (document reference 7.1, V5). The commitment is secured within the Outline Scour and Cable Protection Management Plan (document reference 8.21, V5 updated at Deadline 6) and in the Outline Cable Specification and Installation Plan (document reference 8.5, V7 updated at Deadline 6) secured under condition 13(1)(d), Part 2, Schedule 11 of the DCO).</p> <p>In conclusion, the Applicant maintains its position that an AEol of the Annex I Sandbank and Annex I Reef features of the IDRBNR SAC can be excluded with the mitigation currently proposed, which includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The avoidance of <i>S. spinulosa</i> reef (as identified in the pre-construction surveys) within the IDRBNR SAC (as detailed within the Outline Biogenic Reef Mitigation Plan (REP2-043) and secured in Condition 13(1)(j), Part 2, Schedule 11 of the DCO); and • Adopting the use of removable cable protection across all Annex I sandbank features and within areas of habitat that could support <i>S. spinulosa</i> reef in the future, based on guidance and advice provided by Natural England (this commitment is detailed within the Outline Scour and Cable Protection Management Plan (document reference 8.21, V6 updated at Deadline 6) and in the Outline Cable Specification and Installation Plan (document reference 8.5, V7 updated at Deadline 6), secured under condition 13(1)(d), Part 2, Schedule 11 of the DCO). <p>The Applicant welcomes that Natural England considers the matter regarding sediment disposal resolved. <i>“In the event that disposal of dredged sediment (associated with seabed preparation works or cable installation) is required, material will be deposited, upstream, within an area of similar sediment characteristics, in close proximity to the dredge location, in order to retain sediment within the sediment transport system.”</i></p>

Interested Party	Principal Issues	Pre-examination Status	Mid Examination Status	Close of Examination Status
Natural England (RR-045)	Conclusions of Annex 1 Reef extent.	<p>The Applicant has responded to comments in respect of the conclusions of the Annex 1 reef extent within the Applicant's Relevant Representations (PD1-071). Additionally, the Applicant has submitted an Envision <i>Sabellaria spinulosa</i> reanalysis and report (REP3-035) at the Procedural Deadline.</p> <p>Natural England may wish to seek further clarification once they have had the opportunity to review the information provided to date, at which point the Applicant will provide clarity where needed.</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to engage with Natural England following the engagement process outlined in section 1.4 of this document to seek further resolution, using timeframes and mechanisms that the Applicant and Natural England agree are appropriate for effective engagement.</p>	<p>The Applicant has responded to comments on the conclusions of the Annex 1 reef extent within the Applicant's Comments on Deadline 1 Submissions (REP2-053), submitted at Deadline 2, and has provided further clarification to NE's Appendix K, in the Applicant's comments on ExQ1 Responses (REP3-054).</p> <p>The Applicant has updated Chapter 9 Appendix 2 Benthic Ecology Technical Report and the Offshore Export Cable Corridor (ECC) <i>Sabellaria spinulosa</i> Reanalysis Report at Deadline 3 to address the request from Natural England in Appendix C of its Deadline 1 submission (REP1-059).</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to engage with Natural England following the engagement process outlined in section 1.4 of this document to seek further resolution, using timeframes and mechanisms that the Applicant and Natural England agree are appropriate for effective engagement.</p>	<p>The Applicant can confirm that this issue has been resolved. The Applicant provided further clarification on the extent and distribution of Annex I <i>S. spinulosa</i> reef in the updates to ES Chapter 9 Appendix 2 Benthic Ecology Technical Report (ECC) (REP4a-069) and the Offshore Export Cable Corridor <i>S. spinulosa</i> Reanalysis (REP4a-070). Natural England has now agreed that the report includes adequate additional information and clarification sufficient to address Natural England's previous comments as resolved.</p>
Natural England (RR-045)	Cable protection within the Inner Dowsing, Race Bank and North Ridge (IDRBNR) Special Area of Conservation (SAC) on the sandbank features.	<p>The Applicant has responded to comments about the proposed cable protection within The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations (PD1-071).</p> <p>Natural England may wish to seek further clarification once they have had the opportunity to review the information provided to date. The Applicant will endeavour to work with Natural England to provide clarity where needed.</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to engage with Natural England following the engagement process outlined in section 1.4, using timeframes and mechanisms that the Applicant and Natural England agree are appropriate for effective and collaborative engagement.</p>	<p>The Applicant has responded to comments about the proposed cable protection within Applicant's Comments on Deadline 1 Submissions (REP2-053) (Table 3: Appendix C1), submitted at Deadline 2, and has provided further clarification on NE's Q1 HRA 1.5 response in The Applicant's comments on ExQ1 Responses (REP3-054), submitted at Deadline 3.</p> <p>The Applicant has committed to installing removable cable protection within sandbank features within the SAC, and that this mitigation measure combined with the conclusions of all data submitted at Application, and confirmed through additional studies (PD1-098) of the absence of any qualifying Annex I reef features within the offshore ECC, plus additional mitigation to avoid any reef which may consequently form, the Applicant is confident that the potential for an Adverse Effect on Integrity on this feature of the IDRBNR SAC can be excluded beyond reasonable scientific doubt.</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to engage with Natural England following the engagement process outlined in section 1.4, using timeframes and mechanisms that the</p>	<p>The Applicant can confirm that there is outstanding disagreement. The Applicant has responded to comments about removable cable protection within IDRBNR SAC in Table 21 of The Applicant's Comments on Deadline 5 Submissions (document reference 24.2, submitted at Deadline 6).</p> <p>The Applicant maintains its position that an AEoI of the Annex I Sandbank and Annex I Reef features of the IDRBNR SAC can be excluded with the mitigation currently proposed, which includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The avoidance of <i>S. spinulosa</i> reef (as identified in the pre-construction surveys) within the IDRBNR SAC (as detailed within the Outline Biogenic Reef Mitigation Plan (REP2-043) and secured in Condition 13(1)(j), Part 2, Schedule 11 of the DCO); and Adopting the use of removable cable protection across all Annex I sandbank features and within areas of habitat that could support <i>S. spinulosa</i> reef in the future, based on guidance and advice provided by Natural England (this commitment is detailed within the Outline Scour and Cable Protection Management Plan (document

Interested Party	Principal Issues	Pre-examination Status	Mid Examination Status	Close of Examination Status
			Applicant and Natural England agree are appropriate for effective and collaborative engagement.	reference 8.21, V6 updated at Deadline 6) and in the Outline Cable Specification and Installation Plan (document reference 8.5, V7 updated at Deadline 6), secured under condition 13(1)(d), Part 2, Schedule 11 of the DCO).
Natural England (RR-045)	Compliance with the Export Cable Region Assessments that inform the AfL	<p>The Applicant has responded to comments on the interface between the project-level assessments and the AfL within The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations (PD1-071).</p> <p>Natural England may wish to seek further clarification once they have had the opportunity to review the information provided to date. The Applicant will endeavour to work with Natural England to provide clarity where needed.</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to engage with Natural England following the engagement process outlined in section 1.4, using timeframes and mechanisms that the Applicant and Natural England agree are appropriate for effective and collaborative engagement.</p>	<p>The Applicant entered an Agreement for Lease with The Crown Estate on 17th October 2024 for the Project's transmission assets.</p> <p>The Applicant therefore considers this matter resolved.</p>	The Applicant can confirm that it considers this issue to be resolved.

1.1.2. Civil and Military Aviation and Communication

Table 1.2: Civil and Military Aviation and Communication

Interested Party	Principal Issues	Pre-examination Status	Mid Examination Status	Close of Examination Status
NATS En-Route Ltd (RR-044) Defence Infrastructure Organisation (RR-016)	Potential interference on systems and Radar.	<p>The Applicant has responded to comments about potential interference of the Project on systems and radar within The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations (PD1-071).</p> <p>The Interested Parties may wish to seek further clarification once they have had the opportunity to review the information provided to date. The Applicant will endeavour to work with National Air Traffic Services (NATS) and the Ministry of Defence (MOD) to provide clarity where needed.</p> <p>The Applicant's will continue to engage with Interested Parties following the engagement process outlined in section 1.4, using timeframes and mechanisms that the Applicant and the Interested Parties agree are appropriate for effective and collaborative engagement.</p>	<p>The Applicant has responded to comments about potential interference of the Project on systems and radar within The Applicant's Responses to The ExA's First Written Questions (ExQ1) (REP2-051) Table 1.3, submitted at Deadline 2, and provided an oral case at Issue Specific Hearing 3.</p> <p>In relation to NATS, The Applicant is currently reviewing a draft Mitigation Services Contract provided by NATS. The Applicant has updated the draft DCO to include a requirement (requirement 32) which mitigates the impacts on the Cromer and Claxby radars. The wording of this requirement has been agreed with NATS.</p> <p>In relation to MoD Primary Surveillance Radar (PSR), given that the UK government has committed to funding the technical solution to ensure it is in place by 2030 the</p>	<p>The Applicant can confirm that this issue has been resolved.</p> <p>A Services Agreement has been entered into between NERL and GT R4 Limited dated 10th March 2025 for the agreement of suitable planning requirements and the implementation of an identified and defined mitigation solution in relation to the development that will be implemented under agreement. NERL formally withdrew its Relevant Representation by way of a letter to the Planning Inspectorate (REP5-178) dated 10th March 2025.</p> <p>The MOD submission (REP5-177) dated 13th March 2025 presented alternative DCO Requirement wording in Annex A of their letter that would enable their objection to be withdrawn. The Applicant has accepted and</p>

Interested Party	Principal Issues	Pre-examination Status	Mid Examination Status	Close of Examination Status
			<p>Applicant is confident the relevant mitigation solutions will be in place before the Project is operational.</p> <p>The Applicant's will continue to engage with Interested Parties following the engagement process outlined in section 1.4, using timeframes and mechanisms that the Applicant and the Interested Parties agree are appropriate for effective and collaborative engagement.</p>	incorporated this wording and therefore consider that the MOD objection is withdrawn.

Table 1.3: Commercial Fisheries and Fishing

Interested Party	Principal Issues	Pre-examination Status	Mid Examination Status	Close of Examination Status
	No issues raised		<p>The Examining Authority asked the National Federation of Fishermen's Organisations (NFFO) "Do you have any outstanding concerns regarding either the Applicant's assessment of effects on commercial fishing activities or the mitigation measures that the Applicant has proposed? " in Q1 CF 1.2.</p> <p>At the time of writing, no submissions to the examination have been made by the NFFO.</p>	The Applicant can confirm that this issue has been resolved.

1.1.3. Cumulative Effects

Table 1.4: Cumulative Effects

Interested Party	Principal Issues	Pre-examination Status	Mid Examination Status	Close of Examination Status
MMO (RR-042)	How the cumulative assessment approach has been undertaken, with regards to underwater noise impacts on fish receptors.	<p>The Applicant has responded to comments about underwater noise impacts within The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations (PD1-071).</p> <p>The Interested Parties may wish to seek further clarification once they have had the opportunity to review the information provided to date. The Applicant will endeavour to work with the Marine Management Organisation (MMO) to provide clarity where needed.</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to engage following the engagement process outlined in section 1.4, using timeframes and mechanisms that the Applicant and the MMO agree are appropriate for effective and collaborative engagement.</p>	<p>The Applicant presented the modelled noise contours for the effects of mortality and potential mortal injury (219 dB cumulative sound exposure level (SELcum)), recoverable injury (216 dB SELcum) and temporary threshold shift (TTS) (186 dB SELcum) for sandeel habitat from simultaneous piling of jacket (pin-pile) foundations and monopile foundations in Figures 3.9 and 3.10 respectively (Offshore Restricted Build Area and Revision to the Offshore Export Cable Corridor Appendix A Figures, Part 1 of 2 – PD1-082).</p> <p>In the MMO Deadline 2 (REP2-092) response, the MMO agreed that the overall impacts of TTS from piling will not result in significant adverse impacts to sandeel at a population level.</p>	The Applicant can confirm that this issue has been resolved.

Interested Party	Principal Issues	Pre-examination Status	Mid Examination Status	Close of Examination Status
Lincolnshire County Council (RR-004)	Cumulative effects - LVIA	<p>The Applicant has responded to all queries in relation to this topic through their Responses to Relevant Representation (PD1-071).</p> <p>The Applicant has confirmed that the additional cumulative landscape and visual effects resulting from the contribution of the project to the overall cumulative effect will be very limited, as assessed in the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA).</p> <p>If further concerns are raised the Applicant will follow the process outlined in section 1.4 of this document to seek resolution.</p>	<p>The Applicant has responded to comments on the cumulative effects with other energy infrastructure projects within the LVIA Study Area within the Applicant's Responses to the Host Authorities Local Impact Reports (REP2-052) at Deadline 2.</p> <p>The position remains the same as the pre-examination stage which states that the cumulative landscape and visual effects will be very limited, as assessed in the LVIA.</p> <p>The issue of cumulative landscape and visual effects was not raised by the Examining Authority at Issue Specific Hearing 3.</p>	<p>The Applicant can confirm that this issue has been resolved.</p> <p>The approach for the onshore Cumulative Effects Assessment (REP5-066) followed a staged process as per the guidance in Advice Note 17 on Cumulative Effects Assessment (Planning Inspectorate, 2019) and the process undertaken identified the correct projects for the assessment based on the information available in the public domain at the time.</p> <p>The Applicant and LCC are in agreement that the cumulative scenarios have been assessed in accordance with best practice presented in GLVIA3 and IEMA 2013 and the assessment conclusions (both for the project on its own and cumulatively) are appropriate. These agreements have been documented in Rows LCC 57 and LCC 58 of the Statement of Common Ground (REP5-135).</p>
Lincolnshire County Council (RR-004)	Cumulative effects – Traffic	<p>The Applicant has responded to comments on cumulative effects of traffic within the Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations (PD1-071). The Applicant has confirmed that they will continue to monitor the development and availability of environmental, spatial and temporal project information for other projects in the region to foster collaboration, noting it will be the responsibility of future projects that come forward for planning to undertake their own Cumulative Effects Assessment as per the guidance in Advice Note 17. The Applicant is actively engaging with Lincolnshire County Council (LCC) regarding how the Applicant might evaluate new information from these emerging projects throughout the examination phase.</p>	<p>The Applicant has responded to comments on cumulative effects of traffic within the Applicant's Responses to the Host Authorities Local Impact Reports (REP2-052) at Deadline 2.</p> <p>The Applicant submitted an 'Inter-relationship with other infrastructure projects' report (REP2-055) at Deadline 2.</p> <p>The Applicant provided an oral case at Issue Specific Hearing 3 that the cumulative assessment within the Traffic and Transport chapter (AS1-052) has been undertaken correctly, as per the Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment's Guidelines for the Environmental Assessment of Traffic and Movement</p> <p>Additionally at Issue Specific Hearing 3, the Applicant acknowledged the commitment to review the Inter-relationship report during the Examination and update the ExA at deadlines 4 and 6 if necessary and provided an update as to the Lincolnshire Energy Forum.</p>	<p>The Applicant can confirm that this issue has been resolved.</p> <p>LCC have welcomed the inclusion of the interrelationship report and the Applicant's participation within the Lincolnshire Energy Forum.</p>

1.1.4. Fish and Shellfish Ecology

Table 1.5: Fish and Shellfish Ecology

Interested Party	Principal Issues	Pre-examination Status	Mid Examination Status	Close of Examination Status
MMO (RR-042)	Potential impact to herring spawning grounds and the impact assessment methodology, specifically noise thresholds, and conclusions.	<p>The Applicant has responded to comments about potential impacts on herring spawning grounds and the methodology and conclusions in The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations (PD1-071).</p> <p>The MMO may wish to seek further clarification once it has had the opportunity to review the information provided to date. The Applicant will endeavour to work with the MMO to provide clarity where needed.</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to engage with the MMO following the engagement process outlined in section 1.4, using timeframes and mechanisms that the Applicant and the MMO agree are appropriate for effective and collaborative engagement.</p>	<p>The Applicant has submitted revised figures for herring spawning activity within Document 15.9A (PD1-082) submitted alongside the Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representation (PD1-071) at the Procedural Deadline on 19 September 2024.</p> <p>The Applicant has responded to comments about potential impacts on herring spawning grounds and the need for seasonal piling restrictions within the (Draft) Statement of Common Ground with the MMO (REP1-034, Table 6) submitted at Deadline 1. The Applicant has provided further clarification in The Applicant's Responses to the ExA's First Written Questions (EXQ1) (REP2-051, Table 1.8) at Deadline 2 and The Applicant's Comments on Deadline 2 Submissions (REP3-037) (Table 1.4), submitted at Deadline 3.</p> <p>The Applicant remains confident that the impact assessment is robust and appropriate and maintains the position that piling at the Project will not result in significant population level effects to Banks herring.</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to engage with the MMO following the engagement process outlined in section 1.4, using timeframes and mechanisms that the Applicant and the MMO agree are appropriate for effective and collaborative engagement.</p>	<p>The Applicant can confirm that this issue has been resolved.</p> <p>Following discussion with the MMO throughout the Examination, the Applicant has committed to implement mitigation in the form of a temporal piling ban during the herring spawning season from 1 September and 16 October inclusive across the western extent of the WTG Area and the full extent of the northern ANS location.</p> <p>For impacts to herring at the northern ANS location, the Applicant presented a proposed piling restriction on a without prejudice basis to the MMO in January 2025. In relation to the piling restriction applicable to the WTG Area, the Applicant submitted new underwater noise modelling and a Spawning Herring Piling Restriction Plan to the MMO on 27 March 2025. The MMO confirmed on 2 April 2025 that they are satisfied with the revised modelling and the proposed boundary for the Piling Restriction Area. Whilst there is still a slight overlap of noise impact with a portion of the herring spawning ground, based on the information reviewed, the MMO is satisfied that the likelihood of significant adverse impacts to spawning herring at this location is unlikely to occur as a result of noise disturbance. The Applicant at Deadline 6 has submitted the Spawning Herring Piling Restriction Plan, which shows the agreed Piling Restriction Area and the maximum modelled impact ranges (document reference 8.24). Alternative dML condition wording at condition 25, Part 2, Schedule 10 of the DCO was submitted to the MMO on 27 March 2025, and the MMO confirmed on 4 April 2025 that they are satisfied with the new dML condition wording.</p> <p>Whilst the Applicant maintains that it is not appropriate to use the 135dB impact range for behavioural effects in their impact assessment for herring for the reasons set out in 'The Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations'(PDI-071) and subsequent submissions to the MMO (REP3-037 and REP-108) and the Examining Authority (REP2-051 and REP4-107), the Applicant has agreed a spatial and temporal piling restriction and DCO</p>

Interested Party	Principal Issues	Pre-examination Status	Mid Examination Status	Close of Examination Status
				condition wording which has addressed the MMO's concerns in this regard.
MMO	The robustness of the shellfish baseline characterisation, specifically the datasets.	<p>The Applicant has responded to comments about robustness of the baseline characterisation in The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations (PD1-071).</p> <p>The MMO may wish to seek further clarification once it has had the opportunity to review the information provided to date. The Applicant will endeavour to work with the MMO to provide clarity where needed.</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to engage with the MMO following the engagement process outlined in section 1.4, using timeframes and mechanisms that the Applicant and the MMO agree are appropriate for effective and collaborative engagement.</p>	<p>The Applicant has responded to comments about the robustness of the baseline characterisation for shellfish in the Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations (PD1-071) and the (Draft) Statement of Common Ground with the MMO (REP1-034, Table 6) submitted at Deadline 1.</p> <p>The Applicant received confirmation in the Deadline 2 and Deadline 4 MMO Submission (REP2-092 and REP4-129) that comments regarding the baseline characterisation of shellfish have been resolved.</p>	The Applicant can confirm that this issue has been resolved.

1.1.5. Habitats and Onshore Ecology, including Onshore Ornithology

Table 1.6: Habitats and Onshore Ecology, including Onshore Ornithology

Interested Party	Principal Issues	Pre-examination Status	Mid Examination Status	Close of Examination Status
Natural England (RR-045)	Highlighted the need to review draft protected species licences as part of the consenting process in order to issue a Letter of No Impediment (LoNI).	<p>The Applicant believes this issue has now been resolved.</p> <p>The Applicant has engaged with the Natural England Wildlife Licensing Service (NEWLS) via the Pre-Submission Screening Service and recognises the need for a Letter of No Impediment.</p> <p>In order to obtain LoNIs, the Applicant has submitted full draft licence applications in respect of great crested newt and water vole to Natural England with the aim of obtaining LoNIs prior to the examination.</p> <p>A protected species licence is not anticipated to be required for bats, badger and otter although this position will be reviewed again using data collected during pre-commencement/ pre-construction surveys.</p> <p>If further concerns are raised the applicant will follow the process outlined in section 1.4 of this document to seek resolution.</p>	<p>The Applicant believes this issue has now been resolved.</p> <p>The Applicant has obtained LoNIs in respect of Great Crested Newt (GCN) and water vole.</p> <p>With respect to bats, otter and badger the Applicant's assessment concludes that based on the current baseline and design information, it is possible to mitigate effects, and there are unlikely to be any licensable impacts. The Applicant has updated the OLEMS V3 (PD1-057) to include species Annexes that set out the update assessment and rationale supporting this conclusion. Outline mitigation measure strategies are presented in the OLEMS V3 (PD1-057).</p> <p>Implementation of the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Strategy (OLEMS) is secured by Development Consent Order (DCO) Schedule 1, Part 3, Requirement 10 & 12</p> <p>Pre-commencement surveys will be undertaken to identify any changes to baseline. These are secured under DCO Schedule 1, Part 3 - Requirement 12. If at that stage a licensable impact is identified, the Applicant will engage</p>	<p>The Applicant can confirm that this issue has been resolved.</p> <p>Natural England have confirmed that mitigation measures presented are consistent with expected best practice.</p>

Interested Party	Principal Issues	Pre-examination Status	Mid Examination Status	Close of Examination Status
			with NE to obtain a licence within which detailed mitigation measures will be set out.	
Natural England (RR-045)	Effect of HDD on landfall location at Anderby Creek, just North of Wolla Bank Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)	<p>The Applicant has responded to comments on the effect of HDD on the proposed landfall location in The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations (PD1-071). In particular, the Applicant has undertaken pre-construction ground investigations in July 2024 to avoid unforeseen direct or indirect impacts on Chapel Point to Wolla Bank SSSI. Further details on Frac -Out management are included in Section 2.3 of the Outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) (8.1).</p> <p>Natural England may wish to seek further clarification once they have had the opportunity to review the information provided to date. The Applicant will endeavour to work with Natural England to provide clarity where needed.</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to engage with Natural England following the engagement process outlined in section 1.4, using timeframes and mechanisms that the Applicant and Natural England agree are appropriate for effective and collaborative engagement.</p>	No further comments have been received from Natural England with regard to this matter.	No further comments have been received from Natural England with regard to this matter.
Natural England (RR-045)	Effect on Sea Bank Clay Pits SSSI	<p>An updated version of the Outline CoCP (document 8.1 (Version 2)) has been submitted with this response securing construction stage water monitoring through committing to a pre-construction 'Water Quality Monitoring and Mitigation Plan' that would describe the regime for pre-construction and construction monitoring of private water supplies and other locations (including Sea Bank Clay Pits SSSI).</p> <p>This also details mitigation measures in the event of any impacts being identified during construction. The draft DCO has been updated (3.1 Draft Development Consent Order (Version 3)) to secure that a Water Quality Monitoring and Mitigation Plan forms a part of the Code of Construction Practice to be submitted for approval pursuant to DCO Requirement 18.</p> <p>The Applicant believes that this update resolves this issue. If further concerns are raised the Applicant will</p>	<p>The Applicant has received further comments from Natural England on this matter regarding the requirement for specific mitigation measures.</p> <p>The Applicant has outlined that monitoring of Sea Bank Clay Pits SSSI will be undertaken throughout the construction period for landfall and the initial onshore ECC phase from landfall. In the highly unlikely event that a notable drop in water levels or flows is recorded at the SSSI, any dewatering activity at landfall would be ceased until appropriate assessment of impact or suitable mitigation can be put into place.</p> <p>The Applicant believes that this update resolves this issue. If further concerns are raised the Applicant will follow the process outlined in section 1.4 of this document to seek resolution.</p>	<p>As set out in the Applicant response to this issue at Deadline 4, and its response to ExA Written Question Q1 LU 1.22, Requirement 18 (2) (j) requires that the Water Quality Management and Mitigation Plan (WQMMP) be submitted for approval by Lincolnshire County Council, in consultation with (as appropriate):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the relevant planning authority - The Environment Agency - The relevant Statutory Nature Conservation Body. <p>In this instance Natural England would be the relevant Statutory Nature Conservation Body. On this basis, it is the Applicant's view that this commitment secures Natural England's wish to 'have sight of the plan as part of consent to resolve this issue'.</p> <p>It is not clear to the Applicant why NE's position is unchanged from Deadline 4a. The Applicant's position remains that this update has resolved the outstanding issue.</p>

Interested Party	Principal Issues	Pre-examination Status	Mid Examination Status	Close of Examination Status
		follow the process outlined in section 1.4 of this document to seek resolution.		It should be noted that the process to develop and approve the Water Quality Monitoring and Mitigation Plan has also been a topic discussed with the Environment Agency (See Protection of Groundwater RR-018 below), and the matter has been resolved. The process agreed involves the updating of the Groundwater Risk Assessment (REP4a-058) prior to producing the plan and appending the updated GWRA to the plan. This has been secured through inclusion of this process in the outline Code of Construction Practice (REP5-113), section 5.21 which gives an outline of the plan contents. The provision of the plan is secured through DCO Requirement 18 (j) (3.1 Draft Development Consent Order Version 10).

1.1.6. Habitats Regulations Assessment

Table 1.7: Habitats Regulations Assessment

Interested Party	Principal Issues	Pre-examination Status	Mid Examination Status	Close of Examination Status
Natural England (RR-045)	The conclusion of no adverse effect on integrity (AEol) to the conservation objectives of the Annex 1 sandbank feature of the IDRBNR SAC, in relation to changes in physical processes impacts.	<p>The Applicant has responded to comments regarding the conclusion of no AEol for Annex 1 sandbank features to Relevant Representations (PD1-071).</p> <p>Natural England may wish to seek further clarification once they have had the opportunity to review the information provided to date, at which point the Applicant will provide clarity where needed.</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to engage with Natural England following the engagement process outlined in section 1.4 of this document to seek further resolution, using timeframes and mechanisms that the Applicant and Natural England agree are appropriate for effective engagement.</p>	<p>The Applicant has responded to comments regarding changes to physical processes for Annex 1 sandbank features within the Applicant's Comments on Deadline 1 Submissions (Table 2: Appendix B1) (REP2-053) and has provided further clarification to NE's Appendix K, in The Applicant's comments on ExQ1 Responses (REP3-054).</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to engage with Natural England following the engagement process outlined in section 1.4 of this document to seek further resolution, using timeframes and mechanisms that both the Applicant and Natural England agree are appropriate for effective engagement.</p>	<p>The Applicant has responded to Natural England's disagreement to the conclusions of no AEol to the IDRBNR SAC for the Annex I Sandbank features both alone and in-combination in Table 21 in The Applicant's Comments on Deadline 5 Submissions (document reference 24.2, submitted at Deadline 6).</p> <p>The Applicant maintains its position that an AEol of the Annex I Sandbank features of the IDRBNR SAC can be excluded with the mitigation currently proposed, which includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adopting the use of removable cable protection across all Annex I sandbank features and within areas of habitat that could support <i>S. spinulosa</i> reef in the future, based on guidance and advice provided by Natural England (this commitment is detailed within the Outline Scour and Cable Protection Management Plan (document reference 8.21, V5 updated at Deadline 6) and in the Outline Cable Specification and Installation Plan (document reference 8.5, V7 updated at Deadline 6), secured under condition 13(1)(d), Part 2, Schedule 11 of the DCO).
Natural England (RR-045)	The conclusion of no AEol to the conservation	The Applicant has responded to comments regarding the conclusion of no AEol for Annex 1 reef features to Relevant Representations (PD1-071).	The Applicant has submitted Envision Sabellaria spinulosa reanalysis and report (REP3-035 and Chapter 9	The Applicant has responded to Natural England's disagreement to the conclusions of no AEol to the IDRBNR SAC for the Annex I <i>Sabellaria spinulosa</i> Reef

Interested Party	Principal Issues	Pre-examination Status	Mid Examination Status	Close of Examination Status
	objectives of the Annex 1 reef of the IDRBNR SAC and the determination of reef.	<p>Natural England may wish to seek further clarification once they have had the opportunity to review the information provided to date, at which point the Applicant will provide clarity where needed.</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to engage with Natural England following the engagement process outlined in section 1.4 of this document to seek further resolution, using timeframes and mechanisms that the Applicant and Natural England agree are appropriate for effective engagement.</p>	<p>Appendix 2 Benthic Ecology Technical Report (ECC) (REP3-018) which include relevant responses to Natural England and clarification on the methodology and determination of reef extent.</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to engage with Natural England following the engagement process outlined in section 1.4 of this document to seek further resolution, using timeframes and mechanisms that both the Applicant and Natural England agree are appropriate for effective engagement.</p>	<p>both alone and in-combination in Table 21 in The Applicant's Comments on Deadline 5 Submissions (document reference 24.2, submitted at Deadline 6).</p> <p>The Annex I Reef features of the IDRBNR SAC can be excluded with the mitigation currently proposed, which includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The avoidance of <i>S. spinulosa</i> reef (as identified in the pre-construction surveys) within the IDRBNR SAC (as detailed within the Outline Biogenic Reef Mitigation Plan (REP2-043) and secured in Condition 13(1)(j), Part 2, Schedule 11 of the DCO). ▪ Adopting the use of removable cable protection across all Annex I sandbank features and within areas of habitat that could support <i>S. spinulosa</i> reef in the future, based on guidance and advice provided by Natural England (this commitment is detailed within the Outline Scour and Cable Protection Management Plan (document reference 8.21, V5 updated at Deadline 6) and in the Outline Cable Specification and Installation Plan (document reference 8.5, V7 updated at Deadline 6), secured under condition 13(1)(d), Part 2, Schedule 11 of the DCO).
Natural England (RR-045)	Compensation package proposed for the adverse effect on Kittiwake.	<p>The Applicant has responded to comments regarding the proposed compensation package for Kittiwake in Relevant Representations (PD1-071).</p> <p>Natural England may wish to seek further clarification once they have had the opportunity to review the information provided to date, at which point the Applicant will provide clarity where needed.</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to engage with Natural England following the engagement process outlined in section 1.4 of this document to seek further resolution, using timeframes and mechanisms that the Applicant and Natural England agree are appropriate for effective engagement.</p>	<p>The Applicant has provided further clarification to NE's Appendix K, in The Applicant's comments on ExQ1 Responses (REP3-054).</p> <p>Alongside this, The Applicant's answers to the ExA's first written questions (REP2-051) on the proposed compensation packages and their delivery have been provided.</p> <p>At Deadline 2, the Applicant submitted a Change Notification (REP2-064) that it intends to shorten the requirement for a lead in period of three full breeding seasons to two full breeding seasons before the operation of any turbine. A supporting document, Lead-in periods for kittiwake breeding on Artificial Nesting Structures (REP2-060), has been supplied.</p> <p>The Applicant has submitted a Letter of Comfort from The Crown Estate (TCE) (REP2-062) which confirms TCE have the ability to grant the rights required in respect of the construction of the Offshore ANS site(s), subject to the relevant conditions outlined in the letter.</p>	<p>The Applicant has provided further clarification regarding the compensation package proposed for the adverse effect on Kittiwake in Table 1.7.1 of Appendix G of The Applicant's Comments on Natural England's Risk and Issues Log (document reference 21.8, updated at Deadline 6).</p> <p>The Applicant has provided kittiwake growth models within REP4-104 which show that, in the case of the Applicant's approach with an ANS with 300 AONs, the compensation provided for kittiwake over the anticipated approximate 35-year lifetime of the Project would outweigh the cumulative requirement by over 800 birds. For kittiwake, cumulative outputs have been modelled using an impact agreed with Natural England and assuming all of the impact is addressed by the ANS.</p> <p>The Applicant has provided further comments in PADS NE12 of Table 1.6.2 of The Applicant's Comments on Natural England's Risk and Issues Log (document</p>

Interested Party	Principal Issues	Pre-examination Status	Mid Examination Status	Close of Examination Status
			<p>The Applicant notes that, in their response to the ExA's written questions (REP2-074), Natural England 'consider the kittiwake compensatory measures to present an equivalent or greater level of detail than that provided by previous developments'.</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to engage with Natural England following the engagement process outlined in section 1.4 of this document to seek further resolution, using timeframes and mechanisms that both the Applicant and Natural England agree are appropriate for effective engagement</p>	reference 21.8, updated at Deadline 6). The Applicant awaits Natural England's updated advice regarding 19.11 Lead-in periods for kittiwake breeding on Artificial Nesting Structures (ANS) (REP4-104) at Deadline 6, including comment on the DCO condition wording, in Schedule 22 Part 1 Para 4 (iii) and 5, (REP4-007, REP4a-007).
Natural England (RR-045)	The 'without prejudice' compensation packages for Guillemot and Razorbill.	<p>The Applicant has responded to comments regarding the proposed 'without prejudice' compensation packages in Relevant Representations (PD1-071).</p> <p>Natural England may wish to seek further clarification once they have had the opportunity to review the information provided to date, at which point the Applicant will provide clarity where needed.</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to engage with Natural England following the engagement process outlined in section 1.4 of this document to seek further resolution, using timeframes and mechanisms that the Applicant and Natural England agree are appropriate for effective engagement.</p>	<p>The Applicant has provided further clarification to NE's Appendix K, in The Applicant's comments on ExQ1 Responses (REP3-054). Alongside this, the Applicant's answers to the ExA's first written questions (REP2-051) on the proposed compensation packages and their delivery have been provided.</p> <p>The Applicant provided an updated Predator Control Evidence Base and Road Map (REP2-025) at Deadline 2.</p> <p>The Applicant has committed to providing an updated version of the Without Prejudice Additional Measures for Guillemot and Razorbill evidence and Road Map document (APP-259) at Deadline 4.</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to engage with Natural England following the engagement process outlined in section 1.4 of this document to seek further resolution, using timeframes and mechanisms that both the Applicant and Natural England agree are appropriate for effective engagement</p>	<p>The Applicant has responded to comments in PADS NE11 of Table 1.6.2 of The Applicant's Comments on Natural England's Risk and Issues Log (document reference 21.8, updated at Deadline 6).</p> <p>The Applicant has provided updated versions of Guillemot and Razorbill Compensation Quanta (document reference 20.17, V4), Without Prejudice Guillemot Compensation Plan (document reference 7.7.2, V3) and Without Prejudice Razorbill Compensation Plan (document reference 7.7.3, V3) at Deadline 6 that acknowledge Natural England's updated position on compensation calculation for guillemot and razorbill. Specifically, Natural England's updated position is that when considering the design of measures, the UCI impact and the Hornsea Four method, and an appropriate compensation ratio should be used for guillemot and razorbill. However assessment of the success of these measures (i.e. the actual amount of compensation that needs to be delivered) will be calculated with the mean impact value informing the Hornsea Four calculation, at a 1:1 ratio.</p> <p>If the SoS deems it necessary, the Applicant can deliver the required compensation at a ratio of 2:1 (1.99:1 for razorbill), using Natural England's UCI impacts and the Hornsea Four method. However, the Applicant considers that with the precaution inherent within the assessment, and the use of the UCI impact to inform compensation calculation, there is sufficient precaution built in at the point of compensation calculation to negate the need for a compensation ratio to be applied (see 21.8 The Applicant's Comments on Natural England's Risk and Issues Log).</p>

Interested Party	Principal Issues	Pre-examination Status	Mid Examination Status	Close of Examination Status
				Provision of additional comfort regarding the efficacy of the guillemot and razorbill without prejudice compensation packages was discussed in a meeting with Natural England on 31.3.2025. Updates to 7.7.4 Offshore Artificial Nesting Structures Evidence Base and Roadmap, 7.7.5 Predator Control Evidence Base and Roadmap and 7.7.6 Without Prejudice Additional Measures for Compensation of Guillemot and Razorbill have been made based upon the comments made in this meeting.
Natural England (RR-045)	Conclusion of no AEol on Guillemot and Razorbill	<p>The Applicant has responded to comments regarding the conclusion of no AEol for Guillemot and Razorbill Relevant Representations (PD1-071).</p> <p>Natural England may wish to seek further clarification once they have had the opportunity to review the information provided to date, at which point the Applicant will provide clarity where needed.</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to engage with Natural England following the engagement process outlined in section 1.4 of this document to seek further resolution, using timeframes and mechanisms that the Applicant and Natural England agree are appropriate for effective engagement.</p>	<p>The Applicant maintains its position of no AEol on Guillemot and Razorbill.</p> <p>The Applicant has responded to comments regarding the assessments for Guillemot and Razorbill within the Applicant's Comments on Deadline 1 Submissions (Table 5: Appendix F1) (REP2-053). The Applicant has provided further clarification to NE's Appendix K, in The Applicant's comments on ExQ1 Responses (REP3-054</p> <p>In support of its position, the Applicant has submitted Consideration of bioseasons in the assessment of guillemot (REP2-058) and Rates of displacement in guillemot and razorbill (REP2-059) to explain the Applicant's position in relation to these parameters. Levels of precaution in the assessment and compensation calculations for offshore ornithology (REP-057), was submitted to explain levels of precaution within the assessment and compensation calculations for kittiwakes, guillemot and razorbill.</p> <p>The Applicant has committed to providing an updated in-combination assessment, following the introduction of the Offshore Restricted Build Area (ORBA), at Deadline 4. This assessment will include revised data from projects where the status has changed since the Application was submitted (i.e. those projects which have now submitted applications or been determined).</p>	<p>The Applicant has responded to Natural England's position described in their response to Q.71 from the RIES in Table 3.1 of The Applicant's Comments on Responses to the Report on the Implications for European Sites (RIES (document reference 24.3, submitted at Deadline 6).</p> <p>The Applicant welcomes Natural England's position with regard to the conclusion of no Project alone AEol for Razorbill at FFC SPA.</p> <p>The Applicant notes Natural England's conclusion that an in-combination AEol cannot be ruled out for guillemot and razorbill at FFC SPA.</p> <p>The Applicant maintains its position that AEol for these species is extremely unlikely and that the high levels of precaution in the assessment under Natural England's preferred approach have inflated predicted impacts well beyond the Applicant's well evidenced and appropriately precautionary position (where impacts on guillemot are predicted to be 18.2 birds per year and razorbill to be 10.5 birds per year). Summaries of the precaution in the assessments can be found in REP4a-048 Levels of precaution in the assessment and compensation calculations for offshore ornithology, REP4a-050 Consideration of bioseasons in the assessment of guillemot and REP4a-052 Rates of displacement in guillemot and razorbill.</p>

Interested Party	Principal Issues	Pre-examination Status	Mid Examination Status	Close of Examination Status
			The Applicant will continue to engage with Natural England following the engagement process outlined in section 1.4 of this document to seek further resolution, using timeframes and mechanisms that both the Applicant and Natural England agree are appropriate for effective engagement	<p>When considering impacts on guillemot and razorbill and the level of precaution to be applied, the likely connectivity between the Project and the FFC SPA should be noted. The Applicant considers the use of the MMFR +1SD to establish connectivity to be a highly precautionary approach. The closest distance between the FFC SPA colony and the array is 95km. The mean-max foraging range for guillemot is 73.2 km, which suggests no connectivity between the colony and the array, however, as a precaution, SNCBs advise the use of a mean-max foraging range plus 1SD (standard deviation) which is 153.7km, i.e. connectivity is possible but likely to involve a small number of individuals. Once the anomalous Fair Isle data are removed from the MMFR calculation (foraging ranges in the study referred to may have been unusually high owing to reduced prey availability (Woodward, 2019)), the mean-max foraging range plus 1SD is 95.2 km. Without the inclusion of the Fair Isle data, the distance between the project and the FFC SPA is approximately four times the mean foraging range for guillemot.</p> <p>Similarly for razorbill, the mean-max foraging range plus 1SD (with the removal of the Fair Isle data) is 94.7km therefore there is likely to be no connectivity between the FFC SPA and the array for the vast majority of birds. As such, assuming that all birds within the array are connected to the FFC SPA is highly precautionary, and Natural England's apportioning of 100% to the FFC SPA is unlikely to represent the ecological reality, even on a conservative basis.; The Applicant also considers that there will be no material consequence to birds from the FFC SPA being displaced as they will be displaced into water closer to the colony. Both auk species are ubiquitous across the southern North Sea and can forage in a wide range of depths and environmental conditions.</p> <p>The Applicant believes that it has provided sufficient information into the Examination to date which justifies the Applicant's position</p>
Natural England (RR-045)	Proposed compensation package deliverability	The Applicant has responded to comments about the proposed compensation package deliverability within The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations (PD1-071).	The Applicant has provided further clarification to NE's Appendix K, in The Applicant's comments on ExQ1 Responses (REP3-054). Alongside this, answers to the ExA first written questions (REP2-051) on the proposed	The Applicant has provided updated Without Prejudice Additional Measures for Compensation of Guillemot and Razorbill at Deadline 4 (REP4-065). Species-specific monitoring plans will be drawn up in consultation with

Interested Party	Principal Issues	Pre-examination Status	Mid Examination Status	Close of Examination Status
		<p>Natural England may wish to seek further clarification once they have had the opportunity to review the information provided to date. The Applicant will endeavour to work with Natural England to provide clarity where needed.</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to engage with Natural England following the engagement process outlined in section 1.4, using timeframes and mechanisms that the Applicant and IP agree are appropriate for effective and collaborative engagement.</p>	<p>compensation packages and their delivery have been provided.</p> <p>The Applicant provided an updated Predator Control Evidence Base and Road Map (REP2-025) at Deadline 2.</p> <p>The Applicant has committed to providing an updated version of the Without Prejudice Additional Measures for Guillemot and Razorbill evidence and Road Map document (APP-259) at Deadline 4.</p> <p>The Applicant has submitted a Letter of Comfort from The Crown Estate (TCE) (REP2-062) which confirms TCE have the ability to grant the rights required in respect of the construction of the Offshore ANS site(s), subject to the relevant conditions outlined in the letter.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that, in their response to the ExA's written questions (REP2-074), Natural England 'consider the kittiwake compensatory measures to present an equivalent or greater level of detail than that provided by previous developments'.</p> <p>The Applicant has provided Guillemot and Razorbill: Compensation Quanta (Document Reference 20.17) at Deadline 3 which explains how the potential compensation quanta for guillemot and razorbill have been calculated using the Applicant's and Natural England's approaches and demonstrating how the required scale of compensation can be delivered by the Applicant's without prejudice measures.</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to engage with Natural England following the engagement process outlined in section 1.4 of this document to seek further resolution, using timeframes and mechanisms that both the Applicant and Natural England agree are appropriate for effective engagement</p>	<p>the relevant Compensation Steering Groups as required in Schedule 22, Parts 2 and 3 of the DCO, based on the species-specific Compensation Implementation and Monitoring Plans (Guillemot Compensation Implementation and Monitoring Plan (APP-253) and Razorbill Compensation Implementation and Monitoring Plan (document reference 7.7.3, V3 updated at Deadline 6), which have been provided as outline documents to set out the information which will be contained within the final CIMPs to be approved by the SoS post-consent.</p> <p>The Applicant has provided an updated 7.7.4 Offshore Artificial Nesting Structures Evidence Base and Roadmap at Deadline 6. Monitoring plans will be drawn up in consultation with the relevant Compensation Steering Groups as required in Schedule 22, Parts 2 and 3 of the DCO, based on 7.7.1.1 Outline Kittiwake Compensation Implementation and Monitoring Plan</p> <p>The Applicant believes that it has provided sufficient information into the Examination to date which justifies the Applicant's position.</p>
Natural England (RR-045)	Southern North Sea SAC: effectiveness of the Site Integrity Plan process	The Applicant has responded to comments in respect of the approach taken to the Site Integrity Plan within the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations (PD1-071). The Applicant considers there is no requirement for NAS due to the conclusion of no AEol. Detailed measures are included in the outline SIP (APP-281), that may be included in the final SIP which will be finalised post	The Site Integrity Plan (SIP) was updated (PD1-0480) to reference the potential use of Noise Abatement Systems (NAS) as a secondary mitigation option. The Applicant has provided clarification in the Applicant's Responses to the ExA's First Written Questions (REP2-051).	<p>The Applicant has responded to comments in point 15 of Table 1.5.1 within Appendix E of The Applicant's Comments on Natural England's Risk and Issues Log (document reference 21.8, updated at Deadline 6).</p> <p>The Applicant has submitted an updated Outline Marine Mammal Mitigation Protocol for piling Activities</p>

Interested Party	Principal Issues	Pre-examination Status	Mid Examination Status	Close of Examination Status
		<p>consent. The outline SIP follows current guidance and threshold</p> <p>s (JNCC 2020).</p> <p>Natural England may wish to seek further clarification once they have had the opportunity to review the information provided to date, at which point the Applicant will provide clarity where needed.</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to engage with Natural England following the engagement process outlined in section 1.4 of this document to seek further resolution, using timeframes and mechanisms that the Applicant and Natural England agree are appropriate for effective engagement.</p>	<p>As advised by Natural England, the Applicant is aware of the forthcoming Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) marine noise policy paper, however, at the time of writing, no guidance, policy or legislation has been published. The Applicant has provided a response to the additional comments on NAS from Natural England in the Applicant's Comments on Deadline 1 Submissions (REP2-053).</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to engage with MMO, DEFRA and Natural England on this point. Once relevant policy documents are published the Applicant will consider the implications of the policy on the Project.</p>	<p>(Document reference 8.6.1 submitted Deadline 6) and In-Principle Southern North Sea SAC SIP (Document reference 8.7 submitted Deadline 6).</p> <p>The Applicant's considers the commitment to deploying primary and/or secondary noise reduction methods (Noise Abatement Systems), unless otherwise agreed with the MMO, within the MMMP (Document reference 8.6.1 submitted Deadline 6) and SIP Document reference 8.7 submitted Deadline 6) is beyond the current requirement in the Defra (2025) policy, which states: <i>"From January 2025, given the expected increase in noise levels over the coming years, and the above outlined policy commitments, we expect that all offshore wind pile driving activity across all English waters will be required to demonstrate that they have utilised best endeavours to deliver noise reductions through the use of primary and/or secondary noise reduction methods in the first instance."</i></p> <p>The Applicant considers that this commitment is in line with the advice received from Natural England and this issue is now resolved.</p>
Natural England (RR-045)	Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) - Apportioning of auks to Flamborough and Filey Coast (FFC) SPA	<p>The Applicant has responded to comments raised in respect of the approach taken to the apportionment of auks to FFC SPA within the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations (PD1-071).</p> <p>There are disagreements on the appropriate apportioning rates for guillemot to the FFC SPA within the breeding season. Considering the peak abundance is in April, prior to the core breeding season, the Applicant does not consider it appropriate to assume that all guillemots within the array originate from FFC SPA during this time.</p> <p>Conditions in April are less restrictive compared to the incubation and chick-rearing periods, from which mean maximum foraging ranges are derived, therefore these foraging ranges shouldn't be used to determine connectivity in April. From a review of peer-reviewed literature the Applicant considers an apportionment of 50% to be appropriate for the peak abundances during April. It should be noted that the abundance of guillemot during the core breeding months is roughly half that of April, and therefore the applicants approach assumes</p>	<p>The Applicant maintains its position regarding the apportioning of 50% of guillemot to the FFC SPA in the breeding season, based upon the breeding season assessments being informed by April data, which is before guillemot start to breed, and when many are distant from, or travelling towards, breeding colonies.</p> <p>The Applicant has provided a detailed summary of the precaution used in the assessments 'Levels of precaution in the assessment and compensation calculations for offshore ornithology' (REP-057) at Deadline 2, and has provided an overview of, within the wider context of appropriate use of the precautionary principle, how multi-layered precaution impacts the compensation calculated for 'without prejudice' compensation cases at Deadline 3 (REP3-049).</p>	<p>The Applicant has responded to further comments raised in Table 16 in The Applicant's Comments on Deadline 5 Submissions (document reference 24.2, submitted at Deadline 6). The Applicant's position is maintained, i.e. that its approach is appropriate, but in all cases where there is disagreement with Natural England, both the Applicant and Natural England positions have been presented.</p> <p>The Applicant welcomes Natural England's update regarding the resolution of this issue following additional information provided by the Applicant at Deadline 3 (REP3-037). Please see Appendix F3 to Natural England's Deadline 4 submission.</p>

Interested Party	Principal Issues	Pre-examination Status	Mid Examination Status	Close of Examination Status
		<p>that all birds within the array during the core breeding season originate from FFC SPA.</p> <p>Natural England may wish to seek further clarification once they have had the opportunity to review the information provided to date, at which point the Applicant will provide clarity where needed.</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to engage with Natural England following the engagement process outlined in section 1.4 of this document to seek further resolution, using timeframes and mechanisms that the Applicant and Natural England agree are appropriate for effective engagement.</p>		
Natural England (RR-045)	HRA - Apportioning of adult birds	<p>The Applicant has responded to comments raised in respect of the approach taken to apportionment of adult birds within the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations (PD1-071).</p> <p>Natural England have asked for adult birds to be apportioned using site specific data.</p> <p>Although the Applicant does not consider the approach to be accurate, they have agreed to use site-specific age proportions for adult-like birds where this data is available, robust and in large enough sample sizes. This includes gannet, kittiwake and lesser black-backed gull.</p> <p>Where this data is not available Natural England advise that 100% of birds in the survey area are assumed to be adult birds. The Applicant does not agree with this approach because there is no evidence to support this assumption. The Applicant has used scientific literature and robust estimates of demographic rates to model the stable age distribution of the population to estimate the proportion of adults in the population and applied that to the survey area. The Applicant believes this is appropriate because the array is not in close proximity to colonies (i.e. within mean foraging range for auks) and therefore the proportion of adults is unlikely to be inflated compared to the general population.</p> <p>Natural England may wish to seek further clarification once they have had the opportunity to review the</p>	<p>The Applicant responded to Natural England's comments and requests regarding the use of the method used by Morgan Offshore Wind Farm to derive adult proportions within the Applicant's Comments on Deadline 1 Submissions (Table 5: Appendix F1) (REP2-053), submitted at Deadline 2.</p> <p>The Applicant has provided further clarification to NE's Appendix K1, in The Applicant's comments on ExQ1 Responses (REP3-054), submitted at Deadline 3.</p> <p>The Applicant is content that the adult proportions used are suitable for all three species (gannet, kittiwake and lesser black backed gull). The Applicant can update the assessment based upon the Natural England preferred approach to the calculation of adult proportions at Deadline 4 if required (see Applicant's comments on Submissions received at Deadline 1 (REP 2-053, F2.1).</p> <p>The Applicant maintains its position on the use of the stable age distributions to inform adult proportions where these cannot be derived from site specific Digital Aerial Surveys (DAS). The Applicant considers the adult proportions presented in Furness (2015) to be robust and therefore the best available evidence.</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to engage with Natural England following the engagement process outlined in section 1.4 of this document to seek further resolution, using timeframes and mechanisms that the Applicant</p>	<p>The Applicant has responded to further comments raised in Table 26 in The Applicant's Comments on Deadline 5 Submissions (document reference 24.2, submitted at Deadline 6).</p> <p>The Applicant welcomes Natural England's update regarding the resolution of this issue that this issue is resolved following the Applicant's assessment for razorbill at FFC SPA using Natural England's advised apportioning rate during the post-breeding season in the updated RIAA (document reference 7.1, V4 updated at Deadline 6) and the Applicant has confirming the apportioning rate for kittiwake at FFC when incorporating offshore breeders is 61.3% and this rate has been used within the updated Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment (RIAA) (document reference 7.1, V4 updated at Deadline 6); Natural England confirmed this rate is appropriate (REP4-139).</p>

Interested Party	Principal Issues	Pre-examination Status	Mid Examination Status	Close of Examination Status
		<p>information provided to date, at which point the Applicant will provide clarity where needed.</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to engage with Natural England following the engagement process outlined in section 1.4 of this document to seek further resolution, using timeframes and mechanisms that the Applicant and Natural England agree are appropriate for effective engagement.</p>	<p>and Natural England agree are appropriate for effective engagement.</p>	
Natural England (RR-045)	Without prejudice Guillemot and razorbill compensation measures	<p>The Applicant has Responded to Relevant Representations (PD1-071). Compensation calculation methodologies have not been agreed with Natural England. Given the complexity of the measures (acting on both survival and productivity) it is likely that the compensation benefits will be calculated/estimated on a site-by-site basis. Full details of the potential benefits of the measures will be provided into the examination at a future deadline for Natural England to comment on.</p> <p>Natural England may wish to seek further clarification once they have had the opportunity to review the information provided to date, at which point the Applicant will provide clarity where needed.</p> <p>Progress will be sought following the engagement process outlined in section 1.4 of this document to seek further resolution, using timeframes and mechanisms that the Applicant and Natural England agree are appropriate for effective engagement.</p>	<p>The Applicant has provided further clarification to NE's Appendix K, in The Applicant's comments on ExQ1 Responses (REP3-054). Alongside this, the Applicant's answers to the ExA first written questions (REP2-051) on the proposed compensation packages and their delivery have been provided.</p> <p>The Applicant updated the Predator Control Evidence Base and Roadmap (REP2-025) at Deadline 2.</p> <p>The Applicant has committed to providing an updated version of the Without Prejudice Additional Measures for Guillemot and Razorbill evidence and Road Map document (APP-259) at Deadline 4.</p> <p>The Applicant has provided document reference 20.17 Guillemot and Razorbill: Compensation Quanta at Deadline 3 which explains how the potential compensation quanta for guillemot and razorbill have been calculated using the Applicant's and Natural England's approaches and demonstrating how the required scale of compensation can be delivered by the Applicant's without prejudice measures.</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to engage with Natural England following the engagement process outlined in section 1.4 of this document to seek further resolution, using timeframes and mechanisms that both the Applicant and Natural England agree are appropriate for effective engagement.</p>	<p>The Applicant has responded to comments in PADS NE11 of Table 1.6.2 of The Applicant's Comments on Natural England's Risk and Issues Log (document reference 21.8, updated at Deadline 6).</p> <p>The Applicant has provided updated versions of Guillemot and Razorbill Compensation Quanta (document reference 20.17, V4), Without Prejudice Guillemot Compensation Plan (document reference 7.7.2, V3) and Without Prejudice Razorbill Compensation Plan (document reference 7.7.3, V3) at Deadline 6 that acknowledge Natural England's updated position on compensation calculation for guillemot and razorbill. Specifically, Natural England's updated position is that when considering the design of measures, the UCI impact and the Hornsea Four method, and an appropriate compensation ratio should be used for guillemot and razorbill. However assessment of the success of these measures (i.e. the actual amount of compensation that needs to be delivered) will be calculated with the mean impact value informing the Hornsea Four calculation, at a 1:1 ratio.</p> <p>If the SoS deems it necessary, the Applicant can deliver the required compensation at a ratio of 2:1 (1.99:1 for razorbill), using Natural England's UCI impacts and the Hornsea Four method. However, the Applicant considers that with the precaution inherent within the assessment, and the use of the UCI impact to inform compensation calculation, there is sufficient precaution built in at the point of compensation calculation to negate the need for a compensation ratio to be applied (see 21.8 The Applicant's Comments on Natural England's Risk and Issues Log).</p>

Interested Party	Principal Issues	Pre-examination Status	Mid Examination Status	Close of Examination Status
				Provision of additional comfort regarding the efficacy of the guillemot and razorbill without prejudice compensation packages was discussed in a meeting with Natural England on 31.3.2025. Updates to 7.7.4 Offshore Artificial Nesting Structures Evidence Base and Roadmap, 7.7.5 Predator Control Evidence Base and Roadmap and 7.7.6 Without Prejudice Additional Measures for Compensation of Guillemot and Razorbill have been made based upon the comments made in this meeting.
Natural England (RR-045)	Impacts on and proposed compensation requirements for kittiwake (FFC SPA)	<p>The Applicant has Responded to Relevant Representations (PD1-071).</p> <p>The Applicant has provided updated assessment values for kittiwake within the Environmental Report for the Offshore Restricted Build Area and Revision to the Offshore Export Cable Corridor (document reference 15.9) and the Habitats Regulations Assessment for the Offshore Restricted Build Area and Revision to the Offshore Export Cable Corridor (document reference 15.10).</p> <p>Natural England's position is that the Hornsea Three Part 2 method for calculating the compensation quantum is the most appropriate. The Applicant disagrees with several aspects of this calculation method and proposes using the Hornsea Four calculation method. Both approaches have been provided in the compensation documents and will be updated to reflect the outcomes of the HRA Offshore Restricted Build Area (ORBA) assessment (Document reference 15.10).</p> <p>Natural England may wish to seek further clarification once they have had the opportunity to review the information provided to date, at which point the Applicant will provide clarity where needed.</p> <p>Progress will be sought following the engagement process outlined in section 1.4 of this document to seek further resolution, using timeframes and mechanisms that the Applicant and Natural England agree are appropriate for effective engagement.</p>	<p>The Applicant has responded to comments regarding the assessments for Kittiwake within the Applicant's Comments on Deadline 1 Submissions (Table 5: Appendix F1) (REP2-053). The Applicant has provided further clarification in NE Appendix K1, the Applicant's comments on Deadline 2 submissions (REP3-037).</p> <p>The Applicant has provided further clarification to NE's Appendix K, in The Applicant's comments on ExQ1 Responses (REP3-054). Alongside this, the Applicant's answers to the ExA first written questions (REP2-051) have been provided.</p> <p>The Applicant has submitted a Change Notification (REP2-064) that it intends to submit a change request to shorten the requirement for a lead in period of three full breeding seasons to two full breeding seasons before the operation of any turbine at Deadline 2. A supporting document, Lead-in periods for kittiwake breeding on Artificial Nesting Structures (REP2-060), has also been supplied.</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to engage with Natural England following the engagement process outlined in section 1.4 of this document to seek further resolution, using timeframes and mechanisms that both the Applicant and Natural England agree are appropriate for effective engagement.</p>	<p>The Applicant has responded to comments regarding the assessments for Kittiwake within Table 28 of The Applicant's Comments on Deadline 5 Submissions (document reference 24.2, submitted at Deadline 6)</p> <p>The Applicant is submitting an updated Kittiwake Compensation plan at deadline 6 (REP4-055). The Applicant reiterates the position that the use of the Hornsea 3 part 2 method is not appropriate for compensation calculation for any species, and that the Hornsea Four method is appropriate for the calculation of compensation for kittiwake.</p> <p>The Applicant further responds to the levels of proposed impact on Kittiwake in Table 1.7.1 of The Applicant's comments on Natural England's Risk and Issues Log (document reference 21.8, updated at Deadline 6).</p> <p>The Applicant awaits Natural England's updated advice regarding 19.11 Lead-in periods for kittiwake breeding on Artificial Nesting Structures (ANS) (REP4-105) at Deadline 6, including comment on the DCO condition wording, in Schedule 22 Part 1 Para 4 (iii) and 5, (REP4-007, REP4a-007).</p> <p>The Applicant echoes the ExA's comments at Issue Specific Hearing 8 that the submission of any new information at Deadline 6, to which the Applicant should reasonably be given an opportunity to respond, risks not being accepted into the Examination. The Applicant suggests that such evidence should be afforded limited weight.</p>

Interested Party	Principal Issues	Pre-examination Status	Mid Examination Status	Close of Examination Status
				The Applicant believes that it has provided sufficient information into the Examination to date which justifies the Applicant's position.
Natural England (RR-045)	Lack of full two years of baseline data with regards to distribution patterns and abundance of passage and wintering bird species, including suitability of the proposed mitigation measures to qualifying features of the Wash SPA and Ramsar using functionally linked land (FLL).	<p>The Applicant believes this issue has now been resolved through the submission of the Winter Bird Survey Addendum (AS1-108) which documents the methods and results from the second season of wintering and passage bird surveys, covering the period from September 2023 to April 2024 and was submitted by the Applicant in July 2024 in response to Section 51 Advice.</p> <p>If further concerns are raised the Applicant will engage with Natural England in accordance with the process outlined in section 1.4 of this document to seek resolution.</p>	<p>Natural England have confirmed that the first part of this issue, regarding presentation and analysis of a second season of winter bird survey data, was resolved at Deadline 1, with the provision of AS1-108. The corresponding reference is Point 1 in the Natural England Risks and Issues Log (REP2-094) Section I, which is now resolved.</p> <p>The Natural England Risks and Issues Log (Section I) lists the following issues, which relate to mitigation for The Wash SPA and Ramsar FLL, as being at Amber status at Deadline 2: Points 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11 and 15. Additionally, Points 12, 13, 14, 16, 17 and 18 whilst referring to the assessment of impacts are also closely linked to this principal issue, as they relate specifically to qualifying species utilising FLL and by extension to the suitability of mitigation for potential impacts to those species. A total of 13 of the outstanding 16 Amber status issues in Section I therefore relate to this point.</p> <p>Natural England provided further commentary on this issue in their Deadline 1 response (REP1-066). Specifically in relation to mitigation Natural England stated: <i>"Natural England advises that the principal mitigation measure for overwintering birds is a seasonal restriction to avoid disturbance during sensitive periods. However, where that is not possible management plans will be required to ensure Adverse Effects on Integrity can be avoided. Natural England aims to provide further advice on the feasibility and effectiveness of the Applicants proposed mitigation measures at the next suitable deadline"</i>.</p> <p>The Applicant has responded to comments from Natural England regarding this issue within Table 8 of The Applicant's comments on Deadline 1 submissions (Deadline 2) (REP2-053) and Section 1.45.10 of The Applicant's response to relevant representations (PD1-071). In summary, the Applicant has committed to seasonal restrictions, including where the Order Limits</p>	<p>Consultation since the mid-examination status update has focussed on provision of further mitigation measures for the following qualifying features of The Wash SPA and Ramsar using FLL:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pink-footed goose; • Dark-bellied brent goose; and • Lapwing, golden plover and curlew. <p>For pink-footed goose, additional measures have been included, consisting of a commitment to a goose management plan which will entail collaboration with farmers to seek to avoid and minimise working in proximity to suitable crop types during the core winter period. Where that is not possible, the Applicant has committed to the provision of supplementary feeding. Natural England made some final minor administrative points on this matter at Deadline 5, which the Applicant has addressed in their Deadline 6 submissions, and therefore this matter is now resolved.</p> <p>For dark-bellied brent goose, additional measures have been included, consisting of a range of measures including an ECoW for vegetation clearance works in the seasonally restricted area and visual screening where appropriate for the April soft start works. In addition, the Applicant has committed to a pre-construction survey for brent goose at the seasonally restricted area around The Haven crossing to ensure the measures remain appropriate. Natural England welcomed the measures included for brent geese in their Deadline 5 submission, however queried whether any final further measures could be adopted to minimise disturbance. The Applicant has provided further clarification on the scope of the April soft start works and how they will seek to minimise potential for disturbance, within the OLEMS submitted at Deadline 6. With the update to the OLEMS it is considered that this matter has now been resolved.</p> <p>For lapwing, golden plover and curlew, the Applicant and Natural England engaged directly on this matter at a</p>

Interested Party	Principal Issues	Pre-examination Status	Mid Examination Status	Close of Examination Status
			<p>are in close proximity to The Wash SPA and Ramsar (i.e. at The Haven crossing and Boston Alternative Energy Facility compensation site). Seasonal restrictions have also been included in relation to FLL, including for dark-bellied brent geese around The Haven and construction of the mitigation bund at the landfall. Across the rest of the onshore Order Limits, the Applicant has committed to a seasonal localised working restriction, whereby construction works will be avoided within 98.6% of the Order Limits at any one time during the winter period. AS1-108 shows that the most common crop types utilised by the five key qualifying species were found to be bare/ploughed land, cereal crops, grass and stubble (fallow land). PD1-093 evidences that these crops are common and widespread within the Order Limits plus 400m buffer, which is reflected in the widespread distribution of pink-footed goose, lapwing, golden plover and curlew. Therefore, the mitigation set out in the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment (RIAA) specifically regarding a localised working restriction is sufficient, as it means that alternative foraging resource will remain available.</p> <p>Regarding mitigation for temporary loss of farmland habitat, clarification has been provided in relation to the issue raised by Natural England on this matter in Point I16 in PD1-071. This clarified that a cover crop would not be provided where the land can be handed back to the landowner early to resume usual farming operations as there is no opportunity or need to plant a cover crop in those circumstances. It was also clarified that the cover crop would take the form of a grass or clover mix.</p> <p>The Applicant will consider Natural England's further commentary regarding mitigation measures for FLL once that has been received, however considers that sufficient avoidance and mitigation measures have been included to ensure no adverse effect on the integrity of The Wash SPA and Ramsar.</p>	<p>meeting held on 24 March 2025 and Natural England provided further advice and clarification on the further measures that have been requested. The Applicant has incorporated these additional measures into Section 3.7.5.5 of the OLEMS, which has been shared with Natural England in advance of Deadline 6 in order to achieve resolution at Deadline 6.</p>
Natural England (RR-045)	Lack of detailed analyses of cropping patterns and land use within the Order Limits	The Applicant has responded to comments raised about the proposed mitigation regarding potential impacts to FLL in their Response to Relevant Representations (PD1-071). Further details have also been provided for the	Natural England have confirmed that this issue, regarding presentation of detailed information and analysis of cropping patterns, was resolved at Deadline 1, with the provision of PD1-093 (Additional clarifications relating to	The Applicant can confirm that this issue has been resolved.

Interested Party	Principal Issues	Pre-examination Status	Mid Examination Status	Close of Examination Status
	and therefore conclusions for project impact to qualifying features of protected sites, which are reliant on the availability of alternative FLL and preferred foraging habitats within their foraging range.	<p>study of crop types and are documented in a clarification note (15.11 Additional clarifications relating to Natural England's Relevant Representations (Appendix I Onshore Ornithology)). This provides further evidence that the crop types utilised by the key qualifying features are common within the survey area. The Applicant's responses to Natural England's Relevant Representations in relation to Ornithology and FLL alongside document 15.11 was provided to Natural England in August 2024 for early sight.</p> <p>Natural England may wish to seek further clarification once they have had the opportunity to review the information provided to date, at which point the Applicant will provide clarity where needed.</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to engage with Natural England following the engagement process outlined in section 1.4 of this document to seek further resolution, using timeframes and mechanisms that the Applicant and Natural England agree are appropriate for effective engagement.</p>	<p>Natural England's Relevant Representations – Appendix I). The corresponding reference is Point 2 in the Natural England Risks and Issues Log (Section I), which is now Green status.</p> <p>Natural England provided further commentary on this issue in their Deadline 1 response (REP1-066). Specifically in relation to utilisation of FLL Natural England stated: <i>"Natural England advises that there is likely to be inter-annual variation in FLL preference locations due to crop rotation, environmental factors and disturbance. Generally, there is a trend for an increased number of species and abundance the closer to The Wash, in the vicinity of freshwater courses and RSPB Nature reserves, something which the Applicant has identified may require more intensive mitigation measures. However, for some species such as PFG it has been observed by the Applicant that there is a preference to forage within fields of winter wheat. This information is critical to determining management measures to minimise impacts from loss/reduction in available FLL particularly where seasonal restrictions have not been presented as a mitigation option. Natural England will advise further on this at the next suitable deadline"</i>.</p> <p>It is therefore considered that this point has been resolved and the further commentary which Natural England will provide will be addressed in relation to the preceding principal issue (mitigation for FLL) within this table.</p>	
Natural England	Noise disturbance to qualifying features of The Wash SPA and Ramsar	Issue not raised prior to the start of the DCO examination.	<p>Added as a principal issue in December 2024 on the basis of the number of related issues listed in Natural England's Risks and Issues Log which remain at Amber status at Deadline 2.</p> <p>This issue is summarised in Natural England's Risks and Issues Log (REP2-094) Section I Point 3 which states <i>"The method for assessing potential noise disturbance responses of designated species focuses on minimum compliance thresholds rather than specific species disturbance responses. The Applicant has not assessed whether land already established as functionally linked for designated overwintering bird species would also be within the decibel levels exceedance threshold. The Applicant should assess the disturbance response of each</i></p>	Natural England has accepted the Applicant's analysis of noise pollution impacts outside their usual internal guidance due to the Applicant's justification. They emphasize the importance of monitoring noise impacts during construction and decommissioning on designated ecological sites and adjusting activities if impacts are identified. According to Natural England, increases of 3 dB or more could be significant. They recommend that the Noise and Vibration Management Plan (NVMP) include monitoring of ecological noise-sensitive receptors against the baseline and secure the full NVMP within the DCO, aligning with mitigation measures in Chapters 26 and 22 of the Environmental Statement.

Interested Party	Principal Issues	Pre-examination Status	Mid Examination Status	Close of Examination Status
			<p><i>designated bird species specifically. Please see Tab H for our advice".</i> Natural England have maintained this issue at Amber status at Deadline 2. Tab H lists the following outstanding issues (all Amber status) in relation to potential noise disturbance to The Wash SPA and Ramsar and FLL: Points 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16 and 17.</p> <p>The Applicant has responded to this point in its response to Point I4 (which also addresses I10 and I11) and H2-H5 of Natural England's Relevant Representations (PD1-097). In addition, the Applicant's response to Q1 NV 1.2 to ExQ1 (REP2-051) also relates to this point. A summary of those responses is provided below.</p> <p>It is the Applicant's understanding that Impact Risk Zones (IRZs) identify buffers from a SSSI boundary within which certain types of development may have an impact on the designated site. They do not give details of areas of known FLL. Distribution and abundance surveys have been undertaken over two wintering bird seasons and across the entirety of the Order Limits in order to identify areas of potential FLL. The survey area was based on a 400m buffer from the Order Limits which was agreed through consultation as a reasonable upper limit at which birds may be impacted by disturbance from the Project.</p> <p>Section 22.8.1.3 of APP-077 and Section 9.5.3.2 of the RIAA (AS1-097) assess the potential noise and visual disturbance impact to birds utilising potential FLL. Disturbance to each of the key qualifying bird species is assessed specifically, considering their individual sensitivity/responses to disturbance, in the following sections of the RIAA (AS1-097):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lapwing – paragraphs 1204 to 1222; • Golden plover – paragraphs 1223 to 1234; • Curlew – paragraphs 1235 to 1261; • Dark-bellied brent goose and pink-footed goose – paragraphs 1276 to 1302. <p>The conclusions of the assessments determined that with relevant seasonal restrictions on construction operations and other mitigation measures, the relevant targets from the Supplementary Advice on Conservation Objectives would not be undermined and there would be no AEoI of The Wash SPA or Ramsar as a result of disturbance.</p>	<p>It is unclear to the applicant why Natural England has request monitoring during construction, as previous concerns about noise impacts at designated sites and functionally linked land (FLL) have been resolved. In Tab H Point 16 of the Risks and Issues Log (REP5-171), Natural England confirmed that noise impacts on FLL are addressed in ES Chapter 22 Onshore Ornithology, including mitigation measures. Table 22.21 specifies seasonal restrictions to avoid works within 400m of core areas used by Brent Geese at the Haven. With these measures and additional provisions in the OLEMS and outline NVMP, Natural England is satisfied that noise disturbance to birds in the Haven area will be avoided.</p> <p>The Applicant has responded to Natural England's request for monitoring in The Applicant's Comments on Deadline 5 submission (appendix H7 – Onshore Ecology (document reference 24.2) setting out the reasons why wholesale noise monitoring at all ecological sits and functionally linked land is not appropriate.</p> <p>However, the Applicant has committed, within the OLEMS (document reference 8.10 v8), to further consultation with Natural England to discuss the potential for targeted baseline noise monitoring. The Applicant will undertake this monitoring at selected ecological receptors to assist Natural England in its data gathering activities. This initiative would aim to enhance the scientific knowledge base on this topic and support Natural England in providing robust advice in the future.</p>

Interested Party	Principal Issues	Pre-examination Status	Mid Examination Status	Close of Examination Status
			The Applicant has undertaken a review of several recently consented offshore wind Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP) projects and has not found any examples where noise modelling has been undertaken to assess impacts on avian receptors away outside of designated sites. On this basis it is the view of the Applicant that the approach taken to the assessment of noise impacts on avian receptors is robust and within industry best practice standards.	

1.1.7. Historic Environment and Marine Archaeology

Table 1.8: Historic Environment and Marine Archaeology

Interested Party	Principal Issues	Pre-examination Status	Mid Examination Status	Close of Examination Status
LCC(RR-004)	Trial trenching of blank areas	<p>The Applicant believes this issue has now been resolved through the Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations (document reference 15.3), submitted as part of this suite of documents.</p> <p>The Applicant has confirmed that blank areas are currently being evaluated by intrusive works being undertaken by AOC Archaeology and that further blank areas will be targeted through preconstruction trial trenching according to a proportionate strategy responsive to the depositional environment of the Order Limits and archaeological potential. Direct reference to these works has been included in the updated Outline Written Scheme of Investigation (OWSI) (Onshore) (document 8.9, Version 2).</p> <p>If further concerns are raised the applicant will follow the process outlined in section 1.4 of this document to seek resolution.</p>	<p>The Applicant clarifies that the phrase 'blank' in paragraph 74 of the OWSI (PD1-052) does not preclude areas not subject to geophysical survey.</p> <p>Further trial trenching (in addition to that undertaken post submission in 2024 which primarily targeted magnetometer anomalies) will be undertaken in 2025 in accordance with the results of updated deposit modelling (forthcoming) and the results of Light Detection and Ranging (LiDAR) assessment (APP183) (both of which included all areas not subject to geophysical survey) as well as the results of Electromagnetic (EM) survey which mirrored the areas subject to magnetometer survey.</p> <p>In this instance techniques which are complimentary to each other in reference to the historic topographical parameters of the Order Limits are being deployed.</p> <p>Re the deposit modelling - the submitted deposit modelling (APP 184) is currently being updated by AOC Archaeology to reference post submission works comprising a watching brief of geotechnical works, 59 geoarchaeological boreholes and 80 slit trenches/test pits as well as a number of sondages excavated within 158 archaeological trial trenches. These works were undertaken between June-November 2024 in accordance with a Written Schemes of</p>	The Applicant can confirm that this issue has been resolved, as set out in the Statement of Common Ground between the Applicant and LCC submitted at Deadline 5 (REP5-135).

Interested Party	Principal Issues	Pre-examination Status	Mid Examination Status	Close of Examination Status
			<p>Investigation (WSI) prepared in consultation with the Historic England Regional Science Advisor.</p> <p>The updated deposit model will assist in confirming/clarifying anthropogenic potential within the Order Limits where coastal boundaries have altered through repeated episodes of inundation and will, alongside the results of the LiDAR assessment, assist in the proportionate location of trial trenching in areas not subject to geophysical survey. This further trial trenching will commence in 2025.</p> <p>Where geophysical survey has been undertaken, the deposit will be used in conjunction with the results of EM geophysical survey to determine the location of trial trenches; EM survey indicating further areas of potential not highlighted by magnetometer survey - anthropogenic enhancement caused by prolonged habitation or industrial activity and areas of low conductivity which may reference areas of drier ground. It will also assist in identifying the liminal spaces between areas of high susceptibility/low conductivity and high conductivity which may relate to a zone of exploitation on the edge of wetlands.</p> <p>As agreed at the Hearing on the 5th December 2024 the Applicant will engage with LCC and Historic England (HE) to agree the forthcoming WSI for trial trenching to commence in 2025. It is intended that this will set out all trial trenching in accordance with the above rationale. This will be submitted into Examination at Deadline 6.</p>	
LCC (RR-004) HE (RR-027)	Level of pre-consent trial trenching	<p>The Applicant has responded to comments relating to the level of pre-consent trial trenching within the Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations (PD1-071) and does not consider it necessary to undertake further pre-consent trial trenching.</p> <p>The Applicant has confirmed that trial trenching is underway, and that further trial trenching will be undertaken preconstruction. The results of trial trenching will inform refinement of the identified mitigation strategy in accordance with the OWSI (document 8.9,</p>	<p>As clarified in the Applicants response to LCCs relevant representation question RR-004.013, and also as set out in the Applicant's Responses to The ExA's First Written Questions Q1 HE 1.2 (REP2-051), the lack of trial trenching at EIA is not considered to affect its robustness. The findings of the geophysical survey and deposit modelling in-particular enabled a detailed prediction of archaeological potential and impact as set out within tables 20.3 and 20.9 of the ES chapter (AS1-048).</p> <p>These impacts include specific archaeological receptors but also reference the potential worst-case impacts</p>	<p>Following ongoing bilateral engagement between LCC and the Applicant, it has been agreed that while LCC and the Applicant differ in opinion in respect of the baseline, LCC are comfortable that the wording of the requirement and the wording of the OWSI ongoing liaison between the Applicant's archaeologist and LCC's archaeology team is sufficient to secure the protection of assets of archaeological importance within the Order Limits.</p>

Interested Party	Principal Issues	Pre-examination Status	Mid Examination Status	Close of Examination Status
		<p>Version 2). The OWSI (document 8.9, Version 2) includes measures to mitigate through preservation in situ.</p> <p>The Applicant acknowledges that the pre-construction archaeological works will need to inform the WSIs to be submitted for each stage of the onshore transmission works. As such, requirement 17(1) of the draft DCO (document 3.1, Version 3) has been updated to include the underlined text:</p> <p>“No stage of the onshore transmission works may commence until a written scheme of archaeological investigation (which must accord with the outline onshore written scheme of investigation for archaeological works <u>and is informed by the archaeological investigations referred to in sub-paragraph (2)</u>) for that stage has been submitted to and approved by Lincolnshire County Council in consultation with the relevant planning authority and Historic England.”</p> <p>If further concerns are raised the Applicant will continue to engage with Interested Parties in accordance with the process outlined in section 1.4 of this document to seek resolution.</p>	<p>across the Order Limits, such that other receptors not yet specifically located but nonetheless anticipated from a review of the baseline as a whole are included in the impact assessment, with Column 2 of Table 20.9 referencing larger areas than the specific receptors included in column 1 (AS1-048).</p> <p>The baseline is considered robust on the basis of the evidence provided by Historic Environment Record/Planning Advisory Service(HER/PAS) entries, geophysical survey, LiDAR and deposit modelling.</p> <p>Most notably, the baseline provided evidence to predict that no significant impacts would occur within the footprint of the TJBs or the footprint of the Onshore Substation (OnSS) which are the only parts of the Order Limits where preservation in situ cannot be enabled at the detailed design stage. All potentially significant impacts were restricted to other areas of the Order Limits where the Applicant is committed to preservation in situ of remains of high importance in agreement with LCC through the implementation of part 9.7 of the Outline Written Scheme of Investigation for Archaeological Works (OWSI) (PD1-052).</p> <p>Since the submission of the ES, trial trenching has commenced and has provided confidence in the above statements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Archaeology recorded through the 2024 trial trenching concurs with impacts identified in table 20.9 of the Environmental Statement (ES) and will be able to be mitigated through adherence to the OWSI and the approval of written schemes of investigation by LCC post consent. This mitigation could include preservation in situ if necessary. • The 2024 works ensured that trial trenching was undertaken at the TJB and the OnSS to confirm the conclusions of the ES in that no significant impact would occur where preservation in situ is not possible at the detailed design. This was confirmed in accordance with the conclusions of the ES chapter. 	

Interested Party	Principal Issues	Pre-examination Status	Mid Examination Status	Close of Examination Status
			Interim reporting on the archaeological trial trenching and deposit modeling will be submitted to Examination at Deadline 4.	
LCC (RR-004)	Coverage of Air Photo Analysis	<p>The Applicant has responded to comments raised regarding air photo analysis in the Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations (PD1-071).</p> <p>The Applicant undertook sample area testing to determine the usefulness of aerial photographic assessment alongside the results of geophysical survey. It was determined that full aerial photographic assessment is not necessary; the sample testing did not record any cropmarks indicating the presence of archaeological remains not already identified through LiDAR or geophysical survey.</p> <p>LCC may wish to seek further clarification once they have had the opportunity to review the responses to relevant representations as well as the data received from the ongoing trial trenching campaign, at which point the Applicant will provide clarity where needed.</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to engage with LCC following the engagement process outlined in section 1.4 of this document to seek further resolution, using timeframes and mechanisms that the Applicant and LCC agree are appropriate for effective engagement.</p>	<p>As set out within the Hearing on the 5th December 2024 aerial photographic assessment post geophysical survey is not necessary to inform the archaeological baseline.</p> <p>To evidence this assertion and as stated at the Hearing, it is noted that the LiDAR Assessment (APP 183) included a full review of Google Earth imagery for the whole of the Order Limits, a full review of modern aerial imagery collected by the Project for 100% of the Order Limits and a sample review of historic photographs held by the Historic England archives at Swindon. As set out in the Archaeological Desk Based Assessment (APP 180 – section 20.3.1.5 – page 12) and reiterated in the Applicants response to LCCs relevant representations (PD1-071 – question RR-004.022) a critical review of data provided by this aerial photographic review indicates that a full aerial photographic assessment is not necessary to further evidence the baseline presented, which at EIA is sufficiently evidenced by other baseline techniques including geophysical survey and deposit modelling. As set out in the Applicant's response to LCCs relevant representations (PD1-071 – question RR-004.013), Table 20.9 of submission document AS1-048 includes archaeology extrapolated from the baseline such that the predicted impacts allow for archaeology other than that expressly located at EIA. Full aerial photographic assessment would not be anticipated to add additional impacts outwith those already identified.</p>	<p>Following ongoing bilateral engagement between LCC and the Applicant, it has been agreed that while LCC and the Applicant differ in opinion in respect of the baseline, LCC are comfortable that the wording of the requirement and the OWSI and ongoing liaison between the Applicant's archaeologist and LCC's archaeology team is sufficient to secure the protection of assets of archaeological importance within the Order Limits.</p>
LCC (RR-004)	Consideration of non-designated heritage assets	<p>The Applicant believes this issue has now been resolved through the Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations (PD1-071), submitted as part of this suite of documents.</p> <p>The current assessment of non-designated farmsteads is considered proportionate and sufficient to identify the significance of effect to these assets.</p>	<p>To reiterate the non designated farmhouses potentially sensitive to setting change are identified within the Heritage Statement (APP 188) with assessments of significance provided in section 20.1.21 (pages 48-66) and impact assessments presented in section 20.1.30 (pages 93-104).</p> <p>Non designated farmhouses potentially sensitive to changes caused by the OnSS were subject to individual assessment due to any potential impact being longer than temporary in duration. This related to 8 assets.</p>	<p>Following ongoing bilateral engagement between LCC and the Applicant, it has been agreed that while LCC and the Applicant differ in opinion in respect of the baseline, LCC are comfortable that the wording of the requirement and the OWSI and ongoing liaison between the Applicant's archaeologist and LCC's archaeology team is sufficient to secure the protection of assets of archaeological importance within the Order Limits.</p>

Interested Party	Principal Issues	Pre-examination Status	Mid Examination Status	Close of Examination Status
		If further concerns are raised the Applicant will follow the process outlined in section 1.4 of this document to seek resolution.	The other 40 assets were grouped. The methodology for assessment and the grouping of x 40 non designated farmhouses within the vicinity of the cable route only is justified as per the Applicants response to LCCs relevant representations (PD1-071 – question RR-004.040). The non-designated status of the 40 x assets, the commonality of their interests and important setting elements and the temporary nature of any effects renders an asset specific assessment highly repetitive and unnecessary. As stated by Historic England guidance ('The Setting of Heritage Assets Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3') the information required should be no more than is necessary to reach an informed decision and should be proportionate to the significance of the heritage asset and proportionate to the degree of change. Individual assessment would not be anticipated to materially change the conclusions of the ES.	

1.1.8. Land Use, Geology and Ground Conditions

Table 1.9: Land Use, Geology and Ground Conditions

Interested Parties	Principal Issues	Pre-examination Status	Mid Examination Status	Close of Examination Status
LCC (RR-004) Natural England (RR-045) Landowners	Impacts on Best and Most Versatile (BMV) land	<p>The Applicant has responded to comments on BMV land within the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations (PD1-071). The Applicant has provided clarification on the approach to site selection in relation to BMV land and the approach to Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) soil surveys.</p> <p>Interested Parties may wish to seek further clarification once they have had the opportunity to review the information provided to date, at which point the Applicant will provide clarity where needed.</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to engage with Interested Parties following the engagement process outlined in section 1.4 of this document to seek further resolution, using timeframes and mechanisms that the Applicant and Interested Parties agree are appropriate for effective engagement.</p>	<p>The Applicant has provided further clarification on the approach to the approach to BMV and ALC soil surveys in the Applicant's Comments on Deadline 1 Submissions (REP2-052) and the Applicant's Responses to the Host Authorities Local Impact Reports (REP2-053).</p> <p>The Applicant has committed to carrying ALC surveys prior to construction in the Outline Soil Management Plan ("oSMP") but maintains that site-specific surveys are not necessary to inform EIA as opposed to construction. As a matter of general approach, it does not follow that just because something will need to be done at some stage it is necessary for it to be done now (whether to provide an adequate ES or otherwise).</p> <p>A conservative approach to ALC classification has been taken ensuring the assessment is at least adequate for understanding the ALC Likely Significant Effect in EIA terms, and for informing the contents of the outline Soil Management Plan.</p>	<p>The Applicant believes that they have provided sufficient information to justify the approach taken in regard to impacts on BMV. The Applicant has provided a regional and national cumulative assessment of BMV to address action point 11 arising from ISH3.</p> <p>The Applicant has committed to carrying ALC surveys prior to construction in the Outline Soil Management Plan ("oSMP") but maintains that undertaking ALC surveys prior to consent will not change the likelihood of significant effects, as a worst-case scenario has been assumed for the baseline environment (that all land is BMV). Measures are secured within the oCOCp and oSMP to ensure the sustainable handling of soils and deep peat to mitigate the risk of soil damage and degradation.</p> <p>As has been established by numerous prior DCO applications, it is common practice to finalise mitigation based on the options identified following consent, once</p>

Interested Parties	Principal Issues	Pre-examination Status	Mid Examination Status	Close of Examination Status
			<p>The pre-construction ALCs survey serve a different purpose to this. They will inform the specific measures to be employed at specific locations along the onshore route at the construction stage.</p> <p>The Applicant is confident that this issue is resolved. However, if the interested parties wish to continue to engage on this issues, will continue to engage as necessary.</p>	<p>more information about the project is available. Within the Applicants Responses to EXQ1 (REP2-051) the applicant provided some examples (Triton Knoll, Viking CCS Pipeline, Sheringham Shoal and Dudgeon and Hornsea Project 4) of the numerous other Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects where approval has been given by the Secretary of State (SoS) in the absence of ALC surveys, where only the provisional mapping was used in the assessment.</p> <p>The Applicant is confident that the approach is robust and that this issue is resolved.</p>
LCC (RR-004) Landowners	Soil Management Plan	<p>The Applicant has responded to comments on the Soil Management Plan within the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations (PD1-071). The Applicant has provided clarification on the content of the Outline SMP, providing confirmation that measures will be defined in further detail in the Final SMP, based on the results of pre-construction site surveys.</p> <p>Interested parties may wish to seek further clarification once they have had the opportunity to review the information provided to date, at which point the Applicant will provide clarity where needed.</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to engage with Interested Parties following the engagement process outlined in section 1.4 of this document to seek further resolution, using timeframes and mechanisms that the Applicant and interested parties agree are appropriate for effective engagement.</p>	<p>The Applicant has provided updates to the oSMP (PD1-041) and Outline CoCP (PD1-039) at the Procedural Deadline – September 2024. The Applicant has further reviewed and updated the oSMP which has been provided to interested parties for review and comment, prior to submission at Deadline 3.</p> <p>The Applicant is confident that this issue is resolved. However, if the interested parties wish to continue to engage on this issues, will continue to engage as necessary.</p>	<p>The Applicant has provided updates to the oSMP (document reference 8.1.4, V7 updated at Deadline 6) and oCoCP (document reference 8.1, V8 updated at Deadline 6) throughout the examination process. The Landowner Interest Group which includes TH Clements Agent were invited to review the soil management plan and CoCP in September 2024. Comments were received in November 2024. The Applicant reviewed and where appropriate incorporated into changes into the SMP. In addition, To address the concerns raised by TH Clements and Woodlands the Applicant has provided the oSMP to the interested parties for comment at multiple stages of the Examination. The applicant has reviewed the requested changes each time and incorporated these where possible into revised versions of the outline plans.</p> <p>The Applicant has updated the oCOCP and oSMP to include commitments to undertake low resolution peat surveys and preparation of a peat management plan, should one be required. In addition to the oSMP an Outline Organic Land Protocol (document reference 8.1.7) has been developed to address management requirements specific to organic land that lie outside of the oSMP.</p> <p>The final outstanding points raised by TH Clements following ISH8 have been addressed and the oSMP has been submitted at Deadline 6 and agreed and signed off by TH Clements.</p> <p>The Applicant is confident that the issues have been resolved.</p>

1.1.9. Landscape and Visual Effects

Table 1.10: Landscape and Visual Effects

Interested Party	Principal Issues	Pre-examination Status	Mid Examination Status	Close of Examination Status
LCC (RR-004) LCC (REP2-052)	Concerns regarding impacts on landscape features including trees and hedgerows	<p>The Applicant has responded to all queries in relation to this topic through their Responses to Relevant Representation (PD1-071) and considers all concerns raised have been suitably addressed. Following the interested parties review of these responses, the Applicant expects these will be resolved.</p> <p>The Applicant has confirmed that further detail on the impacts on hedgerows and trees will be available following detailed design stage, but that all impacts will be within the parameters assessed in the LVIA due to the adoption of a Maximum Design Scenario approach. Tree and hedgerow losses were assessed as part of the LVIA and were demonstrated to be minimal, noting these losses will only be refined down following detailed design.</p> <p>If further concerns are raised the Applicant will follow the process outlined in section 1.4 of this document to seek resolution.</p>	<p>The Applicant has responded to comments on the potential impacts on trees and hedgerows within the Applicant's Response to the ExAs First Written Questions (REP2-051) and the Applicant's Responses to the Host Authorities Local Impact Reports (REP2-052) at Deadline 2.</p> <p>Development of the final design post consent will enable exact losses of trees and hedgerows to be calculated. A Landscape Management Plan (LMP) will be developed as a more detailed version of the existing OLEMS (PD1-054) and this will detail the replacement programme for removed trees and hedgerows and the protection of retained trees and hedgerows during construction. The LMP will be secured through the draft DCO (REP2-007).</p> <p>The position remains the same as at the pre-examination stage which is that the Applicant considers all concerns raised have been suitably addressed and that following the interested parties review of these responses, the Applicant expects these will be resolved.</p>	<p>The Applicant can confirm that this issue has been resolved.</p>
LCC (RR-004) LCC (REP2-052) BBC (RR-001) ELDC (RR-002) SHDC (RR-005)	Mitigation planting	<p>The Applicant has responded to all queries in relation to this topic through their Responses to Relevant Representation (PD1-071) and considers all concerns raised have been suitably addressed. Following the interested parties review of these responses, the Applicant expects these will be resolved.</p> <p>The mitigation planting has been developed based on a Maximum Design Scenario and refinements will be undertaken at detailed design stage to ensure that the scheme is sympathetic to the final design. The Applicant has confirmed that any refinements to the mitigation planting would need to be approved through a landscape management plan by the Local Planning Authority (LPA) in consultation with LCC in adherence with Requirement 10 of the draft DCO (Document 3.1, version 3).</p> <p>If further concerns are raised the Applicant will follow the process outlined in section 1.4 of this document to seek resolution.</p>	<p>The Applicant has responded to comments on the effectiveness of the proposed mitigation planting associated with the onshore substation within the Applicant's Response to the ExAs First Written Questions (REP2-051) and the Applicant's Responses to the Host Authorities Local Impact Reports (REP2-052) at Deadline 2.</p> <p>The Applicant also provided an oral case at Issue Specific Hearing 3 that the detailed design, specification and management of the mitigation planting would be developed to ensure the best possible rates of plant survival, which in turn would secure effective screening to mitigate landscape and visual effects between 5 and 15 years from planting. The Applicant explained that this information would be presented in the LMP which would be a more detailed version of the existing OLEMS (PD1-054) and secured through Requirement 10 of the draft DCO (REP2-007).</p>	<p>The Applicant can confirm that this issue has been resolved.</p> <p>The Applicant has updated text within Section 2.5.5 (Maintenance and Management) of the OLEMS (Document 8.10, version 8) to address concerns raised by LCC, which were discussed under Agenda Item 3.5 of Issue Specific Hearing 8.</p> <p>The updated text states that in the unlikely event of external factors causing losses to the Onshore Substation (OnSS) planting (as covered by Works No. 23-Landscaping works in the DCO) during the lifetime of the Project, <u>such that the purpose of screening the OnSS is no longer achieved as a result of gaps in the planting</u>, replacement planting will be undertaken to infill gaps that may arise. This approach will ensure commitments are fulfilled in respect of providing screening of the OnSS and enhancing biodiversity.</p>

Interested Party	Principal Issues	Pre-examination Status	Mid Examination Status	Close of Examination Status
				This update has been shared with Lincolnshire County Council (LCC) on 24 th March, with feedback agreeing this text on 3 rd April.
	Mitigation of visual effects relating to Temporary Construction Compounds		<p>Although raised by the ExA and not an interested party, this issue will have an influence on the development of the detailed design and, therefore, has been included in this table for completeness. The Applicant has responded to comments on the mitigation of visual effects associated with the Temporary Construction Compounds (TCCs) in three specific locations, within the Applicant's Response to the ExAs First Written Questions (REP2-051).</p> <p>The Applicant has updated the Outline CoCP (APP-268) for Deadline 3, to include mitigation measures that could be applied in respect of the small number of residential properties with potential to be affected.</p>	The Applicant can confirm that this issue has been resolved.
	Good Design		<p>Although raised by the ExA and not an interested party, this issue will have an influence on the development of the detailed design and, therefore, has been included in this table for completeness. The Applicant has responded to comments on good design within the Applicant's Response to the ExAs First Written Questions (REP2-051).</p> <p>The Applicant also provided an oral case at Issue Specific Hearing 3 regarding the process of good design that the Applicant has implemented, how it has been set out in the Design Approach Document (APP-292) and Design Principles Statement (APP-293) and secured through Requirement 9 of the Draft DCO (REP2-007), how it has involved engagement with LLC, the LPAs, the Community Liaison Group (CLG) and the independent Design Review Panel (DRP) and how the process, principles and consultation will be further developed through the detailed design process.</p>	<p>The Applicant can confirm that this issue has been resolved.</p> <p>Further discussions were held during ISH5 and ISH 6 (summarised in REP4a-116; Document 24.5, submitted at Deadline 6) , and an action point recorded by the ExA (1.18 Applicant's Response to Action Point 28) (REP4a-120) regarding good design. Further updates were then subsequently made to both the Design Approach Document (DAD) (REP5-125) and the Design Principles Statement (DPS) (REP5-127), both of which were shared with LCC on the 5th March 2025. LCC have subsequently confirmed they support the securement of both documents under Requirement 9 of the DCO, and the updates made in terms of reporting on the feedback from the design review process, to be held during detailed design.</p>

1.1.10. Marine and Intertidal Ornithology

Table 1.11: Marine and Intertidal Ornithology

Interested Party	Principal Issues	Pre-examination Status	Mid Examination Status	Close of Examination Status
Natural England (RR-045)	EIA assessment methodologies	<p>The Applicant has responded to comments on the EIA assessment methodologies within the Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations (PD1-071). The Applicant has updated the collision risk modelling to include the latest Joint Nature Conservation Committee (JNCC) and Natural England guidance (JNCC et al., 2024). In addition, advice on nocturnal activity factors provided by Natural England within their Relevant Representations (RR-045) have been factored into the model for tern species (document reference 15.9E)).</p> <p>Natural England may wish to seek further clarification once they have had the opportunity to review the information provided to date, at which point the Applicant will provide clarity where needed.</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to engage with Natural England following the engagement process outlined in section 1.4 of this document to seek further resolution, using timeframes and mechanisms that the Applicant and Natural England agree are appropriate for effective engagement.</p>	<p>Natural England welcomed the corrections made to Chapter 12 Appendix 1 Intertidal and Offshore Ornithology Technical Baseline (APP-162) and the use of Natural England's preferred apportioning approach in the ORBA documents (PD1-081 - PD1-092). The Applicant considers that the use of these factors adds a further level of precaution to the assessment.</p> <p>The Applicant has clarified that the ORBA documents (PD1-081 - PD1-092) include updated collision risk estimates for sandwich tern using updated Nocturnal Activity Factors (NAF). The collision risk model (CRM) has not been rerun for common tern and little gull as the Applicant considers that a reduction in area resulting from the ORBA can only mean a reduction in migratory collisions for these species, however the Applicant has stated that updated mCRM prediction can be provided as part of the update to the in-combination assessment at Deadline 4 if required (see NE Appendix K1, the Applicant's comments on Deadline 2 submissions (document reference 20.2), submitted at Deadline 3. The Applicant's position is that conclusions will be the same as those presented within the Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment (AS1-095).</p> <p>The Applicant responded to Natural England's comments and requests for updating collision risk modelling using the using the NAF, as well as several other clarifications on EIA assessment methodology, within the Applicant's Comments on Deadline 1 Submissions (Table 5: Appendix F1) (REP2-053). The Applicant has provided further clarification in NE Appendix K1, the Applicant's comments on Deadline 2 submissions (REP3-037), submitted at Deadline 3.</p> <p>The Applicant has also made corrections requested by Natural England, provided additional information pertaining to impacts and displacement matrices using Natural England's preferred approach (requested in RR-045) in PD1-081, PD1-092 and PD1-088. As requested in RR-045, the Applicant has stated the adult proportions</p>	<p>The Applicant at Deadline 4a submitted an updated ES chapter (REP4a-011) and suite of appendices (REP4a-043 – REP4a-048 inclusive), which incorporated all updated methodologies discussed with Natural England. Where there is disagreement on methodologies, the Applicant's preferred methodology and NE preferred methodology is presented. The only point at which agreement has not been reached (here, the presentation of Natural England's preferred position where the Applicant's preferred position differs is considere an agreement) is in relation to HPAI.</p>

Interested Party	Principal Issues	Pre-examination Status	Mid Examination Status	Close of Examination Status
			used for guillemot during the post-breeding bioseason within Natural England's preferred approach. The Applicant will continue to engage with Natural England following the engagement process outlined in section 1.4 of this document to seek further resolution, using timeframes and mechanisms that the Applicant and Natural England agree are appropriate for effective engagement.	
Natural England (RR-045)	EIA assessment conclusions	<p>The Applicant has responded to comments on EIA assessment conclusions within the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations (PD1-071). The Applicant has not concluded a significant effect on any species cumulatively with other planned or consented projects.</p> <p>Natural England may wish to seek further clarification once they have had the opportunity to review the information provided to date, at which point the Applicant will provide clarity where needed.</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to engage with Natural England following the engagement process outlined in section 1.4 of this document to seek further resolution, using timeframes and mechanisms that the Applicant and Natural England agree are appropriate for effective engagement.</p>	<p>The Applicant responded to Natural England's comments regarding cumulative assessments and the inclusion of values from other live projects within the Applicant's Comments on Deadline 1 Submissions (Table 5: Appendix F1) (REP2-053).</p> <p>The Applicant has provided further clarification in NE Appendix K1, the Applicant's comments on Deadline 2 submissions (REP3-037), submitted at Deadline 3.</p> <p>The Applicant has committed to updating the cumulative assessment, following the introduction of the ORBA (During ISH 2, Agenda Item 3.4), at Deadline 5.</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to engage with Natural England following the engagement process outlined in section 1.4 of this document to seek further resolution, using timeframes and mechanisms that the Applicant and Natural England agree are appropriate for effective engagement.</p>	<p>The Applicant updated the cumulative assessment within the suite of updated ornithology ES documents at Deadline 4a (REP4a-011, and REP4a-043 – REP4a-048 inclusive)). These updates included updated assessments after the acceptance of the ORBA, as this led to changes in abundance and density to be considered, which necessitated updated CRM and displacement assessments. The updates also corrected errors that had been flagged by Natural England.</p> <p>The Applicant retains its position that there will be no significant effect concluded either for the Project alone or cumulatively with other planned or consented projects.</p>
Natural England (RR-045)	Auk displacement rates	<p>The Applicant has responded to comments on auk displacement rates within the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations (PD1-071). There are disagreements on the appropriate displacement and mortality rates to use within the displacement assessment for auks (guillemot and razorbill). The Applicant is confident that the rates used are appropriate precautionary based on the best available evidence from UK windfarms within the North Sea (e.g. Trinder et al., 2024). However, both approaches have been presented for the updated ORBA assessment (document reference 15.9).</p> <p>Natural England may wish to seek further clarification once they have had the opportunity to review the information provided to date, at which point the Applicant will provide clarity where needed.</p>	<p>The Applicant responded to Natural England's comments and requests for displacement matrices and abundance value means within the Applicant's Comments on Deadline 1 Submissions (Table 5: Appendix F1) (REP2-053), submitted at Deadline 2.</p> <p>The Applicant has provided further clarification NE Appendix K1, the Applicant's comments on Deadline 2 submissions (REP3-037), submitted at Deadline 3.</p> <p>In summary, displacement matrices for apportioning of guillemot and razorbill to the Flamborough and Filey Coast SPA only, have been presented using the Applicant's preferred approach alongside those derived from Natural England's preferred approach (model-based estimates only). The Applicant considers that the model-based estimates are more robust and likely to be</p>	<p>The Applicant has responded to displacement-affected species in Table 26 in The Applicant's comments on Deadline 5 Submissions (document reference 24.2, submitted at Deadline 6).</p> <p>The Applicant will provide an updated in-combination assessment at Deadline 6 in order that assessments, in line with that requested by Natural England, are provided for guillemot, razorbill and gannet. However, the Applicant's position remains that assessment of displacement for auks is suitably precautionary at 50% displacement and 1% mortality (as evidenced in REP4a-052 Rates of displacement in guillemot and razorbill), and that use of a 70% displacement rate, and mortality rates of 2%, and especially 5%, should be considered extremely precautionary.</p>

Interested Party	Principal Issues	Pre-examination Status	Mid Examination Status	Close of Examination Status
		The Applicant will continue to engage with Natural England following the engagement process outlined in section 1.4 of this document to seek further resolution, using timeframes and mechanisms that the Applicant and Natural England agree are appropriate for effective engagement.	<p>more accurate than any design-based estimates. Please also refer to Rates of displacement in guillemot and razorbill (REP2-059).</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to engage with Natural England following the engagement process outlined in section 1.4 of this document to seek further resolution, using timeframes and mechanisms that the Applicant and Natural England agree are appropriate for effective engagement.</p>	The Applicant also considers an assessment of the impacts of displacement on gannets using a mortality rate of 10% to be extremely precautionary.
Natural England (RR-045)	Guillemot bioseason definitions	<p>The Applicant has responded to comments in respect of the guillemot bioseason definitions within the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations (PD1-071). The Applicant has used the standard approach and natural England general guidance of using the seasonal definitions from Furness (2015). Due to a peak of birds occurring in the array in August and September, Natural England recommended that an additional post-breeding bioseason should be added into the assessment and that it should be treated as additional. The project considers this methodology to vastly overinflate the predicted impact of the project on guillemot and disagrees that this is an appropriate approach. Both approaches have been provided within the updated ORBA assessment (document reference 15.9).</p> <p>Natural England may wish to seek further clarification once they have had the opportunity to review the information provided to date, at which point the Applicant will provide clarity where needed.</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to engage with Natural England following the engagement process outlined in section 1.4 of this document to seek further resolution, using timeframes and mechanisms that the Applicant and Natural England agree are appropriate for effective engagement.</p>	<p>The Applicant responded to Natural England's comments and requests for the addition of a bespoke post-breeding season and recommended apportioning rate for this bioseason within the Applicant's Comments on Deadline 1 Submissions (Table 5: Appendix F1) (REP2-053), submitted at Deadline 2.</p> <p>The Applicant has provided further clarification in NE Appendix K1, the Applicant's comments on Deadline 2 submissions (REP3-037), submitted at Deadline 3.</p> <p>The Applicant has also submitted Consideration of bioseasons in the assessment of guillemot (REP2-058) which sets out in detail the Applicant's position in relation to the use of bioseasons when assessing impacts on guillemot.</p> <p>In summary, the Applicant has presented Natural England's preferred approach which includes a third post breeding bioseason, alongside the Applicant's preferred approach which follows Furness 2015 and utilises only two bioseasons. The Applicant welcomes Natural England's recognition that impacts calculated using Natural England's preferred approach have been presented within the ORBA documents. However, the Applicant still maintains its position that the apportionment of 57% adults, 50% to FFC SPA in breeding season and 4.4% in the non-breeding season is appropriate and that the Applicant's approach should be preferred.</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to engage with Natural England following the engagement process outlined in section 1.4 of this document to seek further resolution,</p>	<p>The Applicant has responded to Bioseasons and their definitions in Table 1.6.2 in The Applicant's comments on Natural England's Risk and Issues Log (document reference 21.8, submitted at Deadline 6).</p> <p>Natural England's advice for guillemot is to consider a discrete post-breeding bioseason (the Applicant notes that this advice was provided into the Examination as a relevant representation (RR-045) and is not currently published guidance; the Applicant does not consider the addition of a discrete post breeding bioseason with 100% of birds apportioned to FFC SPA during these months is appropriate.</p>

Interested Party	Principal Issues	Pre-examination Status	Mid Examination Status	Close of Examination Status
			using timeframes and mechanisms that the Applicant and Natural England agree are appropriate for effective engagement.	
Natural England (RR-045)	Impacts from the Offshore Reactive Compensation Platform (ORCP) to divers during all phases of development.	<p>The Applicant has responded to comments regarding impacts from the ORCP on divers within the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations (PD1-071). The Applicant has provided a detailed clarification on ORCP impacts for all stages of the development within the ORBA reports (document reference 15.9). The Applicant will continue to discuss this matter and seek to come to an agreement with Natural England.</p> <p>Natural England may wish to seek further clarification once they have had the opportunity to review the information provided to date, at which point the Applicant will provide clarity where needed.</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to engage with Natural England following the engagement process outlined in section 1.4 of this document to seek further resolution, using timeframes and mechanisms that the Applicant and Natural England agree are appropriate for effective engagement.</p>	<p>The Applicant responded to Natural England's comments on the potential impacts of the Offshore Reactive Compensation Platforms (ORCP) presence on red throated divers within the Applicant's Comments on Deadline 1 Submissions (Table 5: Appendix F1) (REP2-053), submitted at Deadline 2. Further clarification on the ORCPs impacts within Greater Wash (GW) SPA during the Operation and Maintenance (O&M) phase have been provided in NE Appendix K1, the Applicant's comments on Deadline 2 submissions (REP3-037), submitted at Deadline 3.</p> <p>In summary, there is no longer a disagreement regarding the ORCP assessment methodology. As stated in the Applicant's Responses to The ExA's First Written Questions (REP2-051) the Applicant is undertaking a technical engineering review to reduce the parameters used for the ORCP maximum design scenario and will submit updated information to the Examination at Deadline 4.</p> <p>The Applicant has submitted a Change Notification at Deadline 3 which seeks to reduce the maximum parameters of the ORCP, including the maximum height of the structure (REP3-050)).</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to engage with Natural England following the engagement process outlined in section 1.4 of this document to seek further resolution, using timeframes and mechanisms that the Applicant and Natural England agree are appropriate for effective engagement.</p>	<p>The Applicant can confirm that this issue has been resolved.</p> <p>The Applicant has welcomed Natural England's update regarding the resolution of this issue in Table 26 of The Applicant's Comments on Deadline 5 Submissions (document reference 24.2, submitted at Deadline 6).</p> <p>The Applicant has updated condition 25, Part 2, Schedule 11 of the DCO as follows in light of Natural England's comments:</p> <p>"Seasonal restriction 25-(1) The undertaker must not carry out any offshore cable installation works or works associated with the installation of the offshore reactive compensation platforms within the Greater Wash SPA restriction area between 1 November to 31 March inclusive, unless otherwise agreed with the MMO, in consultation with the statutory nature conservation body.</p> <p>(2) In this paragraph, the "Greater Wash SPA restriction area" means the site designated as the Greater Wash Special Protection Area and an additional area extending two kilometres beyond the boundary of the site designated as the Greater Wash Special Protection Area."</p>

1.1.11. Marine Mammals

Table 1.12: Marine Mammals

Interested Party	Principal Issues	Pre-examination Status	Mid Examination Status	Close of Examination Status
Natural England (RR-045)	In-combination underwater noise assessment.	<p>The Applicant has responded to comments on underwater noise assessment within the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations (PD1-071)</p> <p>Natural England may wish to seek further clarification once they have had the opportunity to review the information provided to date, at which point the Applicant will provide clarity where needed.</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to engage with Natural England following the engagement process outlined in section 1.4 of this document to seek further resolution, using timeframes and mechanisms that the Applicant and Natural England agree are appropriate for effective engagement.</p>	<p>The Applicant maintains that the Site Integrity Plan process is the most effective method to manage the in-combination effects on the Southern North Sea (SNS) SAC from multiple noise generating activities.</p> <p>The Outline SIP was updated (PD1-048) to reference the potential use of Noise Abatement Systems (NAS) as a secondary mitigation option. The Applicant has responded to the ExA's First Written Questions (REP2-051) and in the Applicant's Comments on Deadline 1 (REP2-053).</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to engage with Natural England following the engagement process outlined in section 1.4 of this document to seek further resolution, using timeframes and mechanisms that the Applicant and Natural England agree are appropriate for effective engagement.</p>	<p>The Applicant maintains that the Site Integrity Plan process is the most effective method to manage the in-combination effects on the Southern North Sea (SNS) SAC from multiple noise generating activities.</p> <p>The In Principle SIP (Document reference 8.7 submitted Deadline 6) has been updated to reflect the Applicant's commitment to deploying primary and/or secondary noise reduction methods (Noise Abatement Systems), unless otherwise agreed by the MMO.</p> <p>The Applicant considers that this commitment is in line with the advice received from Natural England and this issue is now resolved.</p> <p>The Applicant considers that the commitment to deploying primary and/or secondary noise reduction methods (Noise Abatement Systems), unless otherwise agreed by the MMO, is beyond the requirement in the current Defra (2025) policy <i>Reducing Marine Noise</i> which states "From January 2025, given the expected increase in noise levels over the coming years, and the above outlined policy commitments, we expect that all offshore wind pile driving activity across all English waters will be required to demonstrate that they have utilised best endeavours to deliver noise reductions through the use of primary and/or secondary noise reduction methods in the first instance."</p>
Natural England (RR-045)	Noise abatement systems	<p>The Applicant has responded to comments on noise abatement systems within the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations (PD1-071). The Applicant maintains that due to no significant impacts in the EIA and no AEoI for HRA, NAS is not required.</p> <p>Natural England may wish to seek further clarification once they have had the opportunity to review the information provided to date, at which point the Applicant will provide clarity where needed.</p>	<p>The Applicant has responded to comments on NAS within the Applicant's Responses to the ExA's First Written Questions (REP2-051) and the Applicant's Comments on Deadline 1 Submissions (REP2-053) at Deadline 2.</p> <p>The Applicant is aware of the DEFRA marine noise policy paper regarding noise reduction measures is due to be published however, at the time of writing no guidance, policy or legislation has been published by DEFRA.</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to engage with MMO, DEFRA and Natural England on this point. Once relevant policy</p>	<p>The Applicant has responded to the use of Noise Abatement Systems in Table 21 of The Applicant's Comments on Deadline 5 Submissions (document reference 24.2, submitted at Deadline 6).</p> <p>The Applicant has committed to deploying primary and/or secondary noise reduction methods (Noise Abatement Systems), unless otherwise agreed by the MMO, this is secured within the MMMP (Document reference 8.6.1 submitted Deadline 6) and SIP (Document reference 8.7 submitted Deadline 6).</p>

Interested Party	Principal Issues	Pre-examination Status	Mid Examination Status	Close of Examination Status
		<p>The Applicant will continue to engage with Natural England following the engagement process outlined in section 1.4 of this document to seek further resolution, using timeframes and mechanisms that the Applicant and Natural England agree are appropriate for effective engagement.</p>	<p>documents are published the Applicant will consider the implications of this on the Project.</p>	<p>The Applicant considers that this commitment is in line with the advice received from Natural England and this issue is now resolved.</p> <p>The Applicant considers that the commitment to deploying primary and/or secondary noise reduction methods (Noise Abatement Systems), unless otherwise agreed by the MMO, is beyond the requirement in the current Defra (2025) policy <i>Reducing Marine Noise</i>, which states:</p> <p><i>“From January 2025, given the expected increase in noise levels over the coming years, and the above outlined policy commitments, we expect that all offshore wind pile driving activity across all English waters will be required to demonstrate that they have utilised best endeavours to deliver noise reductions through the use of primary and/or secondary noise reduction methods in the first instance.”</i></p> <p>The Applicant considers that the commitment it has made is above and beyond what is required by UK government policy (Defra, 2025) and commits the project to the use of Noise Abatement Systems and/or other noise reduction technologies (such as primary reduction measures which are not covered by the term Noise Abatement Systems).</p> <p>In accordance with Schedule 10 Part 2, 13 (1) (f), in the event that driven or part-driven pile foundations are proposed to be used, a Final MMMP in accordance with the Outline MMMP (piling) (Document reference 8.6.1 submitted Deadline 6), the intention of which is to prevent injury to marine mammals, following current best practice as advised by the relevant statutory nature conservation body, to be submitted to the MMO at least six months prior to commencement of piling activities. In relation to the SNS SAC, the Applicant also notes that, in accordance with Schedule 10 Part 2, 22 (1), no piling can begin until a SIP which accords with the principles set out in the In-Principle SNS SAC SIP (Document reference 8.7 submitted Deadline 6) has been submitted to, and approved in writing, by the MMO in consultation with the relevant statutory nature conservation body.</p> <p>Specific technology</p>

Interested Party	Principal Issues	Pre-examination Status	Mid Examination Status	Close of Examination Status
				<p>As set out ISH 6 (REP4a-117), the Applicant has engaged with underwater noise abatement/ noise reduction technology suppliers, and is confident that the existing commitment allows the Project sufficient time to finance, source and implement a noise abatement/ noise reductions system, or a combination of systems, prior to construction commencing. While the Applicant understands that Natural England’s preference is for the Applicant to commit to a specific NAS technology, prior to consent, the Applicant explained in ISH 6.</p> <p>The Applicant is engaging with the market regarding noise reduction measures available (as confirmed with the ExA in ISH 6), however a commitment to a specific noise reduction measure cannot be made at this stage. The Applicant will continue to engage with the market regarding noise reduction methods which are both available and suitable for the Project. It is also noted that this term “NAS” would be restrictive as it does not capture the full suite of noise reduction technologies, and also does not allow for flexibility should new technologies or approaches come onto the market prior to Project construction.</p> <p>The Applicant highlights that the Defra policy paper (Defra, 2025) was published in January 2025, mid-way through examination; prior to this there was no requirement for projects piling in English waters ‘to demonstrate that they have utilised best endeavours to deliver noise reductions through the use of primary and/or secondary noise reduction methods’. There was, therefore, no requirement for consideration of the use of primary and/or secondary noise reduction measures throughout the production of the EIA, including consideration of project design and mitigation. The Applicant does not have the final design scenario yet and therefore cannot commit to any specific measures at this stage, nor has it been identified that NAS is required due to identified significant impacts. The Applicant considers that they have achieved as much as is reasonably possible to expect within the bounds of the remaining examination timeframe and that the commitment made is sufficient.</p>

Interested Party	Principal Issues	Pre-examination Status	Mid Examination Status	Close of Examination Status
Natural England (RR-045)	Magnitude scores and the classifications of impact assessment.	<p>The Applicant has responded to comments on magnitude scores and classification of impact assessment within the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations (PD1-071). The Applicant has undertaken Interim Population Consequences of Disturbance (IPCoD) modelling to further quantify population level effect, thus the magnitude scores are considered robust.</p> <p>Natural England may wish to seek further clarification once they have had the opportunity to review the information provided to date, at which point the Applicant will provide clarity where needed.</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to engage with Natural England following the engagement process outlined in section 1.4 of this document to seek further resolution, using timeframes and mechanisms that the Applicant and Natural England agree are appropriate for effective engagement.</p>	<p>The Applicant has submitted the Interim Population Consequences of Disturbance Modelling Report (PD1-049) for the project alone at the procedural deadline. The Applicant has provided a response to Natural England in Applicant's Comments on Deadline 1 Submissions (REP2-053) at Deadline 2.</p> <p>The Applicant will arrange a meeting with Natural England as soon as possible to agree the methodology for cumulative iPCoD modelling.</p>	<p>The Applicant, at NE request, has undertaken IPCoD modelling for in-combination (document reference 6.3.11.3), submitted at deadline 6 to further quantify population level effect, thus the magnitude scores are considered robust. The Applicant agrees with Natural England that while iPCoD is the best available tool at this time, there are limitations to the model.</p> <p>Therefore, the Applicant considers this issue to be resolved.</p>

1.1.12. Noise and Vibration

Table 1.13: Noise and Vibration

Interested Party	Principal Issues	Pre-examination Status	Mid Examination Status	Close of Examination Status
<p>Fosdyke Parish Council (RR-006)</p> <p>Barry Cooper (RR-080)</p> <p>Anthony Kindred (RR-084)</p> <p>Lisa Kindred (RR-085)</p> <p>Nicola Ann Pearson (RR-091)</p>	Concerns regarding vibration impacts on buildings	<p>The Applicant has responded to all queries in relation to this topic through their Responses to Relevant Representation (PD1-071) and considers all concerns raised have been suitably addressed. Following the interested parties review of these responses, the Applicant expects these will be resolved.</p> <p>If further concerns are raised the Applicant will follow the process outlined in section 1.4 of this document to seek resolution.</p>	No further issues have been raised. The Applicant maintains its position that there are no unresolved issues and awaits formal confirmation of this from the interested parties.	The Applicant can confirm that this issue has been resolved.

1.1.13. Oil, Gas and Other Offshore Infrastructure

Table 1.14: Oil, Gas and Other Offshore Infrastructure

Interested Party	Principal Issues	Pre-examination Status	Mid Examination Status	Close of Examination Status
Perenco (RR-053) Shell (RR-060)	Access and line of sight telecommunications with oil and gas platforms.	<p>The Applicant has responded to comments regarding impacts on oil and gas platforms in Relevant Representations (PD1-071).</p> <p>The Applicant has continued with dialogue and engagement with Shell and will provide an update in due course.</p> <p>Negotiations over a set of protective provisions are ongoing between the Applicant and Perenco. The Applicant will continue to engage with Perenco over the terms of these protective provisions and will introduce those into the draft Development Consent Order in due course.</p> <p>Interested Parties may wish to seek further clarification once they have had the opportunity to review the information provided to date, at which point the Applicant will provide clarity where needed.</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to engage with Interested Parties following the engagement process outlined in section 1.4 of this document to seek further resolution, using timeframes and mechanisms that the Applicant and Interested Parties agree are appropriate for effective engagement.</p>	<p>The Applicant has responded to comments about potential interference of the Project on access and line of sight telecommunications with oil and gas platforms within The Applicant's Responses to The ExA's First Written Questions (ExQ1) (REP2-051) (Table 1.3) and provided an oral case at Issue Specific Hearing 2 (The Applicant's Written Summary of oral case put at Issue Specific Hearing 2 on Offshore matters, 4th Dec (REP3-041)).</p> <p>The Applicant's will continue to engage with Interested Parties following the engagement process outlined in section 1.4, using timeframes and mechanisms that the Applicant and the Interested Parties agree are appropriate for effective and collaborative engagement.</p>	<p>Perenco</p> <p>The Applicant and Perenco have reached agreement on the majority of the Protective Provisions subject to one outstanding point regarding the radius of the communications corridors. The Applicant's submitted Protective Provisions have proposed a 50m radius from the centre of the communications line which the Applicant believes is a sufficient and justified protection as set out elsewhere in the Closing Statement.</p> <p>The Protective Provisions (3.1 dDCO, Schedule 18, Part 11) proposed provide sufficient controls on the Applicant's activities to ensure (i) the necessary protection of Perenco and (ii) the ability for the respective activities to continue in a reasonable manner through (1) the restriction on the works that may be carried out by the Applicant in certain areas and at certain times; (2) the requirement to have certain plans approved before the works set out may take place and (3) the requirement to enter into a co-existence and proximity agreement in the circumstances referred to.</p> <p>The commercial agreement in relation to curtailment of helicopter operations will be finalised as soon as possible after close of Examination, noting that agreement of all Protected Provisions in relation to helicopter operations, including the Protected Provisions Plan, provides sufficient control to Perenco for the protection of their current and future helicopter operations.</p> <p>In relation to the 50m radius distance used to define the communication corridors in the DCO, the Applicant and Perenco will continue with technical discussions to resolve this last remaining point as soon as possible after close of Examination.</p> <p>Shell</p> <p>Shell UK Limited have not provided substantive comments on the Protective Provisions proposed by the Applicant other than in relation to the relevant Shell entity. The Applicant awaits confirmation that Shell agrees with the form of Protective Provision.</p>

Interested Party	Principal Issues	Pre-examination Status	Mid Examination Status	Close of Examination Status
				<p>The Protective Provisions (3.1 dDCO, Schedule 18, Part 12) proposed provide sufficient controls on the Applicant's activities to ensure (i) the necessary protection of Perenco and (ii) the ability for the respective activities to continue in a reasonable manner through (1) the restriction on the works that may be carried out by the Applicant in certain areas and at certain times; (2) the requirement to have certain plans approved before the works set out may take place and (3) the requirement to enter into a co-existence and proximity agreement in the circumstances referred to.</p> <p>The Applicant and Shell are progressing constructively on the key terms of the commercial agreement and continue to progress to a final form of agreement.</p> <p>The commercial agreement in relation to curtailment of helicopter operations will be finalised as soon as possible after close of Examination, noting that agreement of all Protected Provisions in relation to helicopter operations, including the Protected Provisions Plan, provides sufficient control to Shell for the protection of their current and future helicopter operations.</p>
Orsted Hornsea Project Four Limited (RR-051) Orsted Hornsea Project Three (UK) Limited (RR-052) Race Bank Windfarm Ltd (RR-054)	Interference with wind speed or wind direction on the Offshore Wind Farm (OWF).	<p>The Applicant has responded to comments regarding impacts to wind speed and direction for other OWFs in the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations (PD1-071).</p> <p>Interested Parties may wish to seek further clarification once they have had the opportunity to review the information provided to date, at which point the Applicant will provide clarity where needed.</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to engage with Interested Parties following the engagement process outlined in section 1.4 of this document to seek further resolution, using timeframes and mechanisms that the Applicant and Interested Parties agree are appropriate for effective engagement.</p>	The Applicant has responded to comments about interference with wind speed or wind direction on the OWF within The Applicant's Responses to The ExA's First Written Questions (ExQ1) (REP2-051) (Table 1.3, submitted at Deadline 2) and provided an oral case at Issue Specific Hearing 2 (The Applicant's Written Summary of oral case put at Issue Specific Hearing 2 on Offshore matters, 4th Dec (REP3-041)).	<p>Orsted Hornsea Project Three (UK) Limited, Orsted Hornsea Project Four Limited, Lincs Wind Farm Limited and Westernmost Rough Limited</p> <p>The Orsted IPs submission at Deadline 4a (REP4a-125) confirmed Orsted Hornsea Project Three (UK) Limited, Orsted Hornsea Project Four Limited, Lincs Wind Farm Limited and Westernmost Rough Limited withdrew their objections.</p> <p>Race Bank Windfarm Ltd., Hornsea 1 Limited, Breesea Limited, Soundmark Wind Limited, Sonningmay Limited, Optimus Wind Limited</p> <p>The Applicant has demonstrated throughout the Examination that wake effects arising from the Project are very small and cannot be said to be significant in EIA terms or material in policy terms. That position is supported by both general and site-specific analysis. The evidence is set out in Array Layout Yield Study (REP2-056), Wake Loss Technical Note (REP4-114), Wood Thilsted Wake Impact Assessment Report (REP5-152)</p>

Interested Party	Principal Issues	Pre-examination Status	Mid Examination Status	Close of Examination Status
				<p>and Wood Thilsted Wake Impact Assessment Report version 2 (submitted at Deadline 6).</p> <p>The Orsted IPs and the Equinor IPs instead seek the imposition of protective provisions, requiring both mitigation of wake effects through further design and the payment of a commuted sum representing the total loss of revenue for six offshore wind farms anticipated prior to commencement of construction of the Project. The imposition of protective provisions, which have not been agreed by the Applicant must logically be subject to the same tests as the imposition of requirements, particularly in light of the criminal sanctions for breach. The proposed protective provisions fail the tests for the imposition of requirements, as well as broader principles of legal certainty, and there is no basis in law, policy, precedent or evidence for the requested payment provisions.</p> <p>The Applicant has set out its position on wake loss matters in The Applicant's The Applicant's Submissions on Wake Loss Matters (document reference 24.12 submitted at Deadline 6).</p>
<p>Orsted Gunfleet Sands Demo Limited</p> <p>Orsted Hornsea Project Four Limited</p> <p>Orsted Hornsea Project Three (UK) Limited</p> <p>Race Bank Windfarm Ltd</p> <p>RWE Renewables UK Dogger Bank South (West) Limited</p>	Proximity of the Project to the OWF.	<p>The Applicant has responded to comments regarding impacts to other OWFs by the proximity of the Project in the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations (PD1-071).</p> <p>Interested Parties may wish to seek further clarification once they have had the opportunity to review the information provided to date, at which point the Applicant will provide clarity where needed.</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to engage with Interested Parties following the engagement process outlined in section 1.4 of this document to seek further resolution, using timeframes and mechanisms that the Applicant and Interested Parties agree are appropriate for effective engagement.</p>	<p>The Applicant has responded to comments about proximity of the Project to the other OWF within The Applicant's Responses to The ExA's First Written Questions (ExQ1) (REP2-051) (Table 1.3, submitted at Deadline 2) and provided an oral case at Issue Specific Hearing 2 (The Applicant's Written Summary of oral case put at Issue Specific Hearing 2 on Offshore matters, 4th Dec (REP3-041)).</p>	<p><u>Orsted Gunfleet Sands Demo Limited</u></p> <p>No further submissions have been made by Orsted Gunfleet Sands Demo Limited so it has been assumed on the basis of distance from the Applicant array site that no matters relating to proximity remain outstanding.</p> <p><u>Race Bank Wind Farm Limited, Lincs Wind Farm Limited</u></p> <p>The Applicant has issued draft proximity agreements with Race Bank Wind Farm Limited and Lincs Wind Farm Limited to progress an offshore proximity agreement in relation to the offshore cable route. The offshore proximity agreement will be finalised as soon as possible after close of Examination.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Applicant has incorporated a Protective Provisions in Parts 13 and 14 of Schedule 18 in the DCO which provides assurance to these interested parties that no works will take place with a distance of 250m of the relevant wind farm without approval of the relevant party.</p> <p><u>RWE Renewables UK Dogger Bank South (West)</u></p>

Interested Party	Principal Issues	Pre-examination Status	Mid Examination Status	Close of Examination Status
<p>Race Bank Offshore Wind Limited Equinor New Energy Limited (Equinor New Energy Limited) on behalf of Scira Extension Limited and Dudgeon Extension Limited</p> <p>TC Lincs OFTO Ltd</p>				<p>No further submissions have been made by RWE Renewables UK Dogger Bank South (West) so it has been assumed on the basis of distance from the Applicant array site that no matters remain outstanding.</p> <p><u>Equinor New Energy Limited (Equinor New Energy Limited) on behalf of Scira Extension Limited and Dudgeon Extension Limited</u></p> <p>The Applicant has received a draft Cooperation and Proximity Agreement from the Equinor on 3rd April 2025.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Applicant has incorporated a Protective Provision in the DCO which provides assurance to Dudgeon Extension Ltd. that no works will take place with a distance of 250m of the Dudgeon Extension Wind Farm without approval of relevant plans from Dudgeon Extension Ltd.</p> <p>The Cooperation and Proximity Agreement will be finalised as soon as possible after close of Examination, noting that incorporation of Protected Provisions provides sufficient control to Dudgeon Extension Ltd for the protection of their operational assets.</p> <p>Due to the distance between the Project and Sheringham Shoal Extension, The Applicant and Scira Extension Limited have agreed that no proximity agreement will be required for Scira Extension Limited.</p> <p><u>TC Lincs OFTO Ltd</u></p> <p>No further submissions have been made by TC Lincs OFTO Ltd so it has been assumed on the basis of distance from the Applicant Export Cable Corridor to the operating assets of TC Lincs OFTO Ltd that no matters remain outstanding as there is no issue concerning overlap of proximity with the operating assets of TC Lincs OFTO Ltd.</p>

1.1.14. Traffic, Transport and Public Rights of Way

Table 1.15: Traffic, Transport and Public Rights of Way

Interested Party	Principal Issues	Pre-examination Status	Mid Examination Status	Close of Examination Status
Lincolnshire County Council (RR-004)	Roads to be crossed via trenchless technique	As set out in the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representation (PD1-071), the Applicant is committing to using trenchless technology at all adopted roads. The relevant sections of the Transport Assessment (APP-119) and the Traffic and Transport Chapter (APP-082) in revised versions submitted (AS1-086 and AS1-052) have been updated to reflect this commitment. The Applicant therefore believes this issue has now been resolved. If further concerns are raised the Applicant will follow the process outlined in section 1.4 of this document to seek resolution.	The Applicant re-iterated that this issue has previously been addressed in a response within the Applicant's Responses to the Host Authorities Local Impact Reports (REP2-052) at Deadline 2.	The Applicant can confirm that this issue has been resolved.
Lincolnshire County Council (RR-004)	Draft DCO wording (works in the streets, Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) and road closures)	(Document reference 15.3) the Applicant has engaged with LCC and understands that all highway works will be submitted through the LCC Permitting Scheme as requested and that technical details for certain works will need to be approved in advance. The Applicant has included the Highway Permitting requirements in the 'Other Consents and Licenses' document. The Applicant therefore believes this issue has now been resolved. If further concerns are raised the applicant will follow the process outlined in section 1.4 of this document to seek resolution.	The Applicant re-iterated that this issue has previously been addressed in a response within the Applicant's Responses to the Host Authorities Local Impact Reports (REP2-052) at Deadline 2.	The Applicant can confirm that this issue has been resolved.

1.1.15. Hydrology, Hydrogeology and Flood Risk (Water Quality and Resources)

Table 1.16: Hydrology, Hydrogeology and Flood Risk

Interested Party	Principal Issues	Pre-examination Status	Mid Examination Status	Close of Examination Status
Environment Agency (RR-018)	Disapplication of the Environmental Permitting Regulations	The Applicant is engaging with the Environment Agency (EA) regarding the agreement of Protective Provisions. Progress will be sought following the engagement process outlined in section 1.4 of this document to seek further resolution, using timeframes and mechanisms that the Applicant and the Environment Agency agree are appropriate for effective engagement.	The Applicant continues to engage with the EA in respect of agreeing the Protective Provisions and the separate Beach Works agreement and believes this will be closed out shortly.	The Applicant can confirm that this issue has been resolved with the Protective Provisions being agreed and the beach works agreement being in the agreed final form. A letter confirming the EA's agreement to disapplication of legislation is being submitted at Deadline 6.
Environment Agency (RR-018)	Flood Risk Assessments (ECC): Insufficient information	The Applicant has responded to all queries in relation to this topic through the Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representation (PD1-071) and considers all concerns raised have been suitably addressed, both for the Onshore Substation and the ECC. The Applicant is	The Applicant has received Written Representations from the Environment Agency with further comments on this matter. The Applicant will continue to engage with the Environment Agency with regard to model reviews and result interpretations and proposes to submit an	The Applicant can confirm that this issue has been resolved.

Interested Party	Principal Issues	Pre-examination Status	Mid Examination Status	Close of Examination Status
		<p>submitting a clarification in the form of the Landfall Noise Bund Hydraulic Modelling Report (Document 15.07) and an updated ECC and 400kV cable Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) (6.3.24.2)</p> <p>The Environment Agency may wish to seek further clarification once they have had the opportunity to review the information once it is provided, at which point the Applicant will provide clarity where needed.</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to engage with the Environment Agency following the engagement process outlined in section 1.4 of this document to seek further resolution, using timeframes and mechanisms that the Applicant and the Environment Agency agree are appropriate for effective engagement.</p>	<p>updated version of the Landfall Noise Bund Hydraulic Modelling Report (document 15.07) and Onshore ECC and 400KV FRA (document reference 6.3.4.2) at Deadline 4 to address these comments.</p>	<p>The Applicant submitted updated Modelling of the Noise Bund at DL4 (Document Reference REP4-094-098).</p>
Environment Agency (RR-018)	Flood Risk Assessment (ECC): Possibility that during landfall cable installation drilling operation, water ingress into the drill cavity could create a flood risk.	<p>The Applicant is carrying out preliminary design work for the landfall drill site and will provide the EA with its proposals for flood protection, including levels when these have been confirmed.</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to engage with the Environment Agency following the engagement process outlined in section 1.4 of this document to seek further resolution, using timeframes and mechanisms that the Applicant and IP agree are appropriate for effective engagement.</p>	<p>The Applicant has had further engagement with the EA regarding this matter and has updated the outline Code of Construction Practice (oCOCp) (document 8.1) to reference that the landfall drill pits will be bunded to the 0.5% confidence level required by the EA. The Applicant is submitting an updated oCOCp at Deadline 3, including this amendment.</p>	<p>The Applicant can confirm that this issue has been resolved.</p> <p>The Applicant submitted an updated version of the oCOCp at Deadline 5 (REP5-113) confirming the bunding levels as requested by the EA, and also in the Hydrology and Flood Risk Chapter (REP4a-017).</p>
Environment Agency (RR-018)	Flood Risk Assessment (ECC): Inclusion and analysis of fluvial and tidal hazard mapping data to inform works within the floodplain.	<p>The Applicant has responded to this request through the Responses to Relevant Representations (PD1-071), submitted as part of this suite of documents and considers that the point raised has been suitably addressed. An updated version of the Onshore ECC and 400KV FRA (document 6.3.4.2, version 3) has also been submitted including the mapping referred to.</p> <p>If further concerns are raised the Applicant will follow the process outlined in section 1.4 of this document to seek resolution.</p>	<p>The Applicant has received Written Representations from the Environment Agency with further comments on this matter. The Applicant proposes to submit an updated version of the Onshore ECC and 400KV FRA (document reference 6.3.4.2) at Deadline 4 to address these comments.</p>	<p>The Applicant can confirm that this issue has been resolved.</p> <p>The Applicant submitted updated version of the River Welland Breach Hydraulic Modelling Report at Deadline 4 as part of the ONSS FRA (REP4-027-028).</p>
Environment Agency (RR-018)	Flood Risk Assessment (ECC): Working within the floodplain during construction and mitigation measures (including stockpiling and temporary noise bund at landfall).	<p>The Applicant believes this issue has now been resolved through their Responses to Relevant Representation (PD1-071) and considers all concerns raised have been suitably addressed. Updated versions of the Onshore ECC and 400KV FRA (document 6.3.4.2, version 3), Outline CoCP (document 8.1, version 2) and Outline Soil Management Plan (document 8.1.3, version 2) have been submitted. The assessment of the landfall noise bund has</p>	<p>The Applicant has received Written Representations from the Environment Agency with further comments on this matter. The Applicant proposes to submit an updated version of the Onshore ECC and 400KV FRA (document reference 6.3.4.2), Outline CoCP (document 8.1) and Outline Soil Management Plan (document 8.13.3) at Deadline 4 to address these comments.</p>	<p>The Applicant can confirm that this issue has been resolved.</p> <p>The Applicant submitted an updated version of the ECC FRA at Deadline 4 (REP4-023-024) and an updated Soil Management Plan (REP4a-079).</p>

Interested Party	Principal Issues	Pre-examination Status	Mid Examination Status	Close of Examination Status
		<p>been clarified through the submission of a Noise Bund Hydraulic Modelling Report (document 15.7, version 1). The Applicant believes that the clarifications provided will address this concern.</p> <p>If further concerns are raised the Applicant will follow the process outlined in section 1.4 of this document to seek resolution.</p>		
Environment Agency (RR-018)	Flood Risk Assessments – Onshore Substation: Demonstrating compliance with the ‘exception test’	<p>The Applicant has responded to all queries in relation to this topic through their Responses to Relevant Representation (PD1-071) and considers all concerns raised have been suitably addressed, both for the Onshore Substation and the ECC. The Applicant has previously submitted an updated version of the River Welland Breach Modelling Report (AS1-068- AS1-085) which is being reviewed by the EA.</p> <p>The Environment Agency may wish to seek further clarification once they have had the opportunity to review the information once it is provided, at which point the Applicant will provide clarity where needed.</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to engage with the Environment Agency following the engagement process outlined in section 1.4 of this document to seek further resolution, using timeframes and mechanisms that the Applicant and the Environment Agency agree are appropriate for effective engagement.</p>	The Applicant will continue to engage with the Environment Agency regarding model reviews and result interpretations proposes to submit an updated version of the River Welland Breach Modelling Report (document reference 6.3.24.3) at Deadline 4 to address these comments.	<p>The Applicant can confirm that this issue has been resolved.</p> <p>The Applicant submitted an updated version of the River Welland Breach Hydraulic Modelling Report at Deadline 4 as part of the ONSS FRA (REP4-027-028).</p>
Environment Agency (RR-018)	Flood Risk Assessment – Onshore Substation: Concerns regarding the use of 35 years Climate Change allowances	<p>The Applicant has provided a justification for the use of 35 years, explaining that wind farms have a much shorter lifetime compared to other types of infrastructure and 35 years is typical for this type of development within the Applicant’s Response to Relevant Representations (PD1-071)</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to engage with the Environment Agency following the engagement process outlined in section 1.4 of this document to seek further resolution, using timeframes and mechanisms that the Applicant and the Environment Agency agree are appropriate for effective engagement.</p>	The Applicant has received Written Representations from the Environment Agency with further comments on this matter. The Applicant will continue to engage with the Environment Agency with regard to the Environment Agency’s requirement for climate change allowances to be considered for the 75 year lifetime of the OnSS. The Applicant proposes to submit an updated version of the River Welland Hydraulic Modelling Report and OnSS FRA (document reference 6.3.24.3) at Deadline 4 to address these concerns.	<p>The Applicant can confirm that this issue has been resolved.</p> <p>The Applicant submitted an updated version of the River Welland Breach Hydraulic Modelling Report at Deadline 4 as part of the ONSS FRA (REP4-027-028).</p>
Environment Agency (RR-018)	Concerns that the project may interfere with the EA’s annual beach nourishment works, in	<p>The Applicant is waiting for the Heads of Terms for an agreement proposed by the EA and has expressed its willingness to enter into an agreement.</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to engage with the Environment Agency following the engagement process</p>	The Applicant has received, from the EA, Heads of Terms for an agreement and has responded with comments on the proposed form of agreement. The Applicant will continue to engage with the EA in respect of the proposed form of agreement.	The Applicant can confirm that this issue has been resolved.

Interested Party	Principal Issues	Pre-examination Status	Mid Examination Status	Close of Examination Status
	terms of delays or additional cost.	outlined in section 1.4 of this document to seek further resolution, using timeframes and mechanisms that the Applicant and the Environment Agency agree are appropriate for effective engagement.		
Environment Agency (RR-018) Natural England (RR-045)	Protection of groundwater being secured within the DCO.	<p>The Applicant believes this issue has now been resolved through the Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations (PD1-071), submitted as part of this suite of documents. The Applicant has updated Requirement 18 of the draft DCO to secure the provision of a Water Quality Management and Mitigation Plan as part of the Code of Construction Practice. The Outline Code of Construction Practice (Document 8.1 version 2) has also been updated to reflect this commitment.</p> <p>The Applicant believes that the commitment to this plan resolves the issue. The Applicant will continue to engage with the Interested Parties following the engagement process outlined in section 1.4 of this document to seek further resolution, using timeframes and mechanisms that the Applicant and the Interested Parties agree are appropriate for effective engagement.</p> <p>If further concerns are raised the Applicant will follow the process outlined in section 1.4 of this document to seek resolution.</p>	The Applicant can confirm that this issue has been resolved.	
Environment Agency (RR-018)	Concerns that if works are carried out on the seabed within 500m of the intertidal area, this could lead to a deterioration of bathing water quality.	<p>The Applicant has undertaken ground investigations in order to inform its design work and can confirm that the landfall exit pits will be a minimum of 500m seaward of Mean Low Water Springs (MLWS). The Applicant has updated the Outline Code of Construction Practice (document 8.1, version 2) and the Outline Cable Specification and Installation Plan (document 8.5) to include this commitment. The Applicant therefore believes this issue has now been resolved.</p> <p>If further concerns are raised the Applicant will follow the process outlined in section 1.4 of this document to seek resolution.</p>	No further comments have been raised by the Environment Agency regarding this matter.	The Applicant can confirm that this issue has been resolved.
Environment Agency (RR-018)	Potential impediments to possible future East Coast Defences works, which could include sheet pile driving. The concern	The Applicant has provided the EA with information showing that the cables will be installed at sufficient depth so that sheet piling would be feasible. The Applicant has confirmed, in the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations (PD1-071), submitted as part of	No further comments have been raised by the Environment Agency regarding this matter.	The Applicant can confirm that this issue has been resolved.

Interested Party	Principal Issues	Pre-examination Status	Mid Examination Status	Close of Examination Status
	relates to the need for a 10m consultation zone.	<p>this suite of documents, that it requires to be consulted in advance of future piling work within 10m of the cables. This is not a separation requirement; it is to ensure that the works are carried out safely.</p> <p>The Applicant believes that this clarification resolves the issue.</p> <p>If further concerns are raised the Applicant will follow the process outlined in section 1.4 of this document to seek resolution.</p>		
Environment Agency (RR-018)	Potential that cable ducts under main rivers create a flood risk after the lifetime of the project.	<p>The Applicant is committing to permanently filling and sealing ducts after cable removal at decommissioning and has updated the draft DCO to include the Environment Agency as a consultee to the Decommissioning Plan. The Applicant therefore believes this issue has now been resolved.</p> <p>If further concerns are raised the Applicant will follow the process outlined in section 1.4 of this document to seek resolution.</p>	No further comments have been raised by the Environment Agency regarding this matter.	The Applicant can confirm that this issue has been resolved.