The Great Grid Upgrade

Sea Link

Sea Link

Volume 6: Environmental Information

Document: 6.13 Marine Plan Policy Assessment

Planning Inspectorate Reference: EN020026

Version: A
March 2025

Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009 Regulation 5(2)(q)

nationalgrid

Page intentionally blank

Contents

Executive Summary

Ex1.1.1 This document outlines the Marine Plan Policy Assessment for The Sea Link Project (hereafter referred to as the ‘Proposed Project’).

Ex1.1.2 The Proposed Project overlaps the East Inshore and Offshore Marine Plan Areas and the East Inshore and South East Inshore Marine Plan Areas. In this Marine Plan Assessment, the Proposed Project's compliance with the South East Inshore Marine Plan and East Inshore and Offshore Marine Plan policies have been reviewed with references to the relevant ES chapter, where appropriate, to provide further details.

Ex1.1.3 This assessment has concluded that the Proposed Project complies with both the East Inshore and Offshore Marine Plan Areas and the East Inshore and South East Inshore Marine Plan Areas.

1. Marine Plan Policy Assessment

1.1 Introduction

1.1.1 The Sea Link Project (hereafter referred to as the 'Proposed Project') is a proposal by National Grid Electricity Transmission plc (hereafter referred to as National Grid) to reinforce the transmission network in the South East and East Anglia. The Proposed Project is required to accommodate additional power flows generated from renewable and low carbon generation, as well as accommodating additional new interconnection with mainland Europe.

1.1.2 National Grid owns, builds and maintains the electricity transmission network in England and Wales. Under the Electricity Act 1989, National Grid holds a transmission licence under which it is required to develop and maintain an efficient, coordinated, and economic electricity transmission system.

1.1.3 This would be achieved by reinforcing the network with a High Voltage Direct Current (HVDC) Link between the proposed Friston substation in the Sizewell area of Suffolk and the existing Richborough to Canterbury 400kV overhead line close to Richborough in Kent.

1.1.4 National Grid is also required, under Section 38 of the Electricity Act 1989, to comply with the provisions of Schedule 9 of the Act. Schedule 9 requires licence holders, in the formulation of proposals to transmit electricity, to:

1.1.5 Schedule 9(1)(a) '…have regard to the desirability of preserving natural beauty, of conserving flora, fauna and geological or physiographical features of special interest and of protecting sites, buildings and objects of architectural, historic or archaeological interest;' and

1.1.6 Schedule 9(1)(b) '…do what [it] reasonably can to mitigate any effect which the proposals would have on the natural beauty of the countryside or on any such flora, fauna, features, sites, buildings or objects'.

1.2 The Proposed Project

1.2.1 The Proposed Project would comprise the following elements:

The Suffolk Onshore Scheme

- A connection from the existing transmission network via Friston Substation, including the substation itself. Friston Substation already has development consent as part of other third-party projects. If Friston Substation has already been constructed under another consent, only a connection into the substation would be constructed as part of the Proposed Project.
- A high voltage alternating current (HVAC) underground cable of approximately 1.9 km in length between the proposed Friston Substation and a proposed converter station (below).

- A 2 GW high voltage direct current (HVDC) converter station (including permanent access from the B1121 and a new bridge over the River Fromus) up to 26 m high plus external equipment (such as lightning protection, safety rails for maintenance works, ventilation equipment, aerials, similar small scale operational plant, or other roof treatment) near Saxmundham.
- A HVDC underground cable connection of approximately 10 km in length between the proposed converter station near Saxmundham, and a transition joint bay (TJB) approximately 900 m inshore from a landfall point (below) where the cable transitions from onshore to offshore technology.
- A landfall on the Suffolk coast (between Aldeburgh and Thorpeness).

The Offshore Scheme:

- Approximately 122 km of subsea HVDC cable, running between the Suffolk landfall location (between Aldeburgh and Thorpeness), and the Kent landfall location at Pegwell Bay.

The Kent Onshore Scheme:

- A landfall point on the Kent coast at Pegwell Bay.
- A TJB approximately 800 m inshore to transition from offshore HVDC cable to onshore HVDC cable, before continuing underground for approximately 1.7 km to a new converter station (below).
- A 2 GW HVDC converter station (including a new permanent access off the A256), up to 28 m high plus external equipment such as lightning protection, safety rails for maintenance works, ventilation equipment, aerials, and similar small scale operational plant near Minster. A new substation would be located immediately adjacent.
- Removal of approximately 2.2 km of existing HVAC overhead line, and installation of two sections of new HVAC overhead line, together totalling approximately 3.5 km, each connecting from the substation near Minster and the existing Richborough to Canterbury overhead line.

1.2.2 The Proposed Project also includes modifications to sections of existing overhead lines in Suffolk (only if Friston Substation is not built pursuant to another consent) and Kent, diversions of third-party assets, and land drainage from the construction and operational footprint. It also includes opportunities for environmental mitigation and compensation. The construction phase will involve various temporary construction activities including overhead line diversions, use of temporary towers or masts, working areas for construction equipment and machinery, site offices, parking spaces, storage, accesses, bellmouths, and haul roads, as well as watercourse crossings and the diversion of public rights of way (PROWs) and other ancillary operations.

1.3 Policy and Legislative Context

1.3.1 The Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009 (MCAA) sets out a spatial planning system for improved management and protection of the marine and coastal environment. The MCAA contains provisions for the coastal environment, including improving access to the coast and undertaking Integrated Coastal Zone Management, which brings policy

makers, decision makers and stakeholders together to manage coastal and estuarine areas. Additional information on policy and legislation is presented in **Application Document 6.2.1.2 Part 1 Introduction Chapter 2 Regulatory and Planning Context**.

1.3.2 The Marine Policy Statement (MPS) provides the policy framework for the preparation of Marine Plans, establishing how decisions affecting the marine area should be made in order to enable sustainable development. Whilst policy in relation to the MPS was subsequently set out in more detail in National Policy Statements (NPS), the requirement to take the MPS into account in determining a development consent order (DCO) application nonetheless remains. A review of the Proposed Project in the context of the NPS is provided in the Planning Statement (**Application Document 7.1 Planning Statement**).

1.3.3 The MCAA established the Marine Management Organisation (MMO), the authority tasked with ensuring the delivery of sustainable development in the marine area. Part 3 of the MCAA provides a framework for marine planning. In England, the inshore and offshore waters have been split into 11 plan areas. New applications for a marine licence should include a dedicated marine plan policy assessment.

1.4 East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plan

1.4.1 The Proposed Project overlaps the East Inshore and Offshore Marine Plan Areas and South East Inshore Marine Plan Areas. In this Marine Plan Assessment, the Proposed Project's compliance with the South East Inshore Marine Plan and East Inshore and Offshore Marine Plan policies have been reviewed with references to the relevant ES chapter, where appropriate, to provide further details.

1.5 Marine Policy Assessment

1.5.1 The relevant policies of the East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plan established under them are listed in Table 1.1 and details provided on how these have been considered by the National Grid with relevant mitigation measures outlined as appropriate. The policy text presented in this assessment have been taken directly from the East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plans, with references to where these have been considered in the Environmental Statement, including the Study Areas applied, taken from each of the relevant topic chapters in Volume 6 of this DCO application.

Table 1.1 Marine Plan Policy Assessment

Marine Plan Policy Assessment						
Project:	**Sealink**					
Assessment completed by:	[redacted]	**National Grid**				
East Inshore Marine Plan	**Policy Text**	**Policy screened in or out**	**Assessment of Policy**	**Type of impact**	**Relevant Mitigation**	**Compliance with Marine Plan**
EC1	Proposals that provide economic productivity benefits which are additional to Gross Value Added currently generated by existing activities should be supported.	IN	The Socio-economic impacts and benefits of the Proposed Project are considered in **Application Document 6.2.2.10 Part 2 Suffolk Chapter 10 Socio-Economics, Recreation, and Tourism** and **Application Document 6.2.3.10 Part 3 Suffolk Chapter 10 Socio-Economics, Recreation, and Tourism**. The Proposed Project is a proposal by National Grid Electricity Transmission plc to reinforce the transmission network in the South East of England and East Anglia. The Proposed Project is required to accommodate additional power flows generated from renewable and low carbon energy generation, as well as additional new interconnection with mainland Europe. The south of England transmission region includes boundaries LE1, SC1, SC1.5, SC2 and SC3. The LE1 boundary almost exclusively imports power from the north and west of England into the South East. Power flows in the region are determined by the need to meet domestic demand in the southeast as well as imports and exports to Europe via interconnectors. As more energy is pulled across London and into Kent, power flows across LE1 are set to increase. Demand for electricity will grow;	Improving the existing transmission network	N/A	The Proposed Project is in accordance with the policy objectives

Marine Plan Policy Assessment

Project:	**Sealink**					
Assessment completed by:	[redacted]	**National Grid**				
East Inshore Marine Plan	**Policy Text**	**Policy screened in or out**	**Assessment of Policy**	**Type of impact**	**Relevant Mitigation**	**Compliance with Marine Plan**
			interconnectors will exchange more energy with European countries to help balance intermittent sources of power. As a result, the electricity transmission network in the South East will need to be reinforced to ensure it is able to continue operating safely and securely. The Proposed Project will be making a significant contribution to UK Government's ambitious target of 50GW of generating offshore wind energy by 2030. Further details on the Proposed Project needs case is presented in **Application Document 7.2 Strategic Options Back Check Report** with regards the economic benefit of the Proposed Project.			
EC2	Proposals that provide additional employment benefits should be supported, particularly where these benefits have the potential to meet employment needs in localities close to the marine plan areas.	IN	The Socio-economic impacts and benefits of the Proposed Project are considered in **Application Document 6.2.2.10 Part 2 Suffolk Chapter 10 Socio-Economics, Recreation, and Tourism** and **Application Document 6.2.3.10 Part 3 Suffolk Chapter 10 Socio-Economics, Recreation, and Tourism**. The construction period is expected to take approximately four years. The number of full-time equivalent (FTE) jobs required by the Suffolk Onshore Scheme will vary over the four-year construction period. National Grid estimates that a peak of 414 FTE jobs, and an average of 162 gross direct FTE jobs will be required on-site over the four-year construction period. The number of full-time equivalent (FTE) jobs	Improving the existing transmission network. Employment opportunities	N/A	The Proposed Project is in accordance with the policy objectives

Marine Plan Policy Assessment

Project:	**Sealink**					
Assessment completed by:	[redacted]	**National Grid**				
East Inshore Marine Plan	**Policy Text**	**Policy screened in or out**	**Assessment of Policy**	**Type of impact**	**Relevant Mitigation**	**Compliance with Marine Plan**
			required by the Kent Onshore Scheme will vary over the four-year construction period. The Applicant estimates that a peak of 292 FTE jobs, and an average of 118 gross direct FTE jobs will be required on-site over the four-year construction period.			
EC3	Proposals that will help the East marine plan areas to contribute to offshore wind energy generation should be supported.	IN	The Socio-economic impacts and benefits of the Proposed Project are considered in **Application Document 6.2.2.10 Part 2 Suffolk Chapter 10 Socio-Economics, Recreation, and Tourism** and **Application Document 6.2.3.10 Part 3 Suffolk Chapter 10 Socio-Economics, Recreation, and Tourism.** The Proposed Project is a proposal by National Grid Electricity Transmission plc to reinforce the transmission network in the South East of England and East Anglia. The Proposed Project is required to accommodate additional power flows generated from renewable and low carbon energy generation, as well as additional new interconnection with mainland Europe. The south of England transmission region includes boundaries LE1, SC1, SC1.5, SC2 and SC3. The LE1 boundary almost exclusively imports power from the north and west of England into the South East. Power flows in the region	Improving the existing transmission network. Employment opportunities	N/A	The Proposed Project is in accordance with the policy objectives

Marine Plan Policy Assessment

Project:	**Sealink**					
Assessment completed by:	[redacted]	**National Grid**				
East Inshore Marine Plan	**Policy Text**	**Policy screened in or out**	**Assessment of Policy**	**Type of impact**	**Relevant Mitigation**	**Compliance with Marine Plan**
			are determined by the need to meet domestic demand in the southeast as well as imports and exports to Europe via interconnectors. As more energy is pulled across London and into Kent, power flows across LE1 are set to increase. Demand for electricity will grow; interconnectors will exchange more energy with European countries to help balance intermittent sources of power. As a result, the electricity transmission network in the South East will need to be reinforced to ensure it is able to continue operating safely and securely. The Proposed Project will be making a significant contribution to UK Government's ambitious target of 50GW of generating offshore wind energy by 2030. Further details on the Proposed Project needs case is presented in **Application Document 7.2 Strategic Options Back Check Report** outlining the benefits of the Proposed Project for Offshore Wind Energy.			
SOC1	Proposals that provide health and social well-being benefits including through maintaining, or enhancing, access to the coast and marine area should be supported.	IN	The Proposed Project would maintain access to the coast and marine area. National Grid has committed to using trenchless techniques during landfall construction work in order to reduce disruption on the beach at Suffolk and Kent. During offshore construction, safety zones may be required, however the impacts of these on other sea users and local communities would be localised	Disturbance to other sea users. Local communities	Trenchless installation at landfalls.	The Proposed Project is in accordance with the policy objectives

Marine Plan Policy Assessment

Project:	**Sealink**					
Assessment completed by:	[redacted]	**National Grid**				
East Inshore Marine Plan	**Policy Text**	**Policy screened in or out**	**Assessment of Policy**	**Type of impact**	**Relevant Mitigation**	**Compliance with Marine Plan**
			and temporary, with access retained for the wider marine area.			
SOC2	Proposals that may affect heritage assets should demonstrate, in order of preference: a) that they will not compromise or harm elements which contribute to the significance of the heritage asset b) how, if there is compromise or harm to a heritage asset, this will be minimised c) how, where compromise or harm to a heritage asset cannot be minimised it will be mitigated against or d) the public benefits for proceeding with the proposal if it is not possible to minimise or mitigate compromise or harm to the heritage asset.	IN	The Offshore Scheme has been designed to avoid and/or reduce any impacts to heritage assets (**Application Document 8.1 Corridor Preliminary Routeing and Siting Study (CPRSS)).** A Code of construction practice and Mitigation has been developed through the EIA process and outlined in **Application Document 7.5.3.1 CEMP Appendix A Outline Code of Construction Practice** and **Application Document 7.5.3.2 CEMP Appendix B Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments (REAC)**. A full assessment of coastal and marine heritage assets is presented in **Application Document 6.2.4.6 Part 4 Marine Chapter 6 Marine Archaeology**. With the application of mitigation, it is anticipated that impacts to heritage assets will not be compromised.	Disturbance to archaeological material on the seabed	Preventing impact to known and recorded marine archaeological features and material by micro-siting around all known archaeological anomalies including those considered significant enough to require an Archaeological Exclusion Zone (AEZ). If any archaeological material is discovered, contractors must ensure that the bespoke Protocol for Archaeological Discoveries for the Proposed Project is followed and reporting of material occurs accordingly. Prior to works, contractors must provide contact details as required for the purposes of the Protocol.	The Proposed Project is in accordance with the policy objectives

Marine Plan Policy Assessment

Project:	**Sealink**					
Assessment completed by:	[redacted]	**National Grid**				
East Inshore Marine Plan	**Policy Text**	**Policy screened in or out**	**Assessment of Policy**	**Type of impact**	**Relevant Mitigation**	**Compliance with Marine Plan**
SOC3	Proposals that may affect the terrestrial and marine character of an area should demonstrate, in order of preference: a) that they will not adversely impact the terrestrial and marine character of an area b) how, if there are adverse impacts on the terrestrial and marine character of an area, they will minimise them c) how, where these adverse impacts on the terrestrial and marine character of an area cannot be minimised they will be mitigated against d) the case for proceeding with the proposal if it is not possible to minimise or mitigate the adverse impacts.	IN	The Offshore Scheme is not expected to impact the seascape or marine character of the area as the cable will be buried subsea, with no subsea infrastructure visible. Changes to the Project have been implemented to minimise landscape effects with land based activities (above MHWS) included in a separate Landscape and Visual Assessment in the EIA for the Onshore Schemes and presented in **Application Document 6.2.2.1 Part 2 Suffolk Chapter 1 Landscape & Visual** and **Application Document 6.2.3.1 Part 3 Kent Chapter 1 Landscape & Visual**. The Proposed Project needs case is presented in **Application Document 7.2 Strategic Options Back Check Report**.	Impacts to marine character	Location of terrestrial infrastructure as far as practicable from main highways. Planting and screening. Buildings clad with appropriate material.	The Proposed Project is in accordance with the policy objectives
ECO1	Cumulative impacts affecting the ecosystem of the East marine plans and adjacent areas (marine, terrestrial) should be addressed in decision-making and plan implementation.	IN	Cumulative impacts of the Offshore Scheme of Proposed Project with other plans and projects have been assessed and included in this Environmental Statement (ES). This is presented in **Application Document 6.2.4.11 Part 4 Marine Chapter 11 Inter-Project Cumulative Effects**. No significant cumulative impacts have been identified for the Offshore Scheme. For the Onshore Scheme, cumulative impacts assessments are presented in **Application Document 6.2.2.13 Part 2 Suffolk Chapter 13 Suffolk Onshore Scheme Inter-Project Cumulative Effects** and	Cumulative impacts with other proposed developments	N/A	The Proposed Project is in accordancewith the policy objectives

Marine Plan Policy Assessment

Project:	**Sealink**					
Assessment completed by:	[redacted]	**National Grid**				
East Inshore Marine Plan	**Policy Text**	**Policy screened in or out**	**Assessment of Policy**	**Type of impact**	**Relevant Mitigation**	**Compliance with Marine Plan**
			Application Document 6.2.3.13 Part 3 Kent Chapter 13 Kent Onshore Scheme Inter-Project Cumulative Effects.			
ECO2	The risk of release of hazardous substances as a secondary effect due to any increased collision risk should be taken account of in proposals that require an authorisation.	IN	Accidents and disasters through collisions are presented in **Application Document 6.2.4.7 Part 4 Marine Chapter 7 Shipping and Navigation**. All project vessels must comply with the International Regulations for Preventing Collisions at Sea (1972), regulations relating to International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships (the MARPOL Convention 73/78), with the aim of preventing and minimising pollution from ships and the international Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea (SOLAS, 1974). This is also discussed further within **Application Document 7.5.2 Outline Offshore Construction Environmental Management Plan**.	Release of hazardous substances through vessel collisions.	An offshore Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) including an Emergency Spill Response Plan and Waste Management Plan, Marine Pollution Contingency Plan (MPCP), Shipboard Oil Pollution Emergency Plan (SOPEP) and a dropped objects procedure will be produced prior to installation.	The Proposed Project is in accordance with the policy objectives
BIO1	Appropriate weight should be attached to biodiversity, reflecting the need to protect biodiversity as a whole, taking account of the best available evidence including on habitats and species that are protected or of conservation concern in the East marine plans and adjacent areas (marine, terrestrial).	IN	Volume 6, Part 4 of this ES assesses impacts to biodiversity from the Offshore Scheme as well as **Application Document 6.6 Habitat Regulations Assessment Report** and **Application Document 6.11 Marine Conservation Zone Assessment** for marine protected areas. The mitigation hierarchy for impacts to marine biodiversity has been applied when identifying a marine cable corridor for the	Disturbance to marine habitats and species	Sensitive routeing and siting of infrastructure and temporary works. Collection of project specific baseline data to inform assessments.	The Proposed Project is in accordance with the policy objectives

Marine Plan Policy Assessment

Project:	**Sealink**					
Assessment completed by:	[redacted]	**National Grid**				
East Inshore Marine Plan	**Policy Text**	**Policy screened in or out**	**Assessment of Policy**	**Type of impact**	**Relevant Mitigation**	**Compliance with Marine Plan**
			Offshore Scheme to avoid key sensitive habitats and Marine Protected Areas. Engagement with regulators and stakeholders has been ongoing through statutory and non-statutory consultation. Two offshore survey campaigns have been undertaken for the Proposed Project to gain baseline information of marine biodiversity and features. Relevant literature has also been drawn upon during assessments as required.			
BIO2	Where appropriate, proposals for development should incorporate features that enhance biodiversity and geological interests.	IN	Habitat loss as a result of the Offshore Scheme will be highly localised to the cable corridor, and will not impact wider ecosystem functioning or biodiversity. Furthermore, any habitat disturbance will be temporary and would be expected to recover over short periods of time. The Onshore Schemes of the Proposed Project have considered Biodiversity Net Gain plans in accordance with the Environment Act 2021 and is presented in **Application Document 6.12 Biodiversity Net Gain Feasibility Report**.	Biodiversity Net Gain	Biodiversity Net Gain Strategy	The Proposed Project is in accordance with the policy objectives

Marine Plan Policy Assessment

Project:	**Sealink**					
Assessment completed by:	[redacted]	**National Grid**				
East Inshore Marine Plan	**Policy Text**	**Policy screened in or out**	**Assessment of Policy**	**Type of impact**	**Relevant Mitigation**	**Compliance with Marine Plan**
MPA1	Any impacts on the overall Marine Protected Area network must be taken account of in strategic level measures and assessments, with due regard given to any current agreed advice on an ecologically coherent network.	IN	The mitigation hierarchy for impacts to marine protected areas has been applied when identifying a marine cable corridor. Engagement with regulators and stakeholders has been ongoing through statutory and non-statutory consultation. Relevant literature has also been drawn upon during assessments as required. The Proposed Project intersects the Leiston- Aldeburgh Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), Outer Thames Estuary Special Protection Area (SPA),Southern North Sea Special Area of Conservation (SAC), Sandwich Bay SAC, Thanet Coast and Sandwich Bay SPA and Sandwich Bay to Hacklinge Marshes SSSI. The Proposed Project is not expected to result in Likely Significant Effects to any designated features within these sites, and will not interfere with the conservation objectives. The proposal is therefore considered to be in accordance with the MPA1. Effects on designated sites are considered in **Application Document 6.6 Habitat Regulations Assessment Report** and **Application Document 6.11 Marine Conservation Zone Assessment**.	Disturbance to Marine Protected Areas	Sensitive routeing and siting of infrastructure and temporary works to avoid protected sites where possible. If not feasible, additional mitigation will be adhered to avoid significant effects to sensitive features within these sites.	The Proposed Project is in accordance with the policy objectives

Marine Plan Policy Assessment

Project:	**Sealink**					
Assessment completed by:	[redacted]	**National Grid**				
East Inshore Marine Plan	**Policy Text**	**Policy screened in or out**	**Assessment of Policy**	**Type of impact**	**Relevant Mitigation**	**Compliance with Marine Plan**
CC1	Proposals should take account of: how they may be impacted upon by, and respond to, climate change over their lifetime and how they may impact upon any climate change adaptation measures elsewhere during their lifetime. Where detrimental impacts on climate change adaptation measures are identified, evidence should be provided as to how the proposal will reduce such impacts.	IN	A Climate assessment has been undertaken for the Proposed Project and presented in **Application Document 6.2.5.1 Part 5 Combined Chapter 1 Climate Change**. The environmental assessment concluded that the effects on the global climate by the Proposed Project are likely to be not significant because the Proposed Project's GHG impacts are fully consistent with applicable existing and emerging policy requirements set by the government to support them in reaching their net zero target and move away from the use of fossil fuels. The assessment also concluded that the effect of climate change impacts on the Proposed Project are not anticipated to be significant. Where any climate change impacts are identified they will be manged through the appropriate mitigation.	Climate Change and Green House Gases	Construction workers will undergo training to increase their awareness of environmental issues as applicable to their role on the Proposed Project. Vehicles will be correctly maintained and operated in accordance with manufacturer's recommendations. An offshore Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) including an Emergency Spill Response Plan and Waste Management Plan, Marine Pollution Contingency Plan (MPCP), Shipboard Oil Pollution Emergency Plan (SOPEP) and a dropped objects procedure will be produced prior to installation.	The Proposed Project is in accordance with the policy objectives

Marine Plan Policy Assessment

Project:	**Sealink**					
Assessment completed by:	[redacted]	**National Grid**				
East Inshore Marine Plan	**Policy Text**	**Policy screened in or out**	**Assessment of Policy**	**Type of impact**	**Relevant Mitigation**	**Compliance with Marine Plan**
CC2	Proposals for development should minimise emissions of greenhouse gases as far as is appropriate. Mitigation measures will also be encouraged where emissions remain following minimising steps. Consideration should also be given to emissions from other activities or users affected by the proposal.	IN	A Climate assessment has been undertaken for the Proposed Project and presented in **Application Document 6.2.5.1 Part 5 Combined Chapter 1 Climate Change**. The environmental assessment concluded that the effects on the global climate by the Proposed Project are likely to be not significant because the Proposed Project's GHG impacts are fully consistent with applicable existing and emerging policy requirements set by the government to support them in reaching their net zero target and move away from the use of fossil fuels. The assessment also concluded that the effect of climate change impacts on the Proposed Project are not anticipated to be significant. Where any climate change impacts are identified they will be manged through the appropriate mitigation.	Climate Change and Green House Gases	Construction workers will undergo training to increase their awareness of environmental issues as applicable to their role on the Proposed Project. Vehicles will be correctly maintained and operated in accordance with manufacturer's recommendations. An offshore Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) including an Emergency Spill Response Plan and Waste Management Plan, Marine Pollution Contingency Plan (MPCP), Shipboard Oil Pollution Emergency Plan (SOPEP) and a dropped objects procedure will be produced prior to installation.	The Proposed Project is in accordance with the policy objectives
GOV1	Appropriate provision should be made for infrastructure on land which supports activities in the marine area and vice versa.	IN	The onshore infrastructure required for the Proposed Project is detailed in **Application Document 6.2.1.4 Part 1 Introduction Chapter 4 Description of the Proposed Project**. Of particular relevance to the Marine Plan are the landfall works, where trenchless installation will be undertaken from the onshore landfall area to the subtidal zone in Suffolk and wider intertidal zone in Kent. Port provisions required to support works in the offshore project area will be identified post consent.	Disturbance to other sea users	Outline Construction Environmental Mitigation Plan.	The Proposed Project is in accordance with the policy objectives

Marine Plan Policy Assessment

Project:	**Sealink**					
Assessment completed by:	[redacted]	**National Grid**				
East Inshore Marine Plan	**Policy Text**	**Policy screened in or out**	**Assessment of Policy**	**Type of impact**	**Relevant Mitigation**	**Compliance with Marine Plan**
			This approach is standard for offshore developments, due to commercial and procurement constraints. Where port assumptions are required to inform the assessment, the worst case scenario is described in the relevant ES chapters The Suffolk and Kent Onshore Schemes of the Proposed Project have engaged with LPAs through both statutory and non-Statutory consultation. The Offshore Scheme does not significantly compromise other terrestrial developments or activities in the marine area.			
GOV2	Opportunities for co-existence should be maximised wherever possible.	IN	The Proposed Project has been designed in such a way that allows for future co-location in order to reduce conflict with other developments (**Application Document 6.2.1.3 Part 1 Introduction Chapter 3 Main Alternatives Considered**). Likely significant effects on infrastructure and other marine users have been considered in **Application Document 6.2.4.9 Part 4 Marine Chapter 9 Other Sea Users** and includes offshore wind farms, cables, dredging sites, disposal sites, and Ministry of Defence (MOD) activities. Impacts and mitigation to maximise co-existence with commercial fisheries, shipping and recreational users are discussed in **Application Document 6.2.4.7 Part 4 Marine Chapter 7 Shipping and Navigation** and **Application document 6.2.4.8**	Co-Location	Designated Fisheries Liaison Officer (FLO).Outline Construction Environmental Mitigation Plan.	The Proposed Project is in accordancewith the policy objectives

Marine Plan Policy Assessment

Project:	**Sealink**					
Assessment completed by:	[redacted]	**National Grid**				
East Inshore Marine Plan	**Policy Text**	**Policy screened in or out**	**Assessment of Policy**	**Type of impact**	**Relevant Mitigation**	**Compliance with Marine Plan**
			Part 4 Marine Chapter 8 Commercial Fisheries.			
GOV3	Proposals should demonstrate in order of preference: a) that they will avoid displacement of other existing or authorised (but yet to be implemented) activities b) how, if there are adverse impacts resulting in displacement by the proposal, they will minimise them c) how, if the adverse impacts resulting in displacement by the proposal, cannot be minimised, they will be mitigated against or d) the case for proceeding with the proposal if it is not possible to minimise or mitigate the adverse impacts of displacement	IN	The Proposed Project has undertaken extensive routing and siting in order to reduce impacts to fishermen and fishing grounds and has been presented in the CPRSS **(Application Document 8.1**) as well as summerised in **Application Document 6.2.1.3 Part 1 Introduction Chapter 3 Main Alternatives Considered**. This exercise has taken into account the environmental, physical, technical, commercial and social considerations and opportunities, as well as engineering requirements. To ensure the best accommodation of and minimal disturbance to other activities of importance in the area, National Grid has undertaken pre-application engagement with stakeholders, communities and landowners throughout the site selection process and development of the application. Likely significant effects on infrastructure and other marine users have been considered in **Application Document 6.2.4.8 Part 4 Marine Chapter 8 Commercial Fisheries** and **Application Document 6.2.4.9**	Disturbance to other sea users	Designated Fisheries Liaison Officer (FLO). Outline Construction Environmental Mitigation Plan.	The Proposed Project is in accordance with the policy objectives

Marine Plan Policy Assessment

Project:	**Sealink**					
Assessment completed by:	[redacted]	**National Grid**				
East Inshore Marine Plan	**Policy Text**	**Policy screened in or out**	**Assessment of Policy**	**Type of impact**	**Relevant Mitigation**	**Compliance with Marine Plan**
			Part 4 Marine Chapter 9 Other Sea Users.			
DEF1	Proposals in or affecting Ministry of Defence Danger and Exercise Areas should not be authorised without agreement from the Ministry of Defence.	IN	Kentish Knock military practice and exercise area (PEXA) intersects the Offshore Scheme. Given any safety zones around vessels move at the rate of the associated vessels, any disruption will be localised and short term, representing only a slight increase from baseline conditions.	Disturbance to Military Practice Areas	The MOD will be notified prior to any activities taking place in military practice and exercise areas	The Proposed Project is in accordance with the policy objectives
OG1	Proposals within areas with existing oil and gas production should not be authorised except where compatibility with oil and gas production and infrastructure can be satisfactorily demonstrated.	OUT	There are no oil and gas operations located within the Study Area (10 km of Order Limits). There have also been no oil and gas licence blocks identified within the Study Area. Preliminary effects on oil and gas operations are therefore not considered further in this assessment. Existing oil and gas operations remain unchanged.	N/A	N/A	The Proposed Project is in accordance with the policy objectives

Marine Plan Policy Assessment

Project:	**Sealink**					
Assessment completed by:	[redacted]	**National Grid**				
East Inshore Marine Plan	**Policy Text**	**Policy screened in or out**	**Assessment of Policy**	**Type of impact**	**Relevant Mitigation**	**Compliance with Marine Plan**
OG2	Proposals for new oil and gas activity should be supported over proposals for other development.	OUT	There are no oil and gas operations located within the Study Area (10 km of Order Limits). There have also been no oil and gas licence blocks identified within the Study Area. Preliminary effects on oil and gas operations are therefore not considered further in this assessment. Existing oil and gas operations remain unchanged.	N/A	N/A	The Proposed Project is in accordance with the policy objectives
WIND1	Developments requiring authorisation, that are in or could affect sites held under a lease or an agreement for lease that has been granted by The Crown Estate for development of an Offshore Wind Farm, should not be authorised unless a) they can clearly demonstrate that they will not compromise the construction, operation, maintenance, or decommissioning of the Offshore Wind Farm b) the lease/agreement for lease has been surrendered back to The Crown Estate and not been re-tendered c) the lease/agreement for lease has been terminated by the Secretary of State d) in other exceptional circumstances.	IN	Likely significant effects on infrastructure and other marine users have been considered in **Application Document 6.2.4.8 Part 4 Marine Chapter 8 Commercial Fisheries** and **Application Document 6.2.4.9 Part 4 Marine Chapter 9 Other Sea Users**. The Offshore Scheme intersects or passes within close proximity a number of existing, pre-planning application stage, consented or under construction offshore windfarm export cables. However, the Proposed Project will only restrict development in a relatively narrow corridor of seabed. Once installed, a working zone may be required either side of the submarine cables to enable access for cable maintenance and repair operations. According to subsea cable guidance, the working zone is 500m either side of the existing subsea cable.	Occupancy of the Seabed	The Proposed Project will use 500m Recommended Restricted Zones will be established around all vessels associated with the works.	The Proposed Project is in accordance with the policy objectives

Marine Plan Policy Assessment

Project:	**Sealink**					
Assessment completed by:	[redacted]	**National Grid**				
East Inshore Marine Plan	**Policy Text**	**Policy screened in or out**	**Assessment of Policy**	**Type of impact**	**Relevant Mitigation**	**Compliance with Marine Plan**
WIND2	Proposals for Offshore Wind Farms inside Round 3 zones, including relevant supporting projects and infrastructure, should be supported.	IN	Likely significant effects on infrastructure and other marine users including offshore wind farms have been considered in **Application Document 6.2.4.8 Part 4 Marine Chapter 8 Commercial Fisheries** and **Application Document 6.2.4.9 Part 4 Marine Chapter 9 Other Sea Users** which includes Rounds 2 and 3 zones. The Offshore Scheme intersects or passes within close proximity to a number of existing, pre-planning application stage, consented or under construction offshore windfarm export cables. However, the Proposed Project will only restrict development in a relatively narrow corridor of seabed. Once installed, a working zone may be required either side of the submarine cables to enable access for cable maintenance and repair operations. According to subsea cable guidance, the working zone is 500m either side of the existing subsea cable. The Proposed Project is not expected to restrict the development of offshore wind farms.	Occupancy of the Seabed	The Proposed Project will use 500m Recommended Restricted Zones will be established around all vessels associated with the works.	The Proposed Project is in accordance with the policy objectives

Marine Plan Policy Assessment

Project:	**Sealink**					
Assessment completed by:	[redacted]	**National Grid**				
East Inshore Marine Plan	**Policy Text**	**Policy screened in or out**	**Assessment of Policy**	**Type of impact**	**Relevant Mitigation**	**Compliance with Marine Plan**
TIDE1	In defined areas of identified tidal stream resource, proposals should demonstrate, in order of preference: a) that they will not compromise potential future development of a tidal stream project b) how, if there are any adverse impacts on potential tidal stream deployment, they will minimise them c) how, if the adverse impacts cannot be minimised, they will be mitigated d) the case for proceeding with the proposal if it is not possible to minimise or mitigate the adverse impacts	OUT	The Proposed Project does not fall within the identified tidal stream resource and will not compromise future development of a tidal stream project.	N/A	N/A	The Proposed Project is in accordance with the policy objectives
CCS1	Within defined areas of potential carbon dioxide storage, proposals should demonstrate in order of preference: a) that they will not prevent carbon dioxide storage b) how, if there are adverse impacts on carbon dioxide storage, they will minimise them c) how, if the adverse impacts cannot be minimised, they will be mitigated d) the case for proceeding with the proposal if it is not possible to minimise or mitigate the adverse impacts.	OUT	There are no carbon capture and storage infrastructure located within the Study Area (10 km of Order Limits) and no plans for future facilities were found. Based on current information it is not expected that the Offshore Scheme boundary will cross future carbon capture and storage infrastructure. Existing carbon capture infrastructure remains unchanged.	N/A	N/A	The Proposed Project is in accordancewith the policy objectives

Marine Plan Policy Assessment

Project:	**Sealink**					
Assessment completed by:	[redacted]	**National Grid**				
East Inshore Marine Plan	**Policy Text**	**Policy screened in or out**	**Assessment of Policy**	**Type of impact**	**Relevant Mitigation**	**Compliance with Marine Plan**
CCS2	Carbon Capture and Storage proposals should demonstrate that consideration has been given to the re-use of existing oil and gas infrastructure rather than the installation of new infrastructure (either in depleted fields or in active fields via enhanced hydrocarbon recovery).	OUT	The Proposed Project is not a Carbon Capture and Storage Project. Furthermore, there are no carbon capture and storage infrastructure located within the Study Area (10 km of Order Limits) and no plans for future facilities were found. Based on current information it is not expected that the Offshore Scheme boundary will cross future carbon capture and storage infrastructure. Existing carbon capture infrastructure remains unchanged.	N/A	N/A	The Proposed Project is in accordance with the policy objectives
PS1	Proposals that require static sea surface infrastructure or that significantly reduce under-keel clearance should not be authorised in International Maritime Organization designated routes.	IN	No static sea surface infrastructure is proposed as part of the Offshore Scheme. Under-keel clearance also not likely to significantly reduce and has been considered within **Application Document 6.2.4.8 Part 4 Marine Chapter 8 Commercial Fisheries**.	Reduction in under-keel clearance	A risk based burial approach will be used where cables will be buried to a minimum DOL to the top of the cable of 0.5 m (in areas of bedrock), with a target DOL for the Proposed Project of approximately 1 m to 2.5 m, assessing cable protection risk factors such as sediment type, shallow geology, sediment mobility, fishing activity, shipping movements and anchor deployment along the route.	The Proposed Project is in accordance with the policy objectives
PS2	Proposals that require static sea surface infrastructure that encroaches upon important navigation routes should not be authorised unless there are exceptional circumstances. Proposals should: a) be compatible with the need to maintain space for safe navigation, avoiding adverse economic impact b) anticipate and provide for future safe navigational requirements	IN	No static sea surface infrastructure is proposed as part of the Offshore Scheme. Under-keel clearance also not likely to significantly reduce and has been considered within our EIA in **Application Document 6.2.4.8 Part 4 Marine Chapter 8 Commercial Fisheries**.	Reduction in under-keel clearance	A risk based burial approach will be used where cables will be buried to a minimum DOL to the top of the cable of 0.5 m (in areas of bedrock), with a target DOL for the Proposed Project of approximately 1 m to 2.5 m, assessing cable protection risk factors such as sediment type, shallow geology, sediment mobility, fishing activity, shipping movements and	The Proposed Project is in accordance with the policy objectives

Marine Plan Policy Assessment

Project:	**Sealink**					
Assessment completed by:	[redacted]	**National Grid**				
East Inshore Marine Plan	**Policy Text**	**Policy screened in or out**	**Assessment of Policy**	**Type of impact**	**Relevant Mitigation**	**Compliance with Marine Plan**
	where evidence and/or stakeholder input allows and c) account for impacts upon navigation in-combination with other existing and proposed activities				anchor deployment along the route.	
PS3	Proposals should demonstrate, in order of preference: a) that they will not interfere with current activity and future opportunity for expansion of ports and harbours b) how, if the proposal may interfere with current activity and future opportunities for expansion, they will minimise this c) how, if the interference cannot be minimised, it will be mitigated d) the case for proceeding if it is not possible to minimise or mitigate the interference.	IN	Impacts to Shipping and Navigation from the Offshore Scheme are either broadly acceptable or tolerable if as low as reasonably practicable (ALARP). The Proposed Project does not interfere with the expansion of ports and harbours in the Study Area. As such, the risks and therefore any significant effects are considered to be tolerable and ALARP. A detailed assessment is presented in **Application Document 6.2.4.7 Part 4 Marine Chapter 7 Shipping and Navigation**.	Disturbance to shipping and navigation	Timely and efficient communication will be given to sea users in the area via Notices to Mariners (NtM), Kingfisher Bulletins, Navigational Telex (NAVTEX), and Navigational Areas (NAVAREA) warnings.	The Proposed Project is in accordance with the policy objectives

Marine Plan Policy Assessment

Project:	**Sealink**					
Assessment completed by:	[redacted]	**National Grid**				
East Inshore Marine Plan	**Policy Text**	**Policy screened in or out**	**Assessment of Policy**	**Type of impact**	**Relevant Mitigation**	**Compliance with Marine Plan**
DD1	Proposals within or adjacent to licensed dredging and disposal areas should demonstrate, in order of preference a) that they will not adversely impact dredging and disposal activities b) how, if there are adverse impacts on dredging and disposal, they will minimise these c) how, if the adverse impacts cannot be minimised they will be mitigated d) the case for proceeding with the proposal if it is not possible to minimise or mitigate the adverse impacts.	IN	A detailed Shipping and Navigation assessment is presented in **Application Document 6.2.4.7 Part 4 Marine Chapter 7 Shipping and Navigation**. Several navigational dredging sites have been identified in the Study Area (10 km of Order Limits), including Harwich Haven navigation channel, Pegwell Bay, North West Shipwash dredging site, the London Gateway Port navigation channel, the Inner Gabbard dredging area, Greater Gabbard dredging area and Project 8 Windserver dredging area. Several licensed disposal sites have also been identified in the study area, including the Inner Gabbard, Inner Gabbard East disposal site, EA One Route EC-3 disposal area, and Harwich Haven disposal site. A number of closed and disused disposal sites have also been identified within the Study Area. Any disturbance from the physical presence of vessels will be temporary, with any restrictions to commercial operations short term and representing only a very slight change from baseline conditions.	Physical presence of vessels	Timely and efficient communication will be given to sea users in the area via Notices to Mariners (NtM), Kingfisher Bulletins, Navigational Telex (NAVTEX), and Navigational Areas (NAVAREA) warnings.	The Proposed Project is in accordance with the policy objectives

Marine Plan Policy Assessment

Project:	**Sealink**					
Assessment completed by:	[redacted]	**National Grid**				
East Inshore Marine Plan	**Policy Text**	**Policy screened in or out**	**Assessment of Policy**	**Type of impact**	**Relevant Mitigation**	**Compliance with Marine Plan**
AGG1	Proposals in areas where a licence for extraction of aggregates has been granted or formally applied for should not be authorised unless there are exceptional circumstances.	IN	There are a number of mineral and aggregate extraction areas located within the Study Area (10 km of Order Limits). Although these areas do not overlap with the Offshore Scheme, three are located within 1 km. Minor vessel routing changes may be required due to increased vessel movements and the presence of any safety zones. Any disturbance from the physical presence of vessels will be temporary, with any restrictions to commercial operations short term and representing only a very slight change from baseline conditions.	Physical presence of vessels	Timely and efficient communication will be given to sea users in the area via Notices to Mariners (NtM), Kingfisher Bulletins, Navigational Telex (NAVTEX), and Navigational Areas (NAVAREA) warnings.	The Proposed Project is in accordance with the policy objectives
AGG2	Proposals within an area subject to an Exploration and Option Agreement with The Crown Estate should not be supported unless it is demonstrated that the other development or activity is compatible with aggregate extraction or there are exceptional circumstances.	IN	There are a number of mineral and aggregate extraction areas located within the Study Area (10 km of Order Limits). Although these areas do not overlap with the Offshore Scheme, three are located within 1 km. Minor vessel routing changes may be required due to increased vessel movements and the presence of any safety zones. Any disturbance from the physical presence of vessels will be temporary, with any restrictions to commercial operations short term and representing only a very slight change from baseline conditions. No future site agreements have been identified along the cable route during this assessment. The Proposed Project is therefore considered compatible with baseline conditions.	Physical presence of vessels, Occupancy of the Seabed	Timely and efficient communication will be given to sea users in the area via Notices to Mariners (NtM), Kingfisher Bulletins, Navigational Telex (NAVTEX), and Navigational Areas (NAVAREA) warnings.	The Proposed Project is in accordance with the policy objectives

Marine Plan Policy Assessment

Project:	**Sealink**					
Assessment completed by:	[redacted]	**National Grid**				
East Inshore Marine Plan	**Policy Text**	**Policy screened in or out**	**Assessment of Policy**	**Type of impact**	**Relevant Mitigation**	**Compliance with Marine Plan**
AGG3	Within defined areas of high potential aggregate resource, proposals should demonstrate in order of preference: a) that they will not, prevent aggregate extraction b) how, if there are adverse impacts on aggregate extraction, they will minimise these c) how, if the adverse impacts cannot be minimised, they will be mitigated d) the case for proceeding with the application if it is not possible to minimise or mitigate the adverse impacts.	IN	There are a number of mineral and aggregate extraction areas located within the Study Area (10 km of Order Limits). Although these areas do not overlap with the Offshore Scheme, three are located within 1 km. Minor vessel routing changes may be required due to increased vessel movements and the presence of any safety zones. No future site agreements have been identified along the cable route during this assessment. Seabed occupancy will be restricted to the order limits.	Occupancy of the seabed	Timely and efficient communication will be given to sea users in the area via Notices to Mariners (NtM), Kingfisher Bulletins, Navigational Telex (NAVTEX), and Navigational Areas (NAVAREA) warnings.	The Proposed Project is in accordancewith the policy objectives
CAB1	Preference should be given to proposals for cable installation where the method of installation is burial. Where burial is not achievable, decisions should take account of protection measures for the cable that may be proposed by the applicant.	IN	The Offshore Scheme is proposing cable burial as the primary method of installation across the cable route.	Cable Burial	A risk based burial approach will be used where cables will be buried to a minimum DOL to the top of the cable of 0.5 m (in areas of bedrock), with a target DOL for the Proposed Project of approximately 1 m to 2.5 m, assessing cable protection risk factors such as sediment type, shallow geology, sediment mobility, fishing activity, shipping movements and anchor deployment along the route.	The Proposed Project is in accordance with the policy objectives

Marine Plan Policy Assessment

Project:	**Sealink**					
Assessment completed by:	[redacted]	**National Grid**				
East Inshore Marine Plan	**Policy Text**	**Policy screened in or out**	**Assessment of Policy**	**Type of impact**	**Relevant Mitigation**	**Compliance with Marine Plan**
FISH1	Within areas of fishing activity, proposals should demonstrate in order of preference: a) that they will not prevent fishing activities on, or access to, fishing grounds b) how, if there are adverse impacts on the ability to undertake fishing activities or access to fishing grounds, they will minimise them c) how, if the adverse impacts cannot be minimised, they will be mitigated d) the case for proceeding with their proposal if it is not possible to minimise or mitigate the adverse impacts	IN	The Proposed Project has undertaken extensive routing and siting in order to reduce impacts to fishermen and fishing grounds. Avoidance of sensitive areas has been incorporated in to the design where feasible as presented in the CPRSS (**Application Document 8.1 Corridor Preliminary Routeing and Substation Siting study (October 2022**)).	Displacement of fishing activity	A Fisheries Liaison Officer (FLO) and fisheries working group(s) will be maintained throughout installation to ensure project information is effectively disseminated, dialogue is maintained with the commercial fishing industry and access to home ports is maintained during the main fishing season. Timings of any temporary areas of exclusion from fishing grounds will be clearly communicated via a notice to mariners. Berms will be installed where cable protection is necessary. These will be designed with a 1:3 profile and flat crests, intended to prevent the risk of fishing gears snagging. A procedure for the claim of loss of/or damage to fishing gear will be developed.	The Proposed Project is in accordance with the policy objectives

Marine Plan Policy Assessment

Project:	**Sealink**					
Assessment completed by:	[redacted]	**National Grid**				
East Inshore Marine Plan	**Policy Text**	**Policy screened in or out**	**Assessment of Policy**	**Type of impact**	**Relevant Mitigation**	**Compliance with Marine Plan**
FISH2	Proposals should demonstrate, in order of preference: a) that they will not have an adverse impact upon spawning and nursery areas and any associated habitat b) how, if there are adverse impacts upon the spawning and nursery areas and any associated habitat, they will minimise them c) how, if the adverse impacts cannot be minimised they will be mitigated d) the case for proceeding with their proposals if it is not possible to minimise or mitigate the adverse impacts.	IN	The Offshore Scheme is known to pass through spawning grounds for both herring and sandeel. Suitable spawning habitat for herring and sandeel was also recorded sporadically within the Offshore Scheme as part of the project specific benthic characterisation survey in 2021. The spatial extent of temporary disturbance to herring spawning and sandeel grounds is considered low in the context of alternative available habitat surrounding the Offshore Scheme and the wider North Sea. Although suitable habitat for herring was identified along the southern sections of the Offshore Scheme, this area falls outside of the known Southern Bight spawning area where higher levels of IHLS larvae have been recorded. A detailed assessment of herring and sandeel spawning grounds is presented in **Application Document 6.3.4.3.A Appendix 4.3.A Herring and Sandeel Assessment**. Additionally, impacts to spawning and nursery grounds have been mitigated through the Special Protection Area seasonal restriction for Red - Throated Diver between November and January. Impacts have been assessed as not significant.	Disturbance to spawning and nursery grounds	Sensitive routeing and siting of infrastructure and temporary works;	The Proposed Project is in accordance with the policy objectives

Marine Plan Policy Assessment

Project:	**Sealink**					
Assessment completed by:	[redacted]	**National Grid**				
East Inshore Marine Plan	**Policy Text**	**Policy screened in or out**	**Assessment of Policy**	**Type of impact**	**Relevant Mitigation**	**Compliance with Marine Plan**
AQ1	Within sustainable aquaculture development sites (identified through research), proposals should demonstrate in order of preference: a) that they will avoid adverse impacts on future aquaculture development by altering the sea bed or water column in ways which would cause adverse impacts to aquaculture productivity or potential b) how, if there are adverse impacts on aquaculture development, they can be minimised c) how, if the adverse impacts cannot be minimised they will be mitigated d) the case for proceeding with the proposal if it is not possible to minimise or mitigate the adverse impacts	IN	The Study Area (10 km from Order Limits) is intersected by the Outer Thames shellfish waters; however, the Offshore Scheme boundary does not intersect this shellfish water boundary and is located at a distance of over 5 km. Any disturbance from the physical presence of vessels will be temporary, with any restrictions to commercial operations short term, representing only a slight increase from baseline conditions.	Disturbance to fish and shellfish waters	Sensitive routeing and siting of infrastructure and temporary works;	The Proposed Project is in accordance with the policy objectives
TR1	Proposals for development should demonstrate that during construction and operation, in order of preference: a) they will not adversely impact tourism and recreation activities b) how, if there are adverse impacts on tourism and recreation activities, they will minimise them c) how, if the adverse impacts cannot be minimised, they will be mitigated d) the case for proceeding with the proposal if it is not possible to minimise or mitigate the adverse impacts.	IN	Likely significant effects to tourism and recreation during construction and operation is presented in **Application Document 6.2.2.10 Part 2 Suffolk Chapter 10 Socio-Economics, Recreation, and Tourism** and **Application Document 6.2.3.10 Part 3 Kent Chapter 10 Socio-Economics, Recreation and Tourism**. Likely significant effects to other sea users is presented in **Application Document 6.2.4.9 Part 4 Marine Chapter 9 Other Sea Users**. No significant adverse impacts on tourism and recreation are anticipated. Although works during construction, maintenance and decommissioning may temporarily disrupt activities at both landfalls and nearshore for the short term,	Disturbance to recreational boating and angling	Communications with other vessels in the area will be maintained throughout construction, maintenance and decommissioning, and the works will be notified under Notices to Mariners. Recreational boaters will also be advised to the timing and location of works in the nearshore / inter-tidal area.	The Proposed Project is in accordancewith the policy objectives

Marine Plan Policy Assessment

Project:	**Sealink**					
Assessment completed by:	[redacted]	**National Grid**				
East Inshore Marine Plan	**Policy Text**	**Policy screened in or out**	**Assessment of Policy**	**Type of impact**	**Relevant Mitigation**	**Compliance with Marine Plan**
			recreational sailors will be able to use other areas in close proximity.			
TR2	Proposals that require static objects in the East marine plan areas, should demonstrate, in order of preference: a) that they will not adversely impact on recreational boating routes b) how, if there are adverse impacts on recreational boating routes, they will minimise them c) how, if the adverse impacts cannot be minimised, they will be mitigated d) the case for proceeding with the proposal if it is not possible to minimise or mitigate the adverse impacts	IN	No offshore static objects are included as part of the Proposed Project as the cable will be buried. Likely significant effects to tourism and recreation is presented in **Application Document 6.2.2.10 Part 2 Suffolk Chapter 10 Socio-Economics, Recreation, and Tourism** and **Application Document 6.2.3.10 Part 3 Kent Chapter 10 Socio-Economics, Recreation and Tourism**. Likely significant effects to other sea users is presented in **Application Document 6.2.4.9 Part 4 Marine Chapter 9 Other Sea Users**. No significant adverse impacts on tourism and recreation are anticipated. Although works during construction, maintenance and decommissioning may temporarily disrupt activities at both landfalls and nearshore for the short term, recreational sailors will be able to use other areas in close proximity.	Disturbance to recreational boating and angling	Communications with other vessels in the area will be maintained throughout construction, maintenance and decommissioning, and the works will be notified under Notices to Mariners. Recreational boaters will also be advised to the timing and location of works in the nearshore / inter-tidal area.	The Proposed Project is in accordance with the policy objectives

Marine Plan Policy Assessment

Project:	**Sealink**					
Assessment completed by:	[redacted]	**National Grid**				
East Inshore Marine Plan	**Policy Text**	**Policy screened in or out**	**Assessment of Policy**	**Type of impact**	**Relevant Mitigation**	**Compliance with Marine Plan**
TR3	Proposals that deliver tourism and/or recreation related benefits in communities adjacent to the East marine plan areas should be supported.	IN	Likely significant effects to tourism and recreation is presented in **Application Document 6.2.2.10 Part 2 Suffolk Chapter 10 Socio-Economics, Recreation, and Tourism** and **Application Document 6.2.3.10 Part 3 Kent Chapter 10 Socio-Economics, Recreation and Tourism**. The Proposed Project is not proposing measures to promote or facilitate sustainable tourism to the marine area as part of the Offshore Scheme. No significant adverse impacts on sustainable tourism are anticipated. Likely significant effects to other sea users is presented in **Application Document 6.2.4.9 Part 4 Marine Chapter 9 Other Sea Users**. The additional presence of project vessels during construction could interfere with and provide obstacles in an area which is already characterised with high density vessel traffic. Although works during construction, maintenance and decommissioning may temporarily disrupt activities at both landfalls and nearshore for the short term, sailors will be able to use other areas in close proximity.	Disturbance to recreational boating and angling	Communications with other vessels in the area will be maintained throughout construction, maintenance and decommissioning, and the works will be notified under Notices to Mariners. Recreational boaters will also be advised to the timing and location of works in the nearshore / inter-tidal area.	The Proposed Project is in accordance with the policy objectives
South East Inshore Marine Plan	**Policy Text**	**Policy screened in or out**	**Justification for screening (including specific references to Marine Plan pages etc. if required)**	**Type of impact**	**Mitigation or how any impacts will be addressed**	**Final policy assessment**

Marine Plan Policy Assessment

Project:	**Sealink**					
Assessment completed by:	[redacted]	**National Grid**				
East Inshore Marine Plan	**Policy Text**	**Policy screened in or out**	**Assessment of Policy**	**Type of impact**	**Relevant Mitigation**	**Compliance with Marine Plan**
SE-INF-1	Proposals for appropriate marine infrastructure which facilitates land-based activities, or land based infrastructure which facilitates marine activities (including the diversification or regeneration of sustainable marine industries), should be supported.	IN	The onshore infrastructure required for the Proposed Project is detailed in **Application Document 6.2.1.4 Part 1 Introduction Chapter 4 Description of the Proposed Project**. Of particular relevance to the Marine Plan are the landfall works, where trenchless installation will be undertaken from the onshore landfall area to the subtidal zone in Suffolk and wider intertidal zone in Kent. Port provisions required to support works in the Offshore Scheme will be identified post consent. This approach is standard for offshore developments, due to commercial and procurement constraints. Where port assumptions are required to inform the assessment, the worst case scenario is described in the relevant ES chapters. The extensive benefits of the Proposed Project are detailed in the Strategic Options Report (**Application Document 7.2 Strategic Options Back Check Report**).	Improving the existing transmission network	N/A	The Proposed Project is in accordance with the policy objectives

Marine Plan Policy Assessment

Project:	**Sealink**					
Assessment completed by:	[redacted]	**National Grid**				
East Inshore Marine Plan	**Policy Text**	**Policy screened in or out**	**Assessment of Policy**	**Type of impact**	**Relevant Mitigation**	**Compliance with Marine Plan**
SE-INF-2	(1) Proposals for alternative development at existing safeguarded landing facilities will not be supported. (2) Proposals adjacent and opposite existing safeguarded landing facilities must demonstrate that they avoid significant adverse impacts on existing safeguarded landing facilities. (3) Proposals for alternative development at existing landing facilities (excluding safeguarded sites) should not be supported unless that facility is no longer viable or capable of being made viable for waterborne transport. (4) Proposals adjacent and opposite existing landing facilities (excluding safeguarded sites) that may have significant adverse impacts on the landing facilities should demonstrate that they will, in order of preference: a) avoid b) minimise c) mitigate - adverse impacts so they are no longer significant.	Out	The Offshore Scheme is not located near safeguarded landing facilities. Existing facilities will remain unchanged.	N/A	N/A	The Proposed Project is in accordance with the policy objectives
SE-CO-1	Proposals that optimise the use of space and incorporate opportunities for co-existence and cooperation with existing activities will be supported. Proposals that may have significant adverse impacts on, or displace, existing activities must demonstrate that they will, in order of preference: a) avoid b) minimise c) mitigate - adverse impacts so they are no longer significant. If it is not	IN	The Proposed Project has been designed in such a way that allows for future co-location and co-existence with other existing developments. Likely significant effects on infrastructure and other marine users have been considered in **Application Document 6.2.4.9 Part 4 Marine Chapter 9 Other Sea Users** and includes offshore wind farms, cables, dredging sites, disposal sites, and Ministry of Defence	Co-Location and co-existence	Designated Fisheries Liaison Officer (FLO). Outline Construction Environmental Mitigation Plan.	The Proposed Project is in accordance with the policy objectives

Marine Plan Policy Assessment

Project:	**Sealink**					
Assessment completed by:	[redacted]	**National Grid**				
East Inshore Marine Plan	**Policy Text**	**Policy screened in or out**	**Assessment of Policy**	**Type of impact**	**Relevant Mitigation**	**Compliance with Marine Plan**
	possible to mitigate significant adverse impacts, proposals must state the case for proceeding.		(MOD) activities. Impacts and mitigation to maximise co-existence with commercial fisheries, shipping and recreational users are discussed in **Application Document 6.2.4.7 Part 4 Marine Chapter 7 Shipping and Navigation** and **Application document 6.3.4.8 Part 4 Marine Chapter 8 Commercial Fisheries**.			
SE-AGG-1	Proposals in areas where a licence for extraction of aggregates has been granted or formally applied for should not be authorised, unless it is demonstrated that the proposal is compatible with aggregate extraction.	IN	Likely significant effects on infrastructure and other marine users have been considered in **Application Document 6.2.4.8 Part 4 Marine Chapter 8 Commercial Fisheries** and **Application Document 6.2.4.9 Part 4 Marine Chapter 9 Other Sea Users**. There are a number of mineral and aggregate extraction areas located within the Study Area (10 km of Order Limits). Although these areas do not overlap with the Offshore Scheme, three are located within 1 km. Minor vessel routing changes may be required due to increased vessel movements and the presence of any safety zones. Any disturbance from the physical presence of vessels will be temporary, with any restrictions to commercial operations short term and representing only a very slight change from baseline conditions. The Proposed Project is therefore compatible with the existing baseline.	Physical presence of vessels	Timely and efficient communication will be given to sea users in the area via Notices to Mariners (NtM), Kingfisher Bulletins, Navigational Telex (NAVTEX), and Navigational Areas (NAVAREA) warnings.	The Proposed Project is in accordance with the policy objectives

Marine Plan Policy Assessment

Project:	**Sealink**					
Assessment completed by:	[redacted]	**National Grid**				
East Inshore Marine Plan	**Policy Text**	**Policy screened in or out**	**Assessment of Policy**	**Type of impact**	**Relevant Mitigation**	**Compliance with Marine Plan**
SE-AGG-2	Proposals within an area subject to an Exploration and Option Agreement with The Crown Estate should not be supported unless it is demonstrated that the proposal is compatible with aggregate extraction.	IN	Likely significant effects on infrastructure and other marine users have been considered in **Application Document 6.2.4.8** and **Application Document 6.2.4.9 Part 4 Marine Chapter 9 Other Sea Users**. There are a number of mineral and aggregate extraction areas located within the Study Area (10 km of Order Limits). Although these areas do not overlap with the Offshore Scheme, three are located within 1 km. Minor vessel routing changes may be required due to increased vessel movements and the presence of any safety zones. Any disturbance from the physical presence of vessels will be temporary, with any restrictions to commercial operations short term and representing only a very slight change from baseline conditions. No future site agreements have been identified along the cable route during this assessment. Therefore the Proposed Project will not prevent current or future extraction.	Physical presence of vessels, Occupancy of the Seabed	Timely and efficient communication will be given to sea users in the area via Notices to Mariners (NtM), Kingfisher Bulletins, Navigational Telex (NAVTEX), and Navigational Areas (NAVAREA) warnings.	The Proposed Project is in accordance with the policy objectives

Marine Plan Policy Assessment

Project:	**Sealink**					
Assessment completed by:	[redacted]	**National Grid**				
East Inshore Marine Plan	**Policy Text**	**Policy screened in or out**	**Assessment of Policy**	**Type of impact**	**Relevant Mitigation**	**Compliance with Marine Plan**
SE-AGG-3	Proposals in areas of high potential aggregate resource that may have significant adverse impacts on future aggregate extraction should demonstrate that they will, in order of preference: a) avoid b) minimise c) mitigate - significant adverse impacts on future aggregate extraction so they are no longer significant. If it is not possible to mitigate significant adverse impacts, proposals should state the case for proceeding.	IN	Likely significant effects on infrastructure and other marine users have been considered in **Application Document 6.2.4.8 Part 4 Marine Chapter 8 Commercial Fisheries** and **Application Document 6.2.4.9 Part 4 Marine Chapter 9 Other Sea Users**. There are a number of mineral and aggregate extraction areas located within the Study Area (10 km of Order Limits). Although these areas do not overlap with the Offshore Scheme, three are located within 1 km. Minor vessel routing changes may be required due to increased vessel movements and the presence of any safety zones. Any disturbance from the physical presence of vessels will be temporary, with any restrictions to commercial operations short term and representing only a very slight change from baseline conditions. No future site agreements have been identified along the cable route during this assessment and the seabed occupancy will be restricted to the order limits. Therefore the Proposed Project will not prevent current or future extraction of aggregate resources.	Occupancy of the seabed	Timely and efficient communication will be given to sea users in the area via Notices to Mariners (NtM), Kingfisher Bulletins, Navigational Telex (NAVTEX), and Navigational Areas (NAVAREA) warnings.	The Proposed Project is in accordancewith the policy objectives
SE-AQ-1	Proposals within existing or potential strategic areas of sustainable aquaculture production must demonstrate consideration of and compatibility with sustainable aquaculture production. Where compatibility is not possible, proposals that may have	IN	The Study Area (10 km from Order Limits) is intersected by the Outer Thames shellfish waters; however, the Offshore Scheme boundary does not intersect this shellfish water boundary and is located at a distance of over 5 km. Any disturbance from the physical presence of vessels will be	Disturbance to fish and shellfish waters	Sensitive routeing and siting of infrastructure and temporary works;	The Proposed Project is in accordance with the policy objectives

Marine Plan Policy Assessment

Project:	**Sealink**					
Assessment completed by:	[redacted]	**National Grid**				
East Inshore Marine Plan	**Policy Text**	**Policy screened in or out**	**Assessment of Policy**	**Type of impact**	**Relevant Mitigation**	**Compliance with Marine Plan**
	significant adverse impacts on sustainable aquaculture production must demonstrate that they will, in order of preference: a) avoid b) minimise c) mitigate - adverse impacts on sustainable aquaculture production so they are no longer significant. If it is not possible to mitigate significant adverse impacts, proposals should state the case for proceeding.		temporary, with any restrictions to commercial operations short term, representing only a slight increase from baseline conditions. The Proposed Project is therefore compatible with the existing baseline.			
SE-AQ-2	Proposals enabling the provision of infrastructure for sustainable aquaculture and related industries will be supported.	OUT	The Offshore Scheme will not directly contribute or facilitate sustainable aquaculture. Existing sustainable aquaculture will remain unchanged.	N/A	N/A	The Proposed Project is in accordance with the policy objectives
SE-CAB-1	Preference should be given to proposals for cable installation where the method of protection is burial. Where burial is not achievable, decisions should take account of protection measures for the cable that may be proposed by the applicant. Where burial or protection measures are not appropriate, proposals should state the case for proceeding without those measures.	IN	The Offshore Scheme is proposing cable burial as the primary method of installation across the cable route.	Cable Burial	A risk based burial approach will be used where cables will be buried to a minimum DOL to the top of the cable of 0.5 m (in areas of bedrock), with a target DOL for the Proposed Project of approximately 1 m to 2.5 m, assessing cable protection risk factors such as sediment type, shallow geology, sediment mobility, fishing activity, shipping movements and anchor deployment along the route.	The Proposed Project is in accordance with the policy objectives

Marine Plan Policy Assessment

Project:	**Sealink**					
Assessment completed by:	[redacted]	**National Grid**				
East Inshore Marine Plan	**Policy Text**	**Policy screened in or out**	**Assessment of Policy**	**Type of impact**	**Relevant Mitigation**	**Compliance with Marine Plan**
SE-CAB-2	Proposals demonstrating compatibility with existing landfall sites and incorporating measures to enable development of future landfall opportunities should be supported. Where this is not possible proposals will, in order of preference: a) avoid b) minimise c) mitigate - adverse impacts on existing and potential future landfall sites so they are no longer significant. If it is not possible to mitigate significant adverse impacts, proposals should state the case for proceeding.	IN	The Proposed Project has been designed in such a way that allows for future co-location. An extensive routing and siting process has been undertaken to optimise space for Sea Link in consideration of current and future developments.	Co-Location	N/A	The Proposed Project is in accordance with the policy objectives
SE-CAB-3	Where seeking to locate close to existing subsea cables, proposals should demonstrate compatibility with ongoing function, maintenance and decommissioning activities relating to the cable.	IN	Cable owners are, and will continue to be, consulted by the Applicant during the pre-construction development of the Project. The Proposed Project has been designed in such a way that allows for future co-location. Any necessary commercial and technical agreements would be put in place ahead of the commencement of construction which may include crossing and proximity agreements that would be agreed post-consent during the wind farm design period to ensure coexistence. An extensive routing and siting process has been undertaken to optimise space for Sea Link in consideration of current and future developments. The cable system installation is designed such that a regular maintenance regime is not required to maintain the integrity of the link. An initial	Co-Location	N/A	The Proposed Project is in accordance with the policy objectives

Marine Plan Policy Assessment

Project:	**Sealink**					
Assessment completed by:	[redacted]	**National Grid**				
East Inshore Marine Plan	**Policy Text**	**Policy screened in or out**	**Assessment of Policy**	**Type of impact**	**Relevant Mitigation**	**Compliance with Marine Plan**
			decommissioning plan will be written once the final route and installation methodology is engineered by the Contractor. This will be in accordance with all applicable legislation and best practice guidance at the time of compilation.			
SE-DD-1	In areas of authorised dredging activity, including those subject to navigational dredging, proposals for other activities will not be supported unless they are compatible with the dredging activity.	IN	A detailed Shipping and Navigation assessment is presented in **Application Document 6.2.4.7 Part 4 Marine Chapter 7 Shipping and Navigation**. Several navigational dredging sites have been identified in the Study Area (10 km of Order Limits), including Harwich Haven navigation channel, Pegwell Bay, North West Shipwash dredging site, the London Gateway Port navigation channel, the Inner Gabbard dredging area, Greater Gabbard dredging area and Project 8 Windserver dredging area. Several licensed disposal sites have also been identified in the study area, including the Inner Gabbard, Inner Gabbard East disposal site, EA One Route EC-3 disposal area, and Harwich Haven disposal site. A number of closed and disused disposal sites have also been identified within the Study Area. Any disturbance from the physical presence of vessels will be temporary, with any restrictions to commercial	Physical presence of vessels	Timely and efficient communication will be given to sea users in the area via Notices to Mariners (NtM), Kingfisher Bulletins, Navigational Telex (NAVTEX), and Navigational Areas (NAVAREA) warnings.	The Proposed Project is in accordance with the policy objectives

Marine Plan Policy Assessment

Project:	**Sealink**					
Assessment completed by:	[redacted]	**National Grid**				
East Inshore Marine Plan	**Policy Text**	**Policy screened in or out**	**Assessment of Policy**	**Type of impact**	**Relevant Mitigation**	**Compliance with Marine Plan**
			operations short term and representing only a very slight change from baseline conditions. The Proposed Project is therefore compatible with the existing baseline.			
SE-DD-2	Proposals that cause significant adverse impacts on licensed disposal sites should not be supported. Proposals that may have significant adverse impacts on licensed disposal sites must demonstrate that they will, in order of preference: a) avoid b) minimise c) mitigate - adverse impacts so they are no longer significant. If it is not possible to mitigate the significant adverse impacts, proposals must state the case for proceeding.	IN	A detailed Shipping and Navigation assessment is presented in **Application Document 6.2.4.7 Part 4 Marine Chapter 7 Shipping and Navigation**. Several navigational dredging sites have been identified in the Study Area (10 km of Order Limits), including Harwich Haven navigation channel, Pegwell Bay, North West Shipwash dredging site, the London Gateway Port navigation channel, the Inner Gabbard dredging area, Greater Gabbard dredging area and Project 8 Windserver dredging area. Several licensed disposal sites have also been identified in the study area, including the Inner Gabbard, Inner Gabbard East disposal site, EA One Route EC-3 disposal area, and Harwich Haven disposal site. A number of closed and disused disposal sites have also been identified within the Study Area. Any disturbance from the physical presence of vessels will be temporary, with any restrictions to commercial	Physical presence of vessels Occupancy of the Seabed	Timely and efficient communication will be given to sea users in the area via Notices to Mariners (NtM), Kingfisher Bulletins, Navigational Telex (NAVTEX), and Navigational Areas (NAVAREA) warnings.	The Proposed Project is in accordance with the policy objectives

Marine Plan Policy Assessment

Project:	**Sealink**					
Assessment completed by:	[redacted]	**National Grid**				
East Inshore Marine Plan	**Policy Text**	**Policy screened in or out**	**Assessment of Policy**	**Type of impact**	**Relevant Mitigation**	**Compliance with Marine Plan**
			operations short term and representing only a very slight change from baseline conditions. The Proposed Project will not have a significant impact on existing licenced disposal sites and is therefore compatible with the existing baseline.			
SE-DD-3	Proposals for the disposal of dredged material must demonstrate that they have been assessed against the waste hierarchy. Where there is the need to identify new dredge disposal sites, including alternative use sites, proposals should be supported if they conform to best practice and guidance.	IN	Dredge and disposal is not included as part of the Offshore Scheme activities, however pre-sweeping activities are expected to occur between KP96.32 to KP113.883. Sand will be deposited within the Order Limits within the area of pre-sweeping in such a way that the local currents will not backfill the pre-sweep area prior to cable installation and protection.	Disturbance to other sea users	Timely and efficient communication will be given to sea users in the area via Notices to Mariners (NtM), Kingfisher Bulletins, Navigational Telex (NAVTEX), and Navigational Areas (NAVAREA) warnings.	The Proposed Project is in accordance with the policy objectives
SE-OG-1	Proposals in areas where a licence for oil and gas has been granted or formally applied for should not be authorised unless it is demonstrated that the other development or activity is compatible with the oil and gas activity.	OUT	There are no oil and gas operations located within the Study Area (10 km of Order Limits). There have also been no oil and gas licence blocks identified within the Study Area. Effects on oil and gas operations are therefore not considered further in this assessment. Existing oil and gas activities remain unchanged.	N/A	N/A	The Proposed Project is in accordancewith the policy objectives
SE-OG-2	Proposals within areas of geological oil and gas extraction potential demonstrating compatibility with future extraction activity will be supported.	OUT	There are no planned oil and gas activities identified within the Study Area (10 km of Order Limits). Effects on oil and gas operations are therefore not considered further in this	N/A	N/A	The Proposed Project is in accordance with the policy objectives

Marine Plan Policy Assessment

Project:	**Sealink**					
Assessment completed by:	[redacted]	**National Grid**				
East Inshore Marine Plan	**Policy Text**	**Policy screened in or out**	**Assessment of Policy**	**Type of impact**	**Relevant Mitigation**	**Compliance with Marine Plan**
			assessment. Existing oil and gas activities remain unchanged.			
SE-PS-1	In line with the National Policy Statement for Ports, sustainable port and harbour development should be supported. Only proposals demonstrating compatibility with current port and harbour activities will be supported. Proposals within statutory harbour authority areas or their approaches that detrimentally and materially affect safety of navigation, or the compliance by statutory harbour authorities with the Open Port Duty or the Port Marine Safety Code, will not be authorised unless there are exceptional circumstances. Proposals that may have a significant adverse impact upon future opportunity for sustainable expansion of port and harbour activities, must demonstrate that they will, in order of preference: a) avoid, b) minimise c) mitigate - adverse impacts so they are no longer significant. If it is not possible to mitigate significant adverse impacts, proposals should state the case for proceeding.	IN	Sustainable port development is not considered to be impacted by the Proposed Project and is compatible with existing port and harbour activities. Furthermore, significant consultation has been undertaken with ports in the Study Area. A detailed Shipping and Navigation assessment is presented in **Application Document 6.2.4.7 Part 4 Marine Chapter 7 Shipping and Navigation** which considers all effects and mitigation. A detailed routing and siting exercise has been undertaken by the Proposed Project as outlined in the CPRSS (**Application Document 8.1 Corridor Preliminary Routeing and Substation Siting study (October 2022)**) and summerised in **Application Document 6.2.1.3 Part 1 Introduction Chapter 3 Main Alternatives Considered** to avoid sensitive Shipping and Navigational features. Most vessel traffic is unlikely to experience significant disruption. In the unlikely case where they are required to navigate around maintenance vessels or marked seabed hazards, this is considered standard navigational practise. Throughout most of the Offshore Scheme, vessels making minor route deviation to avoid the	Disruption to established shipping routes and areas	Embedded mitigation measures, such as NtM, ensure that awareness of the operations among many of the vessels using the area will be suitably raised through the various promulgations and communications	The Proposed Project is in accordance with the policy objectives

Marine Plan Policy Assessment

Project:	**Sealink**					
Assessment completed by:	[redacted]	**National Grid**				
East Inshore Marine Plan	**Policy Text**	**Policy screened in or out**	**Assessment of Policy**	**Type of impact**	**Relevant Mitigation**	**Compliance with Marine Plan**
			inspection and maintenance activities will not suffer any significant operational impact.			
SE-PS-2	Proposals that require static sea surface infrastructure or that significantly reduce under-keel clearance must not be authorised within or encroaching upon International Maritime Organization routeing systems unless there are exceptional circumstances.	IN	No static sea surface infrastructure is proposed as part of the Offshore Scheme. A detailed Shipping and Navigation assessment is presented in **Application Document 6.2.4.7 Part 4 Marine Chapter 7 Shipping and Navigation.** In line with MCA guidance, it is not planned to reduce the existing navigable water depth by more than 5% along any section of the cable (with respect to Chart Datum). It is therefore expected that under-keel clearance is only reduced at a very small number of locations, which are anticipated to be located close into shore. Considering the limited spatial and temporal footprint of the installation operations at along the cable route, along with various mitigations in place such as increased awareness through notices and Vessel Traffic Service (VTS) communications, as well as the presence of guard vessels throughout the operations, the	Reduction in under-keel clearance	A risk based burial approach will be used where cables will be buried to a minimum DOL to the top of the cable of 0.5 m (in areas of bedrock), with a target DOL for the Proposed Project of approximately 1 m to 2.5 m, assessing cable protection risk factors such as sediment type, shallow geology, sediment mobility, fishing activity, shipping movements and anchor deployment along the route.	The Proposed Project is in accordance with the policy objectives

Marine Plan Policy Assessment

Project:	**Sealink**					
Assessment completed by:	[redacted]	**National Grid**				
East Inshore Marine Plan	**Policy Text**	**Policy screened in or out**	**Assessment of Policy**	**Type of impact**	**Relevant Mitigation**	**Compliance with Marine Plan**
			probability of vessel collision along the Offshore Scheme is considered to be "Remote". Most vessel traffic is unlikely to experience significant disruption in the unlikely case where they are required to navigate around maintenance vessels or marked seabed hazards, this being standard navigational practise. Throughout most of the Offshore Scheme, vessels making minor route deviation to avoid the inspection and maintenance activities will not suffer any significant operational impact.			
SE-PS-3	Proposals that require static sea surface infrastructure or that significantly reduce under-keel clearance which encroaches upon high density navigation routes, strategically important navigation routes, or that pose a risk to the viability of passenger services, must not be authorised unless there are exceptional circumstances.	IN	No static sea surface infrastructure is proposed as part of the Offshore Scheme. A detailed Shipping and Navigation assessment is presented in **Application Document 6.2.4.7 Part 4 Marine Chapter 7 Shipping and Navigation**. In line with MCA guidance, it is not planned to reduce the existing navigable water depth by more than 5% along any section of the cable (with respect to Chart Datum). It is therefore expected that under-keel clearance is only reduced at a very small number of locations, which are anticipated to be located close into shore. Considering the limited spatial and temporal footprint of the installation operations at along the cable route, along with various mitigations in place such as increased awareness through notices and Vessel Traffic Service (VTS) communications, as well as the presence of guard vessels	Vessel collisions Disruption to established shipping routes and areas	Embedded mitigations, including measures such as Merchant Shipping Notes (MSN), Notice to Mariners (NtM), Notification of Regular Runners, guard vessel patrol, Security broadcasts on VHF, stakeholder consultations, and communication efforts, authorities and marine organizations aim to increase awareness of operations among vessels in the area.	The Proposed Project is in accordance with the policy objectives

Marine Plan Policy Assessment

Project:	**Sealink**					
Assessment completed by:	[redacted]	**National Grid**				
East Inshore Marine Plan	**Policy Text**	**Policy screened in or out**	**Assessment of Policy**	**Type of impact**	**Relevant Mitigation**	**Compliance with Marine Plan**
			throughout the operations, the probability of vessel collision along the Offshore Scheme is considered to be "Remote". Most vessel traffic is unlikely to experience significant disruption in the unlikely case where they are required to navigate around maintenance vessels or marked seabed hazards, this being standard navigational practise. Throughout most of the Offshore Scheme, vessels making minor route deviation to avoid the inspection and maintenance activities will not suffer any significant operational impact. .			
SE-PS-4	Proposals promoting or facilitating sustainable coastal and/or short sea shipping as an alternative to road, rail or air transport will be supported where appropriate.	OUT	The Offshore Scheme will not directly contribute or facilitate coastal and / or short sea shipping. Existing sustainable coastal shipping will remain unchanged.	N/A	N/A	The Proposed Project is in accordance with the policy objectives
SE-REN-1	Proposals that enable the provision of renewable energy technologies and associated supply chains, will be supported.	IN	The Proposed Project needs case is presented in **Application Document 7.2 Strategic Options Back Check Report**. The Proposed Project represents a significant contribution to renewable energy technology production and associated infrastructure / supply chains. The Proposed Project is a proposal by National Grid Electricity Transmission plc to reinforce the transmission network in the South East of England and East Anglia. The Proposed Project is required to accommodate additional power flows generated from renewable and low carbon energy generation, as well as additional	Improving the existing transmission network	N/A	The Proposed Project is in accordance with the policy objectives

Marine Plan Policy Assessment

Project:	**Sealink**					
Assessment completed by:	[redacted]	**National Grid**				
East Inshore Marine Plan	**Policy Text**	**Policy screened in or out**	**Assessment of Policy**	**Type of impact**	**Relevant Mitigation**	**Compliance with Marine Plan**
			new interconnection with mainland Europe. The south of England transmission region includes boundaries LE1, SC1, SC1.5, SC2 and SC3. The LE1 boundary almost exclusively imports power from the north and west of England into the South East. Power flows in the region are determined by the need to meet domestic demand in the southeast as well as imports and exports to Europe via interconnectors. As more energy is pulled across London and into Kent, power flows across LE1 are set to increase. Demand for electricity will grow; interconnectors will exchange more energy with European countries to help balance intermittent sources of power. As a result, the electricity transmission network in the South East will need to be reinforced to ensure it is able to continue operating safely and securely. Likely significant effects on infrastructure and other marine users have been considered in **Application Document 6.2.4.8 Part 4 Marine Chapter 8 Commercial Fisheries** and **Application Document 6.2.4.9 Part 4 Marine Chapter 9 Other Sea Users**.			
SE-REN-2	Proposals for new activity within areas held under a lease or an agreement for lease for renewable energy generation should not be authorised, unless it is demonstrated that the proposed development or activity will not reduce the	IN	The Proposed Project needs case is presented in **Application Document 7.2 Strategic Options Back Check Report**. The Proposed Project is not located with a lease area for renewable energy generation, and represents a significant	Disturbance to other sea users	N/A	The Proposed Project is in accordance with the policy objectives

Marine Plan Policy Assessment

Project:	**Sealink**					
Assessment completed by:	[redacted]	**National Grid**				
East Inshore Marine Plan	**Policy Text**	**Policy screened in or out**	**Assessment of Policy**	**Type of impact**	**Relevant Mitigation**	**Compliance with Marine Plan**
	ability to construct, operate or decommission the existing or planned energy generation project.		contribution to renewable energy technology production and associated infrastructure / supply chains. The Proposed Project will not compromise the construction, operation, maintenance or decommissioning of any offshore wind farms in the area.			
SE-REN-3	Proposals for the installation of infrastructure to generate offshore renewable energy, inside areas of identified potential and subject to relevant assessments, will be supported.	IN	The Proposed Project needs case is presented in **Application Document 7.2 Strategic Options Back Check Report**. The Proposed Project is not located with a lease area for renewable energy generation, and represents a significant contribution to renewable energy technology production and associated infrastructure / supply chains. All relevant assessments have been completed as part of the DCO application and presented in Volume 6 of this ES.	Disturbance to other sea users	N/A	The Proposed Project is in accordance with the policy objectives

Marine Plan Policy Assessment

Project:	**Sealink**					
Assessment completed by:	[redacted]	**National Grid**				
East Inshore Marine Plan	**Policy Text**	**Policy screened in or out**	**Assessment of Policy**	**Type of impact**	**Relevant Mitigation**	**Compliance with Marine Plan**
SE-HER-1	Proposals that demonstrate they will conserve and enhance the significance of heritage assets will be supported. Where proposals may cause harm to the significance of heritage assets, proponents must demonstrate that they will, in order of preference: a) avoid b) minimise c) mitigate - any harm to the significance of heritage assets. If it is not possible to mitigate, then public benefits for proceeding with the proposal must outweigh the harm to the significance of heritage assets.	IN	Likely effects on Marine Archaeological Receptors is presented in **Application Document 6.2.4.6 Part 4 Marine Chapter 6 Marine Archaeology**.With the application of mitigation, it is anticipated that impacts on heritage assets as a result of the Proposed Project will be avoided or minimised. There are no designated sites or known sites of prehistoric date within the study area. There are currently no maritime or aviation sites within the study area that are subject to statutory protection. Within the study area, a total of 722 geophysical anomalies were identified as being of possible archaeological potential. There are currently no intertidal sites within the study area that are subject to statutory protection. The Offshore Scheme has been designed to avoid and/or reduce any impacts to marine archaeological receptors and heritage assets. AEZs will be implemented around known wreck sites and marine geophysical anomalies of archaeological interest. A Code of construction practice and Mitigation has been developed through the EIA process and outlined in **Application Document 7.5.3.1 CEMP Appendix A Outline Code of Construction Practice** and **Application Document 7.5.3.2 CEMP Appendix B Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments (REAC)**.The approach to the implementation of	Disturbance and/or damage to locations of archaeological interest	Where sensitive routeing and siting of infrastructure and temporary works around marine heritage assets is not possible, anomaly investigation will be undertaken to confirm the nature and value of the seabed anomaly. Locations of known archaeological interest/value, or areas where archaeological work is planned, will be signposted/fenced off to avoid unintentional damage. Where a previously unknown heritage asset is discovered, or a known heritage asset proves to be more significant than foreseen at the time of application, the project will inform the local planning authority and will agree a solution that protects the significance of the new discovery, so far as is practicable, within the project parameters.	The Proposed Project is in accordancewith the policy objectives

Marine Plan Policy Assessment

Project:	**Sealink**					
Assessment completed by:	[redacted]	**National Grid**				
East Inshore Marine Plan	**Policy Text**	**Policy screened in or out**	**Assessment of Policy**	**Type of impact**	**Relevant Mitigation**	**Compliance with Marine Plan**
			these mitigation measures is described in **Application Document 7.5.5 Outline Offshore Overarching Written Scheme of Investigation (OWSI)**.			
SE-SCP-1	Proposals should ensure they are compatible with their surroundings and should not have a significant adverse impact on the character and visual resource of the seascape and landscape of the area. The location, scale and design of proposals should take account of the character, quality and distinctiveness of the seascape and landscape. Proposals that may have a significant adverse impact on the seascape and landscape of the area should demonstrate that they will, in order of preference: a) avoid b) minimise c) mitigate - adverse impacts so they are no longer significant. If it is not possible	IN	The Offshore Scheme is not expected to impact the seascape or marine character of the area as the cable will be buried subsea, with no subsea infrastructure visible. Changes to the Project have been implemented to minimise landscape effects with land based activities (above MHWS) included in a separate Landscape and Visual Assessment in the EIA for the Onshore Schemes and presented in **Application Document 6.2.2.1 Part 2 Suffolk Chapter 1 Landscape & Visual** and **Application Document 6.2.3.1 Part 3 Kent Chapter 1 Landscape & Visual.** The Proposed Project needs case is presented in **Application**	Impacts to marine character	Location of terrestrial infrastructure as far as practicable from main highways and sensitive coastal areas. Planting and screening. Buildings clad with appropriate material.	The Proposed Project is in accordance with the policy objectives

Marine Plan Policy Assessment

Project:	**Sealink**					
Assessment completed by:	[redacted]	**National Grid**				
East Inshore Marine Plan	**Policy Text**	**Policy screened in or out**	**Assessment of Policy**	**Type of impact**	**Relevant Mitigation**	**Compliance with Marine Plan**
	to mitigate, the public benefits for proceeding with the proposal must outweigh significant adverse impacts to the seascape and landscape of the area. Proposals within or relatively close to nationally designated areas should have regard to the specific statutory purposes of the designated area. Great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty.		**Document 7.2 Strategic Options Back Check Report**.			
SE-FISH-1	Proposals that support a sustainable fishing industry, including the industry's diversification, should be supported.	IN	**Application Document 6.2.4.8 Part 4 Marine Chapter 8 Commercial Fisheries** considers the impact of the Proposed Project on Commercial Fisheries. The Offshore Scheme will not directly contribute to sustainable fishing industries. Existing sustainable fishing remains unchanged.	Disturbance to other sea users	Designated Fisheries Liaison Officer (FLO). Outline Construction Environmental Mitigation Plan.	The Proposed Project is in accordance with the policy objectives
SE-FISH-2	Proposals that enhance access for fishing activities should be supported. Proposals that may have significant adverse impacts on access for fishing activities must demonstrate that they will, in order of preference: a) avoid b) minimise c) mitigate - adverse impacts so they are no longer significant. If it is not possible to mitigate significant adverse impacts, proposals should state the case for proceeding.	IN	**Application Document 6.2.4.8 Part 4 Marine Chapter 8 Commercial Fisherie**s considers the impact of the Proposed Project on Commercial Fisheries. The Offshore Scheme will not directly enhance access for fishing industries. Temporary displacement of other sea users may occur during construction and decommissioning of the Proposed Project. With the short-term, localised and transitory nature of the installation works (and therefore the exclusion zones), and with effective communication	Temporary displacement	A Fisheries Liaison Officer (FLO) and fisheries working group(s) will be maintained throughout installation to ensure project information is effectively disseminated to ensure a dialogue is maintained with the commercial fishing industry and access to home ports remains during the main fishing season. Timings of any temporary areas of exclusion from fishing grounds will be clearly communicated via a Notice to Mariners.	The Proposed Project is in accordance with the policy objectives

Marine Plan Policy Assessment

Project:	**Sealink**					
Assessment completed by:	[redacted]	**National Grid**				
East Inshore Marine Plan	**Policy Text**	**Policy screened in or out**	**Assessment of Policy**	**Type of impact**	**Relevant Mitigation**	**Compliance with Marine Plan**
			measures planned to mitigate any potential effect to fishers, spatially and temporally, it is considered that the majority of netting vessels will be resilient and able to adapt their fishing practices temporarily.			
SE-FISH-3	Proposals that enhance essential fish habitat, including spawning, nursery and feeding grounds, and migratory routes should be supported. Proposals that may have significant adverse impacts on essential fish habitat, including spawning, nursery and feeding grounds, and migratory routes, must demonstrate that they will, in order of preference: a) avoid b) minimise c) mitigate adverse impacts so they are no longer significant.	IN	**Application Document 6.2.4.8 Part 4 Marine Chapter 8 Commercial Fisheries** considers the impact of the Proposed Project on Commercial Fisheries. The Offshore Scheme will not directly enhance essential fish habitat. The footprint of physical disturbance to seabed habitats is considered to be localised and temporary. Recovery of any shellfish and demersal adult and spawning populations (including sandeel and herring), as well as habitat function, is expected to occur following cable burial. A degree of recovery would be expected over the short to medium term (one to five years) with individuals recolonising suitable substrates following completion of cable installation.	Disturbance to essential fish habitats	A risk based burial approach will be used where cables will be buried to a minimum DOL to the top of the cable of 0.5 m (in areas of bedrock), with a target DOL for the Proposed Project of approximately 1 m to 2.5 m, assessing cable protection risk factors such as sediment type, shallow geology, sediment mobility, fishing activity, shipping movements and anchor deployment along the route.	The Proposed Project is in accordance with the policy objectives

Marine Plan Policy Assessment

Project:	**Sealink**					
Assessment completed by:	[redacted]	**National Grid**				
East Inshore Marine Plan	**Policy Text**	**Policy screened in or out**	**Assessment of Policy**	**Type of impact**	**Relevant Mitigation**	**Compliance with Marine Plan**
SE-EMP-1	Proposals that result in a net increase in marine related employment will be supported, particularly where they meet one or more of the following: 1) are aligned with local skills strategies and support the skills available 2) create a diversity of opportunities 3) create employment in locations identified as the most deprived 4) implement new technologies - in, and adjacent to, the south east marine plan area.	IN	The Socio-economic impacts and benefits of the Proposed Project are considered in **Application Document 6.2.2.10 Part 2 Suffolk Chapter 10 Socio-Economics, Recreation, and Tourism** and **Application Document 6.2.3.10 Part 3 Kent Chapter 10 Socio-Economics, Recreation and Tourism**. The construction period is expected to take approximately four years. The number of full-time equivalent (FTE) jobs required by the Suffolk Onshore Scheme will vary over the four-year construction period. National Grid estimates that a peak of 414 FTE jobs, and an average of 162 gross direct FTE jobs will be required on-site over the four-year construction period. The number of full-time equivalent (FTE) jobs required by the Kent Onshore Scheme will vary over the four-year construction period. The Applicant estimates that a peak of 292 FTE jobs, and an average of 118 gross direct FTE jobs will be required on-site over the four-year construction period.	Employment Opportunities	N/A	The Proposed Project is in accordance with the policy objectives
SE-CC-1	Proposals that conserve, restore or enhance habitats that provide flood defence or carbon sequestration will be supported. Proposals that may have significant adverse impacts on habitats that provide a flood defence or carbon sequestration ecosystem service must demonstrate that they will, in order of preference: a) avoid b)	IN	Habitat loss as a result of the Offshore Scheme will be highly localised to the cable corridor, and will not impact wider ecosystem functioning or biodiversity. Furthermore, any habitat disturbance will be temporary and would be expected to recover over short periods of time. The Onshore Schemes of the Proposed Project have considered Biodiversity Net Gain plans in	Biodiversity Net Gain	Biodiversity Net Gain Strategy	The Proposed Project is in accordance with the policy objectives

Marine Plan Policy Assessment

Project:	**Sealink**					
Assessment completed by:	[redacted]	**National Grid**				
East Inshore Marine Plan	**Policy Text**	**Policy screened in or out**	**Assessment of Policy**	**Type of impact**	**Relevant Mitigation**	**Compliance with Marine Plan**
	minimise c) mitigate - adverse impacts so they are no longer significant d) compensate for significant adverse impacts that cannot be mitigated.		accordance with the Environment Act 2021 and is presented in **Application Document 6.12 Biodiversity Net Gain Feasibility Report**.			
SE-CC-2	Proposals in the south east marine plan area should demonstrate for the lifetime of the project that they are resilient to the impacts of climate change and coastal change.	IN	A Climate Change Assessment has been undertaken for the Proposed Project and presented in **Application Document 6.2.5.1 Part 5 Combined Chapter 1 Climate Change**. The environmental assessment concluded that the effects on the global climate by the Proposed Project are likely to be not significant because the Proposed Project's GHG impacts are fully consistent with applicable existing and emerging policy requirements set by the government to support them in reaching their net zero target and move away from the use of fossil fuels. The assessment also concluded that the effect of climate change impacts on the Proposed Project are not anticipated to be significant. Where any climate change impacts are identified they will be managed through the appropriate mitigation.	N/A	Construction workers will undergo training to increase their awareness of environmental issues as applicable to their role on the Proposed Project. Vehicles will be correctly maintained and operated in accordance with manufacturer's recommendations. An offshore Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) including an Emergency Spill Response Plan and Waste Management Plan, Marine Pollution Contingency Plan (MPCP), Shipboard Oil Pollution Emergency Plan (SOPEP) and a dropped objects procedure will be produced prior to installation.	The Proposed Project is in accordance with the policy objectives

Marine Plan Policy Assessment

Project:	**Sealink**					
Assessment completed by:	[redacted]	**National Grid**				
East Inshore Marine Plan	**Policy Text**	**Policy screened in or out**	**Assessment of Policy**	**Type of impact**	**Relevant Mitigation**	**Compliance with Marine Plan**
SE-CC-3	Proposals in the south east marine plan area, and adjacent marine plan areas, that are likely to have significant adverse impacts on coastal change, or on climate change adaptation measures inside and outside of the proposed project areas, should only be supported if they can demonstrate that they will, in order of preference: a) avoid b) minimise c) mitigate - adverse impacts so they are no longer significant.	IN	To minimise impacts of costal erosion, the HVDC cable will use trenchless installation techniques at landfalls. The primary method of installation across the offshore route is burial.	Coastal erosion	A risk based burial approach will be used where cables will be buried to a minimum DOL to the top of the cable of 0.5 m (in areas of bedrock), with a target DOL for the Proposed Project of approximately 1 m to 2.5 m, assessing cable protection risk factors such as sediment type, shallow geology, sediment mobility, fishing activity, shipping movements and anchor deployment along the route.	The Proposed Project is in accordancewith the policy objectives
SE-CCUS-1	Decommissioning programmes for oil and gas facilities should demonstrate that they have considered the potential for re-use of infrastructure	OUT	The Proposed Project is not an oil and gas facility.	N/A	N/A	The Proposed Project is in accordance with the policy objectives
SE-AIR-1	Proposals must assess their direct and indirect impacts upon local air quality and emissions of greenhouse gases. Proposals that are likely to result in increased air pollution or increased emissions of greenhouse gases must demonstrate that they will, in order of preference: a) avoid b) minimise c) mitigate - air pollution and/or greenhouse gas emissions in line with current national and local air quality objectives and legal requirements.	IN	Likely significant effects to Air Quality is presented in **Application Document 6.2.2.8 Part 2 Suffolk Chapter 8 Air Quality** and **Application Document 6.2.3.8 Part 3 Kent Chapter 8 Air Quality** for Kent and Suffolk. No likely significant effects are expected from the Proposed Project in line with current national and local air quality objectives and legal requirements.	Impacts to Air Quality	Outline Construction Environmental Mitigation Plan. Outline Noise and Vibration Management Plan	The Proposed Project is in accordance with the policy objectives

Marine Plan Policy Assessment

Project:	**Sealink**					
Assessment completed by:	[redacted]	**National Grid**				
East Inshore Marine Plan	**Policy Text**	**Policy screened in or out**	**Assessment of Policy**	**Type of impact**	**Relevant Mitigation**	**Compliance with Marine Plan**
SE-ML-1	Public authorities must make adequate provision for the prevention, re-use, recycling and disposal of waste to reduce and prevent marine litter. Public authorities should aspire to undertake measures to remove marine litter within their jurisdiction.	IN	The Proposed Project is not proposing measures to remove marine litter as part of the Offshore Scheme. Existing levels of marine litter will remain unchanged. The management of waste during the offshore works will be detailed post consent within the Construction Environmental Management Plan (**Application Document 7.5.2 Outline Offshore Construction Environmental Management Plan**). In addition, Controls for any wastewater discharges (such as effluent discharges, ballast waters, bilge waters, and deck runoff) will be included in the CEMP, in accordance with the latest legislation, regulatory limits and good practice.	Increase of Marine Litter	An offshore Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) including an Emergency Spill Response Plan and Waste Management Plan, Marine Pollution Contingency Plan (MPCP), Shipboard Oil Pollution Emergency Plan (SOPEP) and a dropped objects procedure will be produced prior to installation.	The Proposed Project is in accordance with the policy objectives
SE-ML-2	Proposals that facilitate waste re-use or recycling to reduce or remove marine litter will be supported. Proposals that could potentially increase the amount of marine litter in the marine plan area must include measures to, in order of preference: a) avoid b) minimise c) mitigate - waste entering the marine environment.	IN	The Proposed Project is not proposing measures to remove marine litter as part of the Offshore Scheme. Existing levels of marine litter will remain unchanged. The management of waste during the offshore works will be detailed post consent within the Construction Environmental Management Plan (**Application Document 7.5.2 Outline Offshore Construction Environmental Management Plan**). In addition, Controls for any wastewater discharges (such as effluent discharges, ballast waters, bilge waters, and deck runoff) will be included in the CEMP, in accordance with the	Increase of Marine Litter	An offshore Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) including an Emergency Spill Response Plan and Waste Management Plan, Marine Pollution Contingency Plan (MPCP), Shipboard Oil Pollution Emergency Plan (SOPEP) and a dropped objects procedure will be produced prior to installation.	The Proposed Project is in accordance with the policy objectives

Marine Plan Policy Assessment

Project:	**Sealink**					
Assessment completed by:	[redacted]	**National Grid**				
East Inshore Marine Plan	**Policy Text**	**Policy screened in or out**	**Assessment of Policy**	**Type of impact**	**Relevant Mitigation**	**Compliance with Marine Plan**
			latest legislation, regulatory limits and good practice.			
SE-WQ-1	Proposals that protect, enhance and restore water quality will be supported. Proposals that cause deterioration of water quality must demonstrate that they will, in order of preference: a) avoid b) minimise) mitigate - deterioration of water quality in the marine environment.	IN	The Proposed Project is not proposing measures to enhance or restore water quality as part of the Offshore Scheme. Deterioration of water quality is considered in **Application Document 6.2.2.4 Part 2 Suffolk Chapter 4 Water Environment**, **Application Document 6.2.3.4 Part 3 Kent Chapter 4 Water Environment** and **Application Document 6.2.4.1 Physical Processes**. No likely significant effects to water quality are expected from the Proposed Project.	Reduction in Water Quality	An offshore Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) including an Emergency Spill Response Plan and Waste Management Plan, Marine Pollution Contingency Plan (MPCP), Shipboard Oil Pollution Emergency Plan (SOPEP) and a dropped objects procedure will be produced prior to installation. The use of biodegradable drilling fluids (pose little or no risk (PLONOR) substances) where practicable.	The Proposed Project is in accordance with the policy objectives
SE-ACC-1	Proposals demonstrating appropriate enhanced and inclusive public access to and within the marine area, including the provision of services for tourism and recreation activities, will be supported. Proposals that may have significant adverse impacts on public access should demonstrate that they will, in order of preference: a) avoid b) minimise c) mitigate- adverse impacts so they are no longer significant.	IN	The Proposed Project is not proposing measures to enhance public access to the marine area as part of the Offshore Scheme but maintain access. No significant adverse impacts on public access are anticipated. National Grid has committed to using trenchless techniques during landfall construction.	Reduction in public access	Timely and efficient communication will be given to sea users in the area via Notices to Mariners, Kingfisher Bulletins, Navigational Telex (NAVTEX and Navigational Areas (NAVAREA) warnings. Trenchless landfall installation.	The Proposed Project is in accordance with the policy objectives

Marine Plan Policy Assessment

Project:	**Sealink**					
Assessment completed by:	[redacted]	**National Grid**				
East Inshore Marine Plan	**Policy Text**	**Policy screened in or out**	**Assessment of Policy**	**Type of impact**	**Relevant Mitigation**	**Compliance with Marine Plan**
SE-TR-1	Proposals that promote or facilitate sustainable tourism and recreation activities, or that create appropriate opportunities to expand or diversify the current use of facilities, should be supported. Proposals that may have significant adverse impacts on tourism and recreation activities must demonstrate that they will, in order of preference: a) avoid b) minimise c) mitigate - adverse impacts so they are no longer significant.	IN	Likely significant effects to tourism and recreation is presented in **Application Document 6.2.2.10 Part 2 Suffolk Chapter 10 Socio-Economics, Recreation, and Tourism** and **Application Document 6.2.3.10 Part 3 Kent Chapter 10 Socio-Economics, Recreation, and Tourism**. Likely significant effects to other sea users is presented in **Application Document 6.2.4.9 Part 4 Marine Chapter 9 Other Sea Users**. The Proposed Project is not proposing measures to promote or facilitate sustainable tourism to the marine area as part of the Offshore Scheme, however, no significant adverse impacts on sustainable tourism are anticipated. Although works during construction, maintenance and decommissioning may temporarily disrupt activities at both landfalls and nearshore for the short term, recreational users will be able to use other areas in close proximity.	Disturbance to recreational boating and angling	Communications with other vessels in the area will be maintained throughout construction, maintenance and decommissioning, and the works will be notified under Notices to Mariners. Recreational boaters will also be advised to the timing and location of works in the nearshore / inter-tidal area.	The Proposed Project is in accordance with the policy objectives
SE-SOC-1	Those bringing forward proposals should consider and demonstrate how their development shall enhance public knowledge, understanding, appreciation and enjoyment of the marine environment as part of (the design of) the proposal.	IN	The Applicant has undertaken engagement with stakeholders, communities and landowners throughout the site selection process and development of the ES through the Scoping and PEIR consultation and Expert Topic Groups.(**Application Document 6.2.1.6 Part 1 Introduction Chapter 6 Scoping Opinion and EIA Consultation**). The Proposed Project has created a number of publicly available information sources regarding the baseline environment of the Offshore	Enhancement of Public Knowledge	N/A	The Proposed Project is in accordance with the policy objectives

Marine Plan Policy Assessment

Project:	**Sealink**					
Assessment completed by:	[redacted]	**National Grid**				
East Inshore Marine Plan	**Policy Text**	**Policy screened in or out**	**Assessment of Policy**	**Type of impact**	**Relevant Mitigation**	**Compliance with Marine Plan**
			Scheme, all of which are available on the website.			
SE-DEF-1	Proposals in or affecting Ministry of Defence areas should only be authorised with agreement from the Ministry of Defence.	IN	Kentish Knock military practice and exercise area (PEXA) intersects the Offshore Scheme. Given any safety zones around vessels move at the rate of the associated vessels, any disruption will be localised and short term, representing only a slight increase from baseline conditions. Consultation with the Ministry of Defence will be ongoing throughout construction to minimise any impacts.	Disturbance to Military Practice Areas	The MOD will be notified prior to any activities taking place in military practice and exercise areas	The Proposed Project is in accordance with the policy objectives
SE-MPA-1	Proposals that support the objectives of marine protected areas and the ecological coherence of the marine protected area network will be supported. Proposals that may have adverse impacts on the objectives of marine protected areas must demonstrate that they will, in order of preference: a) avoid b) minimise c) mitigate - adverse impacts, with due regard given to statutory advice on an ecologically coherent network.	IN	The mitigation hierarchy for impacts to marine protected areas has been applied when identifying a marine cable corridor. Engagement with regulators and stakeholders has been ongoing through statutory and non-statutory consultation. Relevant literature has also been drawn upon during assessments as required. The Proposed Project intersects the Leiston- Aldeburgh Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), Outer Thames Estuary Special Protection Area (SPA),Southern North Sea Special Area of Conservation (SAC), Sandwich Bay SAC, Thanet Coast and Sandwich Bay SPA and Sandwich Bay to Hacklinge Marshes SSSI. The Proposed Project is not expected	Disturbance to Marine Protected Areas	Sensitive routeing and siting of infrastructure and temporary works to avoid protected sites where possible. If not feasible, additional mitigation will be adhered to avoid significant effects to sensitive features within these sites.	The Proposed Project is in accordancewith the policy objectives

Marine Plan Policy Assessment

Project:	**Sealink**					
Assessment completed by:	[redacted]	**National Grid**				
East Inshore Marine Plan	**Policy Text**	**Policy screened in or out**	**Assessment of Policy**	**Type of impact**	**Relevant Mitigation**	**Compliance with Marine Plan**
			to result in Likely Significant Effects to any designated features within these sites, and will not interfere with the conservation objectives. The proposal is therefore considered to be in accordance with the SE-MPA-1. Effects on designated sites are considered in **Application Document 6.6 Habitat Regulations Assessment Report** and **Application Document 6.11 Marine Conservation Zone Assessment**.			
SE-MPA-2	Proposals that enhance a marine protected area's ability to adapt to climate change, enhancing the resilience of the marine protected area network, will be supported. Proposals that may have adverse impacts on an individual marine protected area's ability to adapt to the effects of climate change, and so reduce the resilience of the marine protected area network, must demonstrate that they will, in order of preference: a) avoid b) minimise c) mitigate - adverse impacts	IN	Effects on Marine Protected Areas has been considered in the assessment for the Proposed Project. The mitigation hierarchy for impacts to marine protected areas has been applied when identifying a marine cable corridor. Engagement with regulators and stakeholders has been ongoing through statutory and non-statutory consultation. Relevant literature has also been drawn upon during assessments as required. Effects on designated sites are considered in **Application Document 6.6 Habitat Regulations Assessment Report** and **Application Document 6.11 Marine Conservation Zone Assessment**. Global warming places many species at risk, with a loss of suitable habitats, and shifts in prey distributions due to changing conditions. The extensive benefits of the Project in contributing to combating climate	Disturbance to Marine Protected Areas	Sensitive routeing and siting of infrastructure and temporary works to avoid protected sites where possible. If not feasible, additional mitigation will be adhered to avoid significant effects to sensitive features within these sites.	The Proposed Project is in accordance with the policy objectives

Marine Plan Policy Assessment

Project:	**Sealink**					
Assessment completed by:	[redacted]	**National Grid**				
East Inshore Marine Plan	**Policy Text**	**Policy screened in or out**	**Assessment of Policy**	**Type of impact**	**Relevant Mitigation**	**Compliance with Marine Plan**
			change are detailed in **Application Document 7.2 Strategic Options Report**.			
SE-MPA-3	Where statutory advice states that a marine protected area site condition is deteriorating or that features are moving or changing due to climate change, a suitable boundary change to ensure continued protection of the site and coherence of the overall network should be considered.	IN	The mitigation hierarchy for impacts to marine protected areas has been applied when identifying a marine cable corridor. Engagement with regulators and stakeholders has been ongoing through statutory and non-statutory consultation. Relevant literature has also been drawn upon during assessments as required. The Proposed Project intersects the Leiston- Aldeburgh Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), Outer Thames Estuary Special Protection Area (SPA),Southern North Sea Special Area of Conservation (SAC), Sandwich Bay SAC, Thanet Coast and Sandwich Bay SPA and Sandwich Bay to Hacklinge Marshes SSSI. The Proposed Project is not expected to result in Likely Significant Effects to any designated features within these sites, and will not interfere with the conservation objectives. Effects on designated sites are considered in **Application Document 6.6**	Disturbance to Marine Protected Areas	Sensitive routeing and siting of infrastructure and temporary works to avoid protected sites where possible. If not feasible, additional mitigation will be adhered to avoid significant effects to sensitive features within these sites.	The Proposed Project is in accordance with the policy objectives

Marine Plan Policy Assessment

Project:	**Sealink**					
Assessment completed by:	[redacted]	**National Grid**				
East Inshore Marine Plan	**Policy Text**	**Policy screened in or out**	**Assessment of Policy**	**Type of impact**	**Relevant Mitigation**	**Compliance with Marine Plan**
			Habitat Regulations Assessment Report and **Application Document 6.11 Marine Conservation Zone Assessment**. As a result of Statutory Consultation, the Offshore Scheme Boundary has been moved to avoid intersecting the Goodwin Sands MCZ and the sensitive features located within it.			
SE-MPA-4	Proposals that may have significant adverse impacts on designated geodiversity must demonstrate that they will, in order of preference: a) avoid b) minimise c) mitigate - adverse impacts so they are no longer significant.	IN	Likely significant effects to geodiversity is presented in **Application Document 6.2.4.1 Physical Processes**. The mitigation hierarchy for impacts to marine protected areas has been applied when identifying a marine cable corridor. Engagement with regulators and stakeholders has been ongoing through statutory and non-statutory consultation. Relevant literature has also been drawn upon during assessments as required. Effects on designated sites are considered in **Application Document 6.6 Habitat Regulations Assessment Report** and **Application Document 6.11 Marine Conservation Zone Assessment**. The Proposed Project has been developed to avoid and minimised adverse impacted to geodiversity though a full routing and siting exercise (**Application Document 8.1**	Disturbance to Marine Protected Areas	Sensitive routeing and siting of infrastructure and temporary works to avoid protected sites where possible. If not feasible, additional mitigation will be adhered to avoid significant effects to sensitive features within these sites.	The Proposed Project is in accordance with the policy objectives

Marine Plan Policy Assessment

Project:	**Sealink**					
Assessment completed by:	[redacted]	**National Grid**				
East Inshore Marine Plan	**Policy Text**	**Policy screened in or out**	**Assessment of Policy**	**Type of impact**	**Relevant Mitigation**	**Compliance with Marine Plan**
			Corridor Preliminary Routeing and Substation Siting study (October 2022).			
SE-BIO-1	Proposals that enhance the distribution of priority habitats and priority species will be supported. Proposals that may have significant adverse impacts on the distribution of priority habitats and priority species must demonstrate that they will, in order of preference: a) avoid b) minimise c) mitigate - adverse impacts so they are no longer significant d) compensate for significant adverse impacts that cannot be mitigated.	IN	The mitigation hierarchy for impacts to marine biodiversity has been applied when identifying a marine cable corridor. Marine ecology and biodiversity has been considered within the EIA. Engagement with regulators and stakeholders has been ongoing through statutory and non-statutory consultation. Two survey campaigns have been undertaken for the Proposed Project to gain baseline information of marine biodiversity and features. Relevant literature has also been drawn upon during assessments as required. The Proposed Project is not expected to significantly impact priority habitats and species.	Disturbance to priority habitats and species	Sensitive routeing and siting of infrastructure and temporary works.	The Proposed Project is in accordance with the policy objectives

Marine Plan Policy Assessment

Project:	**Sealink**					
Assessment completed by:	[redacted]	**National Grid**				
East Inshore Marine Plan	**Policy Text**	**Policy screened in or out**	**Assessment of Policy**	**Type of impact**	**Relevant Mitigation**	**Compliance with Marine Plan**
SE-BIO-2	Proposals that enhance or facilitate native species or habitat adaptation or connectivity, or native species migration, will be supported. Proposals that may cause significant adverse impacts on native species or habitat adaptation or connectivity, or native species migration, must demonstrate that they will, in order of preference: a) avoid b) minimise c) mitigate - adverse impacts so they are no longer significant d) compensate for significant adverse impacts that cannot be mitigated.	IN	Habitat loss as a result of the Offshore Scheme will be highly localised to the cable corridor, and will not impact wider ecosystem functioning or biodiversity. Furthermore, any habitat disturbance will be temporary and would be expected to recover over short periods of time. The Onshore Schemes of the Proposed Project have considered Biodiversity Net Gain plans in accordance with the Environment Act 2021 in **Application Document 6.12 Biodiversity Net Gain Feasibility Report**. The Proposed Project is not expected to significantly impact native habitats and species.	Habitat Loss	Sensitive routeing and siting of infrastructure and temporary works.	The Proposed Project is in accordance with the policy objectives
SE-BIO-3	Proposals that conserve, restore or enhance coastal habitats, where important in their own right and/or for ecosystem functioning and provision of ecosystem services, will be supported. Proposals must take account of the space required for coastal habitats, where important in their own right and/or for ecosystem functioning and provision of ecosystem services, and demonstrate that they will, in order of preference: a) avoid b) minimise c) mitigate d) compensate for - net habitat loss.	IN	Habitat loss as a result of the Offshore Scheme will be highly localised to the cable corridor, and will not impact wider ecosystem functioning or biodiversity. Furthermore, any habitat disturbance will be temporary and would be expected to recover over short periods of time. Impacts to sensitive coastal habitats such as saltmarsh have been avoided through the use of trenchless techniques at both landfalls. The Onshore Schemes of the Proposed Project have also considered Biodiversity Net Gain plans in accordance with the Environment Act 2021 in **Application Document 6.12 Biodiversity Net Gain Feasibility Report**.	Biodiversity Net Gain	Biodiversity Net Gain Strategy	The Proposed Project is in accordance with the policy objectives

Marine Plan Policy Assessment

Project:	**Sealink**					
Assessment completed by:	[redacted]	**National Grid**				
East Inshore Marine Plan	**Policy Text**	**Policy screened in or out**	**Assessment of Policy**	**Type of impact**	**Relevant Mitigation**	**Compliance with Marine Plan**
SE-INNS-1	Proposals that reduce the risk of introduction and/or spread of invasive non-native species should be supported. Proposals must put in place appropriate measures to avoid or minimise significant adverse impacts that would arise through the introduction and transport of invasive non-native species, particularly when: 1) moving equipment, boats or livestock (for example fish or shellfish) from one water body to another 2) introducing structures suitable for settlement of invasive non-native species, or the spread of invasive non-native species known to exist in the area.	IN	The use of cables is expected to require protection at some locations, which will introduce hard substrates in the form of rock protection or mattresses, to habitats dominated by sediments ranging from mud to sand and gravel. This could provide additional habitat for any existing epifaunal INNS populations allowing for localised spreading. The potential impact of the introduction of INNS via vessel hull or ballast water was considered unlikely. To ensure, that the potential impact of INNS introduction is reduced, all rock and concrete mattresses used for cable protection will be clean, so do not provide a vector for INNS directly. Furthermore, although there are concerns around introduced substrata providing habitat for INNS, particularly given the substantial growth of marine infrastructure in the North Sea, to date, no spread of INNS caused by submarine cabling has been documented. **Application Document 7.5.12 Outline Invasive Non-Native Species Management Plan** outlines the measures to be adhered to by the Proposed Project.	Introduction and spread of INNS via the addition of cable protection during construction and maintenance	A biosecurity plan will be produced for the project, following the latest guidance on INNS from the GB non-native species secretariat.All project vessels must adhere to the International Maritime Organisation (IMO) Guidelines for the control and management of ships' biofouling to minimize the transfer of invasive aquatic species.Any material introduced into the marine environment, such as rock protection material, will be from a suitable source to ensure no INNS can be introduced.Where possible, cable protection materials will be selected to match the environment (e.g. when cables are installed in areas of cobbles or other natural rock features.	The Proposed Project is in accordancewith the policy objectives

Marine Plan Policy Assessment

Project:	**Sealink**					
Assessment completed by:	[redacted]	**National Grid**				
East Inshore Marine Plan	**Policy Text**	**Policy screened in or out**	**Assessment of Policy**	**Type of impact**	**Relevant Mitigation**	**Compliance with Marine Plan**
SE-INNS-2	Public authorities with functions to manage activities that could potentially introduce, transport or spread invasive non-native species should implement adequate biosecurity measures to avoid or minimise the risk of introducing, transporting or spreading invasive non-native species.	IN	The use of cables is expected to require protection at some locations, which will introduce hard substrates in the form of rock protection or mattresses, to habitats dominated by sediments ranging from mud to sand and gravel. This could provide additional habitat for any existing epifaunal INNS populations allowing for localised spreading. The potential impact of the introduction of INNS via vessel hull or ballast water was considered unlikely. To ensure, that the potential impact of INNS introduction is reduced, all rock and concrete mattresses used for cable protection will be clean, so do not provide a vector for INNS directly. Furthermore, although there are concerns around introduced substrata providing habitat for INNS, particularly given the substantial growth of marine infrastructure in the North Sea, to date, no spread of INNS caused by submarine cabling has been documented. **Application Document 7.5.12 Outline Invasive Non-Native Species Management Plan** outlines the measures to be adhered to by the Proposed Project.	Introduction and spread of INNS via the addition of cable protection during construction and maintenance	A biosecurity plan will be produced for the project, following the latest guidance on INNS from the GB non-native species secretariat.All project vessels must adhere to the International Maritime Organisation (IMO) Guidelines for the control and management of ships' biofouling to minimize the transfer of invasive aquatic species.Any material introduced into the marine environment, such as rock protection material, will be from a suitable source to ensure no INNS can be introduced.Where possible, cable protection materials will be selected to match the environment (e.g. when cables are installed in areas of cobbles or other natural rock features.	The Proposed Project is in accordancewith the policy objectives

Marine Plan Policy Assessment

Project:	**Sealink**					
Assessment completed by:	[redacted]	**National Grid**				
East Inshore Marine Plan	**Policy Text**	**Policy screened in or out**	**Assessment of Policy**	**Type of impact**	**Relevant Mitigation**	**Compliance with Marine Plan**
SE-DIST-1	Proposals that may have significant adverse impacts on highly mobile species through disturbance or displacement must demonstrate that they will, in order of preference: a) avoid b) minimise c) mitigate - adverse impacts so they are no longer significant.	IN	Volume 6, Part 4 of the ES assesses impacts from the Proposed Project on highly mobile species such as Fish and Shellfish Ecology, Marine Mammals and Marine Ornithology. Several activities undertaken during the lifetime of the project will generate underwater sound which may disturb or displace highly mobile species. With regard to disturbance from underwater sound, the activity with the highest sound source is the operation of the sub bottom profiler. The distance from sound source at which disturbance can occur, referred to as the Effective Deterrent Range (EDR) is 5 km. Thus, the area of disturbance from the project activities identified above is small in relation to the distribution range of the populations of concern. In addition, as project vessels are continuously moving, any disturbance impacts will be transient, intermittent, and short-term. Airborne sound produced during the project life cycle is likely to be limited to vessel operation and landfall activities. Given the slow speeds at which the offshore installation vessels are known to operate during cable installation, it is unlikely that high airborne sound levels offshore will be produced. Project activities will be taking place near Goodwin Sands, where highly mobile species including seals are known to haul-out but activities will only take	Airborne sounds and visual disturbance. Underwater sound	Adherence to JNCC guidelines, where appropriate, regarding the minimisation of impacts from underwater sound generated from known project activities. Adherence to JNCC guidance for assessing the significance of noise disturbance against conservation objectives of the Southern North Sea SAC.	The Proposed Project is in accordance with the policy objectives

Marine Plan Policy Assessment

Project:	**Sealink**					
Assessment completed by:	[redacted]	**National Grid**				
East Inshore Marine Plan	**Policy Text**	**Policy screened in or out**	**Assessment of Policy**	**Type of impact**	**Relevant Mitigation**	**Compliance with Marine Plan**
			place at high tide and so disturbance here is unlikely. Seal surveys have also been undertaken at Pegwell Bay to supplement our assessment within **Application Document 6.2.4.4 Marine Mammals** and **Application Document 7.5.11 Outline Marine Mammal Mitigation Plan** has also been included at DCO submission.			
SE-UWN-1	Proposals that result in the generation of impulsive sound must contribute data to the UK Marine Noise Registry as per any currently agreed requirements. Public authorities must take account of any currently agreed targets under the Marine Strategy Part One Descriptor 11.	OUT	The only impulsive sound generated from the Proposed Project will be UXO detonation. UXO detonation is not considered as part of the DCO submission but will be subject to an additional Marine Licence once locations are known in order to make a more accurate assessment of impacts. The UK Marine Noise Registry will be updated as required.	UXO Under Water Noise	Adherence to JNCC guidelines, where appropriate, regarding the minimisation of impacts from underwater sound generated from known project activities. Adherence to JNCC guidance for assessing the significance of noise disturbance against conservation objectives of the Southern North Sea SAC.	The Proposed Project is in accordance with the policy objectives

Marine Plan Policy Assessment

Project:	**Sealink**					
Assessment completed by:	[redacted]	**National Grid**				
East Inshore Marine Plan	**Policy Text**	**Policy screened in or out**	**Assessment of Policy**	**Type of impact**	**Relevant Mitigation**	**Compliance with Marine Plan**
SE-UWN-2	Proposals that result in the generation of impulsive or non-impulsive noise must demonstrate that they will, in order of preference: a) avoid b) minimise c) mitigate - adverse impacts on highly mobile species so they are no longer significant. If it is not possible to mitigate significant adverse impacts, proposals must state the case for proceeding.	IN	Volume 6, Part 4 of the ES assesses impacts from the Proposed Project on Fish and Shellfish Ecology, Marine Mammals and Marine Ornithology. Several activities undertaken during the lifetime of the project will generate underwater sound. With regard to disturbance, the activity with the highest sound source is the operation of the sub bottom profiler. The distance from sound source at which disturbance can occur, referred to as the Effective Deterrent Range (EDR) is 5 km. Thus, the area of disturbance from the project activities identified above is small in relation to the distribution range of the populations of concern. In addition, as project vessels are continuously moving, any disturbance impacts will be transient, intermittent, and short-term. Although behavioural responses may occur, they will be temporary and localised. **Application Document 7.5.11 Outline Marine Mammal Mitigation Plan** has been included at DCO submission.	Underwater sound	Adherence to JNCC guidelines, where appropriate, regarding the minimisation of impacts from underwater sound generated from known project activities. Adherence to JNCC guidance for assessing the significance of noise disturbance against conservation objectives of the Southern North Sea SAC.	The Proposed Project is in accordance with the policy objectives
SE-CE-1	Proposals which may have adverse cumulative effects with other existing, authorised, or reasonably foreseeable proposals must demonstrate that they will, in order of preference: a) avoid b) minimise c) mitigate - adverse cumulative and/or in-combination effects so they are no longer significant.	IN	A cumulative assessment is provided for each technical chapter in the ES. This assessment considers other plans, projects and activities that may impact cumulatively with the Proposed Project. These activities include offshore windfarms, subsea cables and pipelines, oil and gas exploration and extraction and fisheries management areas.	Cumulative impacts with other proposed developments	N/A	The Proposed Project is in accordance with the policy objectives

Marine Plan Policy Assessment

Project:	**Sealink**					
Assessment completed by:	[redacted]	**National Grid**				
East Inshore Marine Plan	**Policy Text**	**Policy screened in or out**	**Assessment of Policy**	**Type of impact**	**Relevant Mitigation**	**Compliance with Marine Plan**
			As a general rule, other activities are only screened into the assessment where there is a spatial and/or temporal overlap in effects such that a cumulative effect would be possible, or where effects are on a defined receptor group (such as within the boundaries of a designated site). No likely cumulative effects are anticipated for the Proposed Project.			
SE-CBC-1	Proposals must consider cross-border impacts throughout the lifetime of the proposed activity. Proposals that impact upon one or more marine plan areas or terrestrial environments must show evidence of the relevant public authorities (including other countries) being consulted and responses considered.	IN	All works associated with the Proposed Project fall within the UK jurisdiction (12 NM). Given the distance of the Proposed Project from French waters (approximately 25 km), no significant transboundary effects have been identified. Predicted disturbance from the Proposed Project is short term and local and are therefore not anticipated to be sufficient to influence marine mammal receptors (highly mobile species) outside UK waters, and subsequently cause transboundary effects.	Transboundary Effects	N/A	The Proposed Project is in accordance with the policy objectives

Page intentionally blank

National Grid plc
National Grid House,
Warwick Technology Park,
Gallows Hill, Warwick.
CV34 6DA United Kingdom

Registered in England and Wales
No. 4031152
nationalgrid.com